

# The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse  
Nov 3-00 Box 511

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 18, 1900.

Number 124.

**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.

He who is not vain falls far short of being a human man; he who does not suppress his vanity goes a long way toward being a human fool.

According to the McKinley policy, the slaveholding, polygamous Mohammedan Sulus are fit for self-government. Mr. McKinley has made a treaty with them. But the Christian Filipinos are not fit for self-government. He refuses them a treaty and demands unconditional submission. Even Christianity is at low water mark with our imperialistic administration.

Gov. Roosevelt's decision to hold Mayor Van Wyck to account in connection with the republican ice trust of New York city, would be more impressive if he had not exposed his partisan bias in the matter in his speech at Philadelphia. When judges publicly declare their views in advance of a decision, as to the guilt or innocence of parties on trial before them, their decision, when it comes, is fairly open to question. So with Roosevelt's decision in this case.

In Bucks county, Pa., there is a McKinley man of local prominence, William C. Mayne by name, whose candor completely outruns his discretion. At a recent meeting of the Bristol township republican club, says the Doylestown Democrat, of August 9, Mr. Mayne proposed a declaration of principles which refers to McKinley and Roosevelt as "men whom our country will ever recall as emperors both in peace and war." Bucks county McKinleyism has at

least the rare quality of honest expression.

The McKinley organs have to move back and forth lively in this exasperating presidential campaign. It is no uncommon thing for them in one column to assure their readers that the silver question is the paramount issue, while in another they tell of free silver republicans returning to the Hanna fold, because the silver question will not be an issue for years to come!

For the purpose of indicating the enormous growth of site values in London, the Westminster Gazette compares the cost of making the new tramway extensions with the cost of the land required. The comparison is highly significant if you have eyes to see and a brain to think. We quote from the Gazette:

The cost of the tramways themselves, including all the necessary paving and other works in connection with them, is to be £844,200. But in order to carry out this work, street widenings and the acquisition of land are necessary; and the cost of this is estimated at £993,760—a subsidiary expense which is just £150,000 greater than the expense of the work itself!

The high water mark of demagogic impudence is reached by the McKinley papers that assail Bryan for publishing his book through a nonunion printing establishment. Bryan had nothing to do with choosing the printer who made his book. It was a matter he could not control. But the printer who is thus stigmatized as a non-union employer, is among the warmest supporters of McKinley. McKinleyism appears to be in a bad way for campaign material.

On the day of the assembling of the Liberty congress at Indianapolis,

the McKinley administration gave to the press a letter captured months ago in the Philippines, which it stigmatized as treasonable. There was nothing treasonable about it. Treason cannot be predicated of any act in connection with the American war in the Philippines, for it is not a lawful war. The letter in question was merely absurd. Had it been an authoritative expression of the anti-imperialist movement, it would properly enough have brought ridicule upon the movement. But, coming as it did from a purely personal and irresponsible source, it could not fairly influence any intelligent man either to laugh at the movement or to denounce it. Yet the administration saves up this foolish letter for months so as to have it published with the accompaniment of flaring headlines just as the Liberty congress is in session. The obvious purpose was to make a sensation for political effect. That purpose fails, but the demagogic methods of the administration are again exposed.

The action this week of the London waiters in proposing to abolish "tips" as degrading and demoralizing is a good sign. We should like to see workingmen in our own country set themselves sternly against this humiliating but rapidly growing custom. It does not even add to their wages. But assailing their self-respect at the outset, it depletes their incomes in the end. For wherever "tips" are plentiful wages are low. In some places wages drop off altogether, and employes have to pay their employers a premium for the chance of getting "tips."

One of the most promising signs of the times is the manifest disposition of colored voters to divide politically. It will be better for the

country as a whole; it will be better for them as a race. There were sentimental reasons why they should have supported the republican party almost as a body in the years following the acquisition of their rights. These rights had been bestowed by that party, and their bestowal had been wrongfully and foolishly opposed by the so-called democrats. But, if this sense of gratitude had not prevailed, the race question would have been settled in favor of the negro long ago. Had his race split their vote, both political parties would have sought for the largest slice, and each would have electioneered for it. That matter, however, has gone into the past. The present question for the negro to solve, and he must solve it for himself, is whether he will allow his gratitude to the party of Lincoln to make of his race a political attachment to the party of Hanna. From the outrageous treatment his race receives at the hands of some so-called democrats at the south—mere survivals of a period when the democratic party was pro-slavery and imperialistic—he may naturally feel, if he does not stop to analyze conditions, that the democratic party is still the enemy of his race. But if he does analyze he will observe that the democratic party is rapidly becoming the liberty party of the country, while the republican party is as rapidly losing its claim to that title. Old things are passing away in politics; all things are becoming new. Just as an anti-slavery Boutwell comes over from the republicans to the democrats to get away from the new republican doctrine about the subjugation of "inferior races," so the Robert Toombs type of southern democrat is finding his way into the republican party as the only political home for men who believe in that doctrine. Negroes who fall in with this doctrine of subjugating "inferior races" ought to support Mark Hanna's party. Those who believe in equality regardless of race will find in the new democracy the only party that now makes that principle its ideal.

In these days of Christianizing and civilizing of barbarians at the point of the bayonet and the grim music of machine guns, it is worth one's while, for it may help to precipitate the mud of deviltry that beclouds his religious aspirations, to read a book just published by the Cassell company, called "A White Woman in Central Africa." It is by Helen Cad-dick, an English woman. Day by day and night by night she was alone in the charge and at the mercy of barbarian blacks. Yet their respect and care for this white woman could not have been surpassed, if indeed it would have been equaled, in the midst of our boasted Christian civilization. To appreciate a striking difference between "barbarism" and "civilization," one has only to inquire what would be the experience of a black woman who should attempt such a solitary trip through enlightened America as this white woman made through Central Africa!

If imagination fails to indicate how a lone barbarian woman might fare at the hands of civilized men, let this story suggest. It is told by the wife of E. B. Drew, British commissioner of customs at Tientsin, a lady who recently arrived at San Francisco from China and told the story to an Associated Press reporter. We extract it from the Chicago Record of the 8th. Mrs. Drew said of the Russian soldiery (and are not the Russians our civilized allies):

They pillaged, looted, tortured and murdered right and left. There were many infants and children killed by bayonet thrusts. And many were tossed time and again. There is ample evidence of these unspeakable occurrences. And about Chinese women. They were mistreated and murdered in house after house. It seemed as if nothing could stay the mad frenzy of these Russians. Out from Tientsin are numerous little villages. The Russians swept through the villages, destroying life and property. In these places they also tossed infants and older children in the air from bayonets. The Russians also drove women and children into the river, where they were drowned.

In a recent lecture, Prof. Harry

Pratt Judson, of the University of Chicago, touched upon the disposition of some people to think that they are persecuted pioneers of truth when in fact they are justly discredited cranks a few degrees removed from insanity. Because some epithet like "crank" has been applied to all great reformers, these people jump to the conclusion that if they themselves are called cranks they are presumably great reformers whom society will delight to honor. Prof. Judson describes this logic as so deliciously innocent as to be quite irresistible. In that he is quite right. But he clearly mistakes the attitude of mind which likens the treatment of so-called cranks in our day with the scurvy treatment of pioneers of truth in the past. Few so-called cranks try to prove by reference to the similarity of their treatment to that of the treatment of historic reformers that they also are great reformers. What these references to the bad treatment of dead and gone reformers by the thoughtless herd of their time usually mean is that the thoughtless herd now is the same as the thoughtless herd then. Now as aforetime, when something new is proposed, it is denounced and its proposer is crucified, regardless of whether it is a false or true, but simply because it is new and disturbing. In this view of the matter it is the cranks who are right, and not Prof. Judson. Since historic time began, and it was doubtless so long before, every new truth has come into the world as a babe born in a manger, and after confounding in its youth the professors, has been denounced by them and crucified at the behest of the mob, to arise from the dead, glorified at last. As many falsities have gone through the same experience, except the last — for a falsity once killed is killed forever; it has no resurrection—we cannot reasonably infer that persecution is evidence of the truth of the thing persecuted or of the inspiration of its preachers; but we can infer that the wise mob and the foolish mob in all