

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1898.

Number 27.

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.

If an Indian massacre has really taken place, as now seems probable, the blame is primarily upon congress. The Indians in question were not only peaceable but friendly, until several of them, including a chief, were arrested by the United States authorities for making whisky without a license. Small blame to the Indians if they could see no crime in doing without a government license what white men with a license do on a large scale.

The only astonishing thing about the arrest of Senator Quay, the republican leader of Pennsylvania, for conspiring to loot a bank, is the arrest.

Throughout the war, the caricaturists of Spain have habitually represented the United States as a hog; and now our imperialists are doing their utmost to show that these caricaturists were true prophets.

One of Davenport's caricature sketches represents Senator Hanna as a little boy reaching out to Secretary Alger, another little boy, for a manikin which the latter is dangling by a string. The manikin bears a striking resemblance to Mr. McKinley, and the inscription is: "I want dat president back!" Judging from Mr. Hanna's last interview, he has got "dat president back." The interview was evidently prepared with a good deal of care, and it bears the thumb marks of presidential approval. Besides, Mr. Hanna puts it forth with that tone of a president-keeper which became so familiar before the war. This interview indicates that the reports from

Paris to the effect that the American peace commissioners are demanding all the Philippine islands, are true. Mr. Hanna says that Spain must give them all up. Having lost the fight, she must "suffer all consequences which defeat implies." Then the United States "is under obligations to the insurgents to establish a safe and enlightened form of government throughout the entire archipelago," which, during the transitional period, is to be "an arbitrary form of control" maintained "by means of the army and navy." That the insurgents oppose those plans, is "assuredly among the probabilities," says Mr. Hanna, though "we may find the Filipinos tractable and willing to accept whatever form of government we finally decide upon, so long as Spain will have no hand in its administration." But the possibility of insurgent opposition gives Mr. Hanna no concern. He evidently depends upon "the army and navy." If we understand Mr. Hanna and Mr. McKinley—and in the lump, we think we do,—that interview is an outline of the plan of the white house coterie for the settlement of the Philippine question.

Renewed efforts are being made by the railroads to secure national legislation against scalpers. All such legislation is pernicious. Scalpers merely extend to the general public some of the privileges which the railroads first extend to favored individuals. Let the railroads stop discriminating and make their terms uniform, as all public servants ought to do, and there would be no scalpers to legislate against.

Some things are said to be good as far as they go, but we incline to think the administration will have to say of Gen. Wheeler's testimony that it would be better if it didn't go so far.

A witness who defends the management of the war by making everything appear to have been lovely—no lack of anything worth speaking of, no reasonable fault to find with the food supplies, no defaults in the medical department, no sickness even, that was not inevitable or for which the victims themselves were not responsible, nobody to blame and nothing wrong—is just a little "swift," as the lawyers say. Gen. Wheeler's good nature seems to have got the best of his powers of observation. At any rate, let those who in fact are to blame, take no such flattering unction to their souls as that the people will be satisfied with a verdict of nothing wrong, without much more recalcitratory evidence than Gen. Wheeler can give. With a record of 300 deaths from the casualties of battle, and five times as many from the casualties of camp, it is superlative good nature to infer that nothing was wrong in the war management. Besides, the soldiers themselves have begun to talk to their friends.

The fatuity of the gold democrats of the East is only a little less marked than it was for the two years preceding the Chicago convention. Then they repeatedly asserted, as they do now, that the silver question had been killed; and notwithstanding that it came to life again after each assassination, they killed it off "some more" as jauntily as ever. They were simply making fools of themselves. No inspired prophet was needed to predict that these men would be run down by the silver movement of the West and South to overwhelming defeat, when the convention of 1896 should meet; yet, when the inevitable happened, they were as much astonished as a child with its first wasp. And now they are solemnly preparing for themselves a similar surprise at

the convention of 1900. Because the democratic conventions of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut have ignored the national platform of the party and by implication condemned free silver coinage, these credulous gold democrats of the East are hugging one another and assuring themselves, as they did five, four and three years ago, and even on the eve of the convention, that "the silver issue is dead." Their shallowness is manifest when it is considered that in those three states there was no silver issue to die. The action of the democratic conventions there in ignoring that issue is without the least significance. But there is a significance, one of no trifling import, in the fact that though there was but recently no silver sentiment at all among the democrats of those states, this year it has taken such a hold of the party there that the silver question is ignored only after hard fights in two of the states and at the dictation of "bosses" in all three. In this there is something much more suggestive of the birth than of the death of the silver issue in that region. But be it birth or death, the "turning down" of the silver issue by the "boss"-ridden democratic conventions of Connecticut, New Jersey and New York is no more predictive than the last horse race of the action of the next national convention.

Congressman Lentz, of Ohio, was quite right, when in a New York Herald interview relative to the action of the Connecticut convention he said that it amounted to nothing, and added:

We people west of the Allegheny mountains are going to nominate the democratic candidate for the presidency. We will nominate Mr. Bryan on the Chicago platform, and we will elect him by the votes west of the Allegheny mountains. The East will not be consulted about it at all. This is a situation which the richer classes of the East do not yet seem to have grasped. But, whether we would have it so or not, it is the situation. The eastern states are no longer need-

ed to carry presidential elections, and it has been demonstrated that a campaign can be managed without those money contributions from eastern monopolists masquerading as democrats, about which national conventions were so long bullied into making concessions. There is therefore no longer any influence strong enough to force compromises between the democratic "bosses" east of the Alleghenies and the people to the west. Added to this, the democrats west of the Alleghenies are in the main firm believers in free silver coinage, and, freed from the domination of the Hills, Crokers and Whittneys, they will in 1900, as Mr. Lentz says, go to the people again with that issue without consulting eastern bosses. That the free coinage idea is an economic heresy, or that it would accomplish nothing for the people even if it were orthodox, makes no difference. It is the standard which the democrats of the West were taught by the campaign of 1896 to accept as their test of regularity, and he who imagines that they have abandoned it because the democratic bosses of three Hanna-McKinley states of the East have ignored it, knows little of human nature and less of democratic sentiment in the West.

In view of this situation, we are at a loss to understand why the free silver men of New York, who, though the situation must be clear to them, have put an opposition democratic ticket in the field. With all the party machinery against them, and the disadvantage of being regarded as "irregular," they cannot hope to secure the support of even a small fraction of their sympathizers, and their vote will not fairly represent the cause they stand for. This would be of secondary importance if by establishing a reasonable claim to regularity as the national platform democrats of New York, and so securing representation in the next national convention, they could help in a close fight. But aside from the objection that they would be contestants without

a visible constituency, their presence in the convention would be somewhat worse than useless. For, if the Croker delegates were turned out by a contesting delegation, they would be saved the political stigma of bolting, whereas if they were freely admitted and then voted down, as they will be, they would be obliged either to support Bryan and the platform, or to repeat their bolting performance of two years ago. Either course would end their influence in national politics, and neither would affect the result of the election.

The decision of Henry George, Jr., declining the nomination for governor tendered him by the national platform democrats of New York, was therefore politically wise. It was also wise in a deeper sense. He could not have accepted the nomination without appearing at least to be an advocate of free silver coinage, and thereby giving further color to the notion that his father also believed in that doctrine. The fact is that Henry George, the father, condemned the coinage of both gold and silver, being as he often said, not a gold man nor a silver man, but a "greenbacker." His support of Bryan and the Chicago platform was not because they represented the coinage idea. It was in spite of that, and because he believed that in other respects they stood for freedom as against the encroachments of plutocracy. Holding the same views in this respect as his father, Henry George, Jr., could not have accepted the nomination tendered by the free silver men without making an explanation that might have seemed to falsify their position, or by his silence appearing to stultify his own convictions.

The prohibition plebiscite in Canada has probably produced no results. Though the prohibitionists secured a majority of the votes cast, the vote was small. It is not probable, therefore, that the ministry will feel obliged to bring in a prohibition bill. This plebiscite, it should be understood, was not a submission of the