

**"UNITE OR  
PERISH" (?)**

You have probably read Speaker Reed's apt retort to the windy representative who declared: "I would rather be right than president," and Mr. Reed answered: "Y-a-as, but you'll never be either." For the sound meat in that laconic rejoinder it might almost become a classic.

There are so many mouthy people who shout so loudly about being "right," whose every act, according to their representative, is based on the "truth." They work only for truth, they have no aim or object but to show forth the truth; in short, their constant declaration, in whatever form of expression, is: "I had rather be right than president."

And we who see through the film of words to the motive beneath, say in our hearts: "Oh, y-a-a-s, but you'll never be either."

In the July number of *The Arena* the Rev. W. D. P. Bliss acts as mouthpiece for the Union Reform League. He adds an asterisk and calls on us to see that this article of his is an open letter from the Union Reform League of America to the members of the Buffalo conference. A good deal of it has the ring of the howl of a single wolf on the mountain who, being lank and sniffing plunder, howls to drum up a pack that united they may over-master the prey. He leads off with this statement:

"There will be, on the republican side, in the campaign, of 1900, the organizers of every trust, the president and directors of every bank, the officers and larger stockholders of every railroad, the employers in every protected industry, the managers and beneficiaries of every corporation operated under, or in hope of, special privilege; and, above all these, the creators of and gainers by the great monopoly of money. There will be exceptions, but so few as only to illuminate the fact; and this will occur, no matter what the platform, or who the nominees of the party. The platform will be framed to deceive, the nominees chosen to mislead."

Yet this man signs himself "Rev." Do we wonder that religion is in disrepute? Do we wonder that the truthful business man so often considers the title of "Rev." as the synonym of a driveling prevaricator? Further on he says:

"Yet this is not all. It is startling to realize that on the republican side will be many workingmen, especially among the poorest."

I wonder why he is so startled? It is probably quite true that thousands of the men who were without work and on the verge of starvation four years ago, and who have steady work since the shops and factories opened up when the present administration came into control, may vote the straight republican ticket. But if the men prefer work and

wages to idleness and starvation, why should the president of the Reform League be "startled?"

But he wishes to start a new party. Evidently he is not in the old one, and proposes to build a party up about himself. He declares that there is no way to whip the republican party, and be in the one that is in power, except for all who are out of the republican party to unite. "Unite or Perish" is his slogan.

This is good, shrewd, political scheming; excellent, so far as its *proposed* results, but extremely silly and amateurish as to its conception.

Somehow it is easier to get elected as president of a reform league than it is to mass all the disgruntled in politics, and have them elect you president of the United States. The Rev. W. D. P. Bliss will learn this later.

But it is not his lack of political insight that most amuses the reader. He is hardly a Mark Hanna, and is not to blame for that, but his pulpit-theatrical stage play is simply side-splitting. He says:

"But there is one other condition of success, a condition greater than that of union. It is truth. Truth is greater than unity."

Yea, verily, brother, yea, verily. But let us look at this new party platform of truth. The first "plank" added, that at all differs from ordinary republican principles, is this:

"Two other planks must be added. The first of these is an anti-imperialist plank."

Let us see, were not there a number of people back in the early '60's who carried precisely the same hue and cry? Was it not exactly this same spirit, this "platform of truth," that urged J. Wilkes Booth on to his fateful deed? There can be but one answer to this question. There can be no possible question of "imperialism" now; there might have been one raised then, but not a sane man of our united nation today will say the republican policy then pursued was wrong or unwise. The cry of "imperialism" is a whine for "spoils" from the puppies outside the present "basket." "Only that and nothing more."

Listen what our "brother" says of this plank:

"There will, too, be political gain in such a plank."

Now listen to his "fourthly:"

"The fourth plank that we must adopt is the endorsement of the fundamental principles of the Chicago platform of 1896. This at first will not appear necessary to some, but it is so. To leave it out would mean absolute defeat. Let any who doubt ask themselves two questions. First, can reform win without the coöperation of that great new democratic party which, in 1896, polled 6,500,000 votes? Second, can that

democratic party, fresh from that battle, go back on the issue that gave it birth?"

And this is the party that is to be builded on the solid foundation stone of "truth." If you notice, we do not "adopt" the "Chicago platform" because it is right, is "truth" at all, but bless your eyes, *because we can't win unless we do.*

This, you see, is the religious teacher who does not teach you that you must not sin, but who teaches you that after you have had a first-class bout of sinning you can shirk all the consequences off onto a "Redeemer." "Jesus paid it all." It is the same bent of mind. Found all your undertakings in "truth." Shout loudly for truth, but when it comes to getting into political power, be, to quote the famous author, "de-vel-ish sly."

Oh, consistency, thou jewel! He adds further:

"Free silver furnishes the feet of reform, and it alone can give us a standing that can unite with us the largest party opposed to republican domination. Without the democratic party we cannot win."

And when they pass the plums, Brother Bliss, which shall they reserve for you?

MAUDE MEREDITH.

Dubuque, Ia. Sept. 9, 1899.

**MELTING UP COPPER COINS.**

"The Brass Foundry company of New Haven has profited by the low price of old copper coins in India to buy them by the ton to melt up. Nearly 10,000 bags or about 250 tons of these old coins have been brought from India as scrap copper to be melted up, as at the present price of copper they are worth more than their coin value. Scrap copper is worth 19 cents a pound, but for 19 cents silver several pounds of these coins can be bought in India, and with proverbial Connecticut shrewdness one foundry company in that state has profited financially by this fact."—Chicago Tribune, Sept. 14, '99.

The late John M. Forbes, of Boston, many years ago, when he sailed in the China trade, brought home several hundred tons of copper cash—a Chinese coin. Mr. Forbes bought the coin at a less rate than the uncoined metal sold for in Boston and made money selling Chinese money merely as scrap copper.

The Chinese government had not raised the bullion value of copper, and copper coinage in India has been equally unsuccessful in adding value to that metal.

How does silver differ from copper so that free coinage at 16 to 1 will raise its bullion price all over the world to \$1.29 an ounce? If government cannot enhance the bullion of one metal by coinage, how can it do so much for silver values by coinage at 16 to 1?