

perialism, what is it? Even if it were not, in what fundamental respect could imperialism be less republican? Don't shy at the label, gentlemen! If you accept the new doctrine of your party that congress and the president are empowered to govern distant peoples without their consent and free from the safeguards of the constitution, be brave about it and pin on the imperial label. This label is no whit worse than the policy it is intended to identify.

The democratic platform is justly criticized by Goldwin Smith for its neglect, when charging the republicans with making an ill-concealed alliance with Great Britain, to distinguish between Great Britain and British Tories. Mr. Smith well says, writing for the Toronto Weekly Sun, that—

Great Britain is not an individual. It is a nation like the United States, divided into parties, and, under normal conditions, pretty equally divided, though at the present moment the liberal party is depressed by the ascendancy of the war spirit. With the tory party in Great Britain President McKinley and his followers unquestionably are in alliance. They fancy, though without any real ground, that they owe to it diplomatic support against the other European powers for their raid on the Spanish possessions. They think that, by its proceedings in South Africa, it is countenancing their proceedings in the Philippines. They probably look forward to having it as their accomplice in any expansionist designs which they may be meditating for the future. But the tory party is not Great Britain; nor is Great Britain to be treated as though she were inclined as a whole to a partnership with the government of Washington in any sort of violence or wrong. The democratic party is morally in alliance, not ill-concealed, but ill-understood, with the liberal party in Great Britain, against the spirit of imperial aggression which threatens to get possession of the world. It ought, in composing its manifestoes, to take notice of the friends as well as of the enemies of its cause in Great Britain.

Evidently public opinion in Great Britain, jingo though it is, is not yet ready to face military conscription. The ministry proposed it, and one day last week the under secretary for

war made a plea for it in parliament. But he was finally obliged to withdraw the measure. It was strenuously opposed, not only by the democratic elements, but also by imperialists. The London Star pertinently asks why imperialists should have opposed conscription, saying "you cannot assert your hegemony in China, your suzerainty in Africa, claim the golden stool of Ashanti, teach France her manners, and wield a longer spoon than Russia, without either courting disaster or facing conscription." The answer, however, to the Star's question, is simple. Imperialists in England understand perfectly that if their policy continues conscription must be faced; but they also understand that while the British people are ready enough to jubilate over victories in London they are not ready to be drafted to win them across seas. They may accept imperialism, but not militarism—not yet. That is the reason the conscription measure was withdrawn. In our own country similar conditions prevail. We have not yet got so far as to propose a military draft law in congress. But this must come if we keep on with McKinley's policy. As certainly as the wheel horse follows his leader in a tandem, so certainly does militarism follow imperialism. To govern refractory colonies requires a large military force, and except when patriotism runs high, the maintenance of a large military force necessitates conscription.

Letters from imperialist warriors in the Philippines, which are percolating through the McKinley press, express great anxiety over the election possibilities. Their writers want McKinley elected because it would be, as one of this letter-writing corps puts it, "a more crushing blow to the insurgent army than we can administer to them in a dozen battles." The first thing to consider about letters of that kind is the fact that the mail of soldiers in the Philippines is under censorship. Consequently no one here can know whether the letters represent soldier sentiment in general or

not. The next thing is that soldier sentiment in favor of imperialism is, anyhow, a poor guide for voters who do not believe in militarism. The third is that Mr. McKinley, after seven full months with 65,000 troops, has failed to put down an "insurrection" which, according to Gen. Otis, was already put down before the seven months began to run. What then can be hoped for from him?

Another southern community has been disgraced by the lynching of a negro. We refer to Huntsville, Ala. This lynching was not attended with the barbarous cruelties that characterized those of Georgia several months ago. The mob merely hanged the prisoner without a trial. But it was a responsible mob, led by a well-known citizen; and if the people of Alabama do not bring him to the bar as a murderer and do their utmost to see him legally hanged for his crime, they make themselves responsible in the eyes of civilized men for his lawlessness. And they cannot excuse the mob nor themselves by pleading the infamy of the crime for which the negro was lynched. His guilt was not established. Neither the mob nor the community knows to this day whether he was guilty or not. And even if his guilt were positively known, the crime of the mob is no less. We could in that case discard sympathy for the murdered negro, saying that he had got his deserts; but we should still leave innocent negroes in danger of lynching upon unfounded accusations. The community that believes in law and order will not tolerate mob law even against the guilty. It will punish those who lawlessly execute vengeance upon the guilty, to the end that there may be security for the innocent. Nor will it allow race prejudice to swerve it from this manifest duty.

All through the fit of business hysterics, now at an end, which was generally and confidently exploited as evidence of prosperity, we insisted that the so-called prosperity was a feverish sham. All the circumstances

bore out this opinion. Some rich men were, indeed, getting richer, and many working men were finding jobs. But men out of jobs were much more abundant than jobs out of men. There was no healthy industrial activity. So manifest was this that even the prosperity touters were obliged to do most of their shouting in the future tense. And now the correctness of our view of the matter is being conceded. Not only is it agreed that times are far from good, but the conviction is growing that they were not really good while they were supposed to be so. The great Wall street operator, Keene, is the first king of finance to openly acknowledge the truth. In an interview in London on the 23d, he said:

I do not look upon the business situation in the United States as prosperous. We have had a period of four years of extraordinary excitement, which is now on the ebb. That kind of business cannot live when the excitement is over.

It was sham prosperity all the time.

Attention is called by the New York Nation to the suggestive fact that in the seven states in which the question of woman suffrage has been twice submitted to popular vote it has without exception been much better supported at the polls the second time than the first. The latest instance was that of Oregon. Earlier reports of this election described the woman suffrage amendment as "snowed under." But as an amendment to strike out of the constitution a pro-slavery clause which had been there since before the civil war had also been "snowed under," the bad defeat of the woman suffrage amendment did not appear to be significant of much except a possible deficiency of intelligence in the Oregon electorate. From the official vote in Oregon, however, it now appears that the woman suffrage amendment was not "snowed under." Oregon has, on the contrary, vastly increased her first vote for woman suffrage. Whereas in 1884 the negative vote was 28,176 to 11,223, this year the negative vote is hardly increased, being only 28,402, while

the affirmative vote is 26,265. It is interesting to note that the strength against the amendment centered in Portland. The gain in favor of it was in the country districts. This result is explained, doubtless, by the fact that slums are in cities, and slums are invariably opposed to woman suffrage.

An idea of the radical tendency of the democratic party may be had from noting the local platforms throughout the country. Some of these to which our attention has been called give marked evidence of an awakening in the rank and file to political and economic truth. An instance is the platform of the democrats of Wyandotte county, Kan., adopted on the 21st at Kansas City, Kan., by the largest democratic convention ever held in that county. In addition to reaffirming the declaration of the national platform "against private monopoly in every form," the Wyandotte county platform lays down this wholesome and far-reaching principle:

Behold this truth to be self-evident: that each laborer is entitled to all wealth due to his individual exertion. We demand the natural increase of wages that a just distribution of wealth would give. As to what is the just distribution of wealth there can be no dispute. It is that which gives wealth to him who makes it, and secures wealth to him who saves it.

Declarations of that kind, coming from the local conventions of the party, are things with which the great conventions must soon reckon.

One or two wise civic reforms are noted from Canada. In the province of Ontario all townships, villages and towns of less than 5,000 population are now required to elect their councilors by a vote of the whole electorate. Towns of more than 5,000 population and cities of not more than 40,000 may, by a by-law of the council approved by the people, adopt the same method, thus abolishing the ward system. Cities of more than 40,000 population which choose to abolish the ward system are allowed, if they wish, to make two electoral di-

visions, half of the aldermen to be elected as a body from each division. This plan, also, must receive popular indorsement to make its adoption final. The trend of these changes, as will be observed, is towards proportional representation. With the ward system abolished, a system of proportional representation in the municipal legislatures could be easily applied. In New South Wales this idea has progressed so far that the premier has decided to introduce in the provincial parliament a bill providing for the election of senators by a proportional system. Under such a system of voting, nominating conventions and primaries would be divested of their power. It is a reform, therefore, to be welcomed wherever universal suffrage prevails.

Indications of advance in the direction of proportional representation and the initiative and referendum are not lacking in this country. Very timidly, but nevertheless unmistakably, the national democratic platform indorses the latter; and in third party platforms both are frequently endorsed. So have one or the other or both been distinctly endorsed by democratic state platforms. Most significant, however, of the growing popularity of this idea in the United States is the attention it has begun to attract from the press. The truth is that the necessity for a system of voting that will enable the citizen to express himself at the polls instead of being dictated to by bosses and rings and combines is keenly felt everywhere, and intelligent politicians and newspapers alike are being influenced by it.

#### THE RIGHT TO WORK.

In newspaper and magazine, from pulpit and bar and bench, at the university and in the home, around the tables of the city club and the stove of the village store, wherever, in short, public opinion of the better sort is made, one principle has for a decade or two been universally conceded. More than conceded, it has been strenuously defended. Whoever has ven-