

The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 541

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1900.

Number 136.

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.

"Though the cause of Evil prosper, yet 'tis Truth alone is strong."

Four years more of a "syndicated president." Four years more of trusts, imperialism, speculation, monopoly, plutocracy and a dinner pail "full" with lettering on the outside and scant of food within. Four years more of a prosperity banquet of which the deluded masses only catch the aroma but upon which the syndicates fatten.

The real objection to William J. Bryan is not his so-called "economic vagaries." It is his steady conscience. Men are accustomed to delude themselves with the notion that what they wish in politics is an honest man. It is all a mistake. What too many do wish is a dishonest man whose dishonesty is of the same pattern as their own. Bryan's greatest weakness as a presidential candidate is his honesty of purpose and fidelity to conviction.

Says Robert T. Lincoln, the plutocratic son of the third of America's four great democrats, "the election eliminates in Mr. Bryan a man who has been a danger and a threat to the country." Precisely that spirit was manifested in the fifties by the proslavery men toward Mr. Lincoln's illustrious father, who was the same dangerous and threatening man then that Bryan is now. And for the same reason: Lincoln threatened vested interests in slavery; Bryan threatens vested interests in monopoly. Like Lincoln, Bryan is an enemy of institutional larceny. Hence to men like

Robert T. Lincoln he is as dangerous as Abraham Lincoln was in the estimation of Toombs.

The number of people who voted for McKinley because they feared that if he were defeated a panic might be artificially caused in resentment was doubtless much larger than one accustomed to respecting human nature would guess. It is hard to believe that any man with a spark of civic conscience and even a rabbit's courage would vote to perpetuate the power of a regime which could produce a panic at will. If McKinley's plutocratic friends can do this, it is high time they were shorn of their power; and in that case he must be a pitiful coward who would pass on the fight with them to his children, instead of bearing the burden of it himself. What we need in this country is not so much brute courage of the Roosevelt kind, as manly moral courage of the John Hampden kind.

That peculiar kind of prosperity which, from its extraordinary vagaries, has come to be distinguished as the McKinley brand, responded with startling promptness to the results of the presidential election. Trust stocks went up with a boom, on the day after the vote, and the price of wheat went down. Our flag, as well as the British, has become, in the language of Cecil Rhodes, "a valuable commercial asset"—for the privileged classes by whom the sources and channels of commerce are monopolized.

Republican papers are accusing Aguinaldo of resorting—we quote from the Chicago Tribune of the 8th—to

peculiar means of securing arms for his followers. It is by offering to pay the American soldiers, or the imper-

ialistic soldiers as he terms them, for the delivery of their arms to the Filipinos.

And in a headline the Tribune describes this as offering "bribes to Americans." Inasmuch as the present American administration set the example in that method of warfare, by offering to buy arms from Filipino soldiers, and boasted of it in official reports, there is delicious simplicity in calling it peculiar and denouncing it as bribery. The only thing peculiar about it, however, is the fact that whereas American soldiers sell their arms to Aguinaldo, the Filipino soldiers refused to sell theirs to President McKinley. But this peculiarity adds no luster to the American name. It indicates rather that the American soldier in the Philippines has nothing there worth fighting for, while the Filipino fights for the independence of his native land.

An attempt to reorganize the democratic party under plutocratic influences is announced from Detroit, apparently upon the authority of Don M. Dickinson. The report states that a meeting will be held in a few weeks in New York to outline a plan of reorganization and promulgate a declaration of principles. Some of the names mentioned in connection with this movement are enough to damn it at the start with all declaration of independence democrats. Among them are William C. Whitney and Abram S. Hewitt. Whitney is one of the Standard Oil trust party, who not only draws a vast income from the earnings of an impoverished people, but advocates the perpetuation of every law and institution that makes his unearned fortune possible. Hewitt never was and is not now able to distinguish a democratic principle from a government bond. A proslavery man when his party, under

the dictation of the slave power, defied the declaration of independence, he has never changed, but still clings to the notion that robbery of the poor by the rich, if upon a large scale and by authority of ancient law, is sound democratic doctrine. The meaning of this proposed reorganization of the democratic party is plain. It looks to making of the democratic and the republican parties two office seeking factions of a dominating plutocratic combine.

In response to the Whitney-Dickinson-Hewitt scheme to turn the democratic organization over to plutocracy and the trusts, we gladly commend Gov. Altgeld's pertinent observations:

The second defeat of Bryan will not result in complete reorganization of the democratic party. Bryan is 2,000,000 votes stronger than any other man in the party, and if we cannot elect him we cannot elect anybody. The result simply shows that money can control the American elections. The issues have nothing to do with it. If we had declared for the gold standard the defeat would have been worse, for we would have lost what we had and would not have gained anything, because the corrupt syndicates wanted a tool and not a man in the white house, and they would have corrupted the elections just the same to elect McKinley. We do not want to win if we must sell or mortgage the democratic party to eastern speculators for moneymaking purposes as was done both times when we elected Cleveland. If the government must be run on corrupt Hamiltonian principles, we want the republicans to do it. The democratic party must stand for the toiling masses or else have no mission. To-day the party stands for justice and seven or more millions of men who supported Bryan are satisfied with it. They are not asking for reorganization. The men who are talking about reorganization are the hypocrites and the corporation creatures who supported McKinley when they found that they would not be permitted to prostitute the democratic party. Their proper place is the republican party. Justice must triumph in the end, and the democracy will win if it is only true to great principles, and it will be spat on if it again allies itself with the corruptionists who run the syndicates.

We were told before the election that the Filipinos would stop fighting if McKinley were elected. The

notion was that they would see the hopelessness of the effort—as if a people fighting for liberty are ever hopeless. But now that the election is over, and McKinley has—most unfortunately for the real prosperity and true honor of the country—been reelected, we are told that his election instead of bringing peace in the Philippine islands, will only strengthen our subjugating arms. Upon being officially advised by the war department that McKinley had won, Gen. MacArthur replied that this decision of the American people to hold the Philippines would materially aid the military in overcoming the native resistance. That does not sound like voluntary submission. But there is worse to come. The same dispatch from Washington in which this information about MacArthur was given tells of preparations to increase the army. Secretary Root has based his estimates upon a force of 100,000 men, 65,000 of them to be in the regular service. He and the president are to urge upon congress, so the Washington dispatch continues, the necessity of this increase, and as soon as authority is obtained they will adopt measures to recruit and transport enough troops to the Philippines to take the place of those whose terms expire. So the Filipinos must be crushed, and the beginnings of a giant military establishment must be continued. Here, then, we have the outcroppings of that bolder policy which is to be adopted in consequence of the *carte blanche* Mr. McKinley received at the polls last Tuesday—a more pronounced imperialism and a less timid militarism. And who that voted for McKinley has the right to complain?

The British tories celebrate Mr. McKinley's political victory with nearly as much enthusiasm as they celebrated their own. The *St. James Gazette* regards the result as a popular approval of the American colonial policy in imitation of the British; and the *Pall Mall Gazette* proclaims that "in McKinley and Roose-

velt Great Britain has just the sort of friends" she wants. Evidently the British tories understand what was involved in our election, even if so many of our own people did not. To them the result is a favorable response to Chamberlain's wish that while other nations may be friendly to British imperialism, the United States may be more than friendly. And they are right. Mr. McKinley's reelection, under the circumstances, seals a friendly alliance, not with the people of England, which we should welcome, but with the tory party of the British empire. It confirms that "understanding between statesmen," and makes the dominant parties of both countries one—one for empire abroad and militarism at home.

The tipping system in restaurants has reached such a point of perfection in London that proprietors sell to waiters the privilege of working. The waiters not only live upon tips, getting no wages, but pay premiums for the opportunity. A better illustration could hardly be desired of the truth that gratuities to the working class, when general, go not into the pockets of that class, but into the tills of somebody who exploits them.

Waldorf Astor is making more trouble in London. He is now trying to close a footpath which runs through his grounds, and the people are up in arms about it. But why should they be? If the grounds are Astor's own, he ought not to incur anyone's displeasure by closing them against other people. If, on the other hand, the grounds are not his, why make a fuss about a footpath?

The president of the National Live Stock association, in his opening speech at the recent annual meeting in Chicago, declared that "the cities are filled to overflowing and cannot provide labor for all who come." He, therefore, advised that "social rest and peace and the prosperity of our nation" demand that workers go from the cities to the country. But he