

ical power, are the aim and object of both. If New York were a republican city, "Tammany hall" would be a republican organization and Croker a republican leader. Hanna would never have been heard of outside of Cleveland. If Chicago were a republican city, the "City hall" would be a republican organization and Harrison a republican heeler. As it is, both "Tammany hall" in New York, and the "City hall" in Chicago, must profess to be democratic. Otherwise they could not get at the spoils. It is not strange, in these circumstances, that Harrison's "City hall" and Croker's "Tammany hall" work in harmony. Certain kinds of affiliation are natural. Nor will it be remarkable if both try to wreck the presidential ticket, since neither can benefit by its election and both may find local advantage in compassing its defeat. The disposition to do this will be in no degree weakened by the fact that Croker and Harrison were alike "turned down" at Kansas City. Croker was completely balked at every turn by Hill, very much to his own discomfiture and Hill's advantage; while Harrison was rebuked by the nomination of Stevenson, and, though nominal leader of the Illinois delegation, was overshadowed by Altgeld.

It was through the manipulation of the Harrison faction—the "City hall" of Chicago politics—that Stevenson had been humiliated at the Springfield convention in June. Stevenson's career in national politics and his standing in the state made him an eminently appropriate candidate for delegate at large to the national convention; but "peanut" politics prevailed, and a Chicago criminal lawyer, with no political standing or record, was made a delegate at large, while Stevenson was pushed into the position of alternate. But without the slightest effort on his part, and equally without any on the part of the Harrison faction, Stevenson, whom the "peanut" machine had rejected as a delegate, became the party candidate for vice president. This

is one of the incidents which goes to show how utterly weak Mr. Harrison is when he gets beyond the influence of the city appointments and contracts which he controls in Chicago.

Another incident in this line was connected with the presence of Altgeld at the national convention. Altgeld stood no more chance of being sent from Chicago to either the state or the national convention than Thomas Jefferson would if he had been here. Harrison's "City hall" machine, with its appointments and contracts, controlled the local conventions. But when Altgeld appeared at the state convention the calls for him were too spontaneous and enthusiastic to be ignored. He was invited to the platform where he delivered a speech which made it impossible for any of Bryan's secret enemies to frustrate a vote of instructions for Bryan. From the state convention Altgeld went, still as a private member of the party, to the national convention at Kansas City. He arrived in good time to prevent something worse than a blunder. Harrison, as the head of the Illinois delegation, had almost upset the arrangement of Bryan's friends to make Gov. Thomas temporary presiding officer; but Altgeld, almost with a wave of the hand, brushed Harrison aside and saved this important position from going from Thomas to Rose of Milwaukee. From that moment Harrison was a nonentity at Kansas City. In spite of his expectation that Altgeld would view the Kansas City convention from the gallery, if at all, Altgeld was the first person not a delegate to be invited to address the convention from the platform. Though the convention was very largely composed of politicians of the Harrison order, it was not insensible to the overshadowing qualities of superior men; and it was evident at Kansas City that Altgeld, however short he might be of the support of "peanut" politicians in Chicago, is the one great national character of Illinois in the democratic party.

In the gold democratic movement four years ago there were two types of men. Both believed in the gold standard. Both had economic reasons for their belief. But whereas the men of one type, being plutocrats as well as economists, found themselves at home in association with the McKinley-Hanna outfit, men of the other type, being essentially democrats, were drawn away from the democracy only by their economic convictions. Where these two types of gold democrats will be found in the coming campaign it is easy to conjecture. The plutocratic type will support McKinley, while the democratic type will support Bryan. An example of the way in which the latter looks upon the present situation is afforded by Edward J. Shriver, a well-known single tax man of the east, who broke away from most of the single tax men of the country four years ago because he could not reconcile "16 to 1" with his economic conscience. We quote from Mr. Shriver's letter:

For the sake of whatever slight influence it may have, in view of my having exerted myself among single taxers against Bryan in 1896, may I ask you to register my intention to vote for him this year, and that most willingly? By doing this I do not wish to recant my views in any way on the money question, nor my opinion that the 16 to 1 proposition is a distinctly paternalistic one to which as a single taxer it would be impossible for me to subscribe; but even were it to become an issue this year, which I do not believe possible, it seems to me that the present danger to the very fundamentals of republican institutions is too great, and the corruption of the present administration too disgraceful, for anyone who believes in abstract democracy or common decency to regard anything else. I should be willing to set aside even my interest in the single tax for the more pressing emergency. As a gold democrat, moreover, I consider that the silver democrats have conceded to us in the Kansas City platform all that we have a right to ask, and that when they invite us to join them in the "paramount issue" where we agree, it would be petty in us to deny them the privilege of reasserting their convictions on other points, however wrong we may still deem those to be.

It would have been impossible for

the free silver men to refrain from repeating the coinage clause of the platform of 1896, after the reception which the republicans had given to the state platforms that merely reaffirmed. Even the platform adopted in Illinois, which reaffirmed in whole and in part, in letter and in spirit, was described by the republican press, and even by some of the gold democracy press, as a backdown. This made it necessary to do what might otherwise have been unnecessary. The only alternative was to reassert the silver declarations of 1896 or to go into the campaign under charges of trimming. Bryan preferred the former course. Another reason doubtless influenced him. It was the evident intention of the mere "peanut" politicians of the party to make a reaffirmation the basis for a free silver campaign in the west, and the neglect to reassert it the basis for a gold campaign in the east. That was the kind of campaign that McKinley made in 1896. But Bryan is not like McKinley. Come victory or come defeat, Bryan is frank with the people. So the free silver clause was repeated because the democratic party stands for free silver. Any ambiguity on that issue would have been a fraud. At the same time it must be conceded, and this will be demonstrated as the campaign progresses, that the repetition of the free silver clause puts the money issue out of this election. Had there been no repetition the revolt of the populists and the free silver republicans, the anger of free silver democrats, and the letter of Bryan whether of acceptance or declination, would have given a new impetus to that question which even so fundamental an issue as imperialism might not have checked. As it is, the money issue remains in abeyance while the issue of republic or empire is tried at the bar of American citizenship.

And now it leaks out that Mr. McKinley tried to hedge on the silver question. Postmaster General Smith drafted a platform for the Philadel-

phia convention in which the party would have been made once more to oppose silver coinage "except by international agreement," and this statement of the issue Mr. McKinley approved. But the bosses were too much for him. Knowing that such a declaration wasn't worth a nickel for corruption fund purposes, they changed it to a flat-footed gold standard demand, which Mr. McKinley swallows as meekly as he swallows all the other doses that Hanna has prepared for him. The contrast between such a man and the man who notified his party that if it stultified him in its platform it must seek another candidate is worth studying.

An American military officer in the Philippines has been convicted and sentenced to be reprimanded for conniving at the looting by his men of Filipino homes. The articles taken from these "naked savages," as the imperialist papers delight in describing the Filipinos, were such things as one silver watch, two hypodermic syringes, one diamond glass cutter, one bugle in leather case, one lot of clothing, three canes with silver heads, one box canned goods, two bottles of wine, two bottles of rum, one double-barrel shotgun, one parasol, and one lot of coins. The convicted officer must have been surprised when in the formal reprimand he was advised that the army is in the Philippines to protect, not to despoil. As a rational being he must have observed that the army is there to do on a large scale what he allowed his men to do on a small one.

A letter published in the Omaha World, from A. F. Miller, Thirty-second United States volunteers, tells of a method of torturing Filipinos which is as ingenious as it is devilish. It is called the water cure. Describing it, Mr. Miller, with no little gusto, as becomes a Christian soldier bent on converting the heathen by force of arms, explains that the soldiers put the Filipinos—

on their backs, a man standing on each hand and each foot; then put a round

stick in the mouth and pour a pail of water in the mouth and nose, and if they don't give up pour another pail. They swell up like toads. I'll tell you it's terrible torture.

This torture is applied to compel the Filipinos to give up their hidden arms. In confirmation of Miller's story an officer, writing to the "City and State," of Philadelphia, also tells of the water cure; but he attributes its use to the Macabebe scouts whom the American government employs. The Macabebe is a bitter enemy of the Filipino, in much the same way and probably for much the same reason that the American Indian was bitter in his enmity toward the colonists of our revolutionary period. Like the American Indian, also, he is a savage. His employment, therefore by our government is analogous to the employment by the British government of savage Indians in the war of subjugation against the American patriots. The Indians scalped and burned their prisoners; the Macabebes flood theirs with water until they "swell up like toads." While it relieves our soldiers of the charge of brutality to attribute this torture to the Macabebes, the responsibility is only shifted from the soldiers to their government. Great Britain has been condemned by the civilized world for engaging savage Indians to torture the American revolutionists; shall we escape similar condemnation when it appears that we have employed Macabebe savages to torture Filipinos?

That extraordinary democrat, St. Clair McKelway, editor of the renegade Brooklyn Eagle, has evolved from his inner consciousness a principle of constitutional law of the first magnitude as a curiosity. Arguing for imperialism, he says that this republic as a nation "made the constitution and the constitution did not make it." As if that were not absurd enough, he adds that the nation "derives from the constitution no right and duty of sovereignty." Yet further he proclaims that "its sovereignty is in itself, not in the constitution;" and asserting that "its sovereignty