

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 08044482 5

The Commoner

CONDENSED

William J. Bryan



CHAS. W. BRYAN,

BUSINESS MANAGER

"THE COMMONER"

The Commoner

Condensed

BY

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

VOLUME IV.

Published by
THE WOODRUFF-COLLINS PRINTING CO.,
Lincoln, Nebraska.

1905



CONTENTS

EDITORIALS.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| A Conscience Campaign | 1 |
| A Democratic Prayer | 2 |
| Statistics in Stocks..... | 3 |
| Enforce the Law | 5 |
| The Trust Lottery | 6 |
| Their Mask Is Torn Off..... | 7 |
| Must Be Honest | 9 |
| Mr. Bryan as a "Bolter"..... | 9 |
| Attention! One Hundred Dollars Reward..... | 12 |
| Watch the Primaries..... | 13 |
| The Moral Issue | 14 |
| The Paramount Issue | 26 |
| A Dictator | 28 |
| "Division and Silence"..... | 30 |
| Reorganization Means Clevelandism..... | 31 |
| Surrender Demanded | 33 |
| Instruct | 34 |
| Wall Street Is in Line..... | 34 |
| Oppose Popular Government..... | 36 |
| Drawing the Fangs..... | 39 |
| One Plank Proposed..... | 40 |
| Enforcing the Criminal Law..... | 41 |
| The Wisdom of Doing Right..... | 42 |
| Unexpected Candor | 60 |
| Platform of 1892..... | 61 |
| Gambling in Futures..... | 63 |
| Why the War?..... | 64 |
| The Beef Trust's Work..... | 65 |
| Cost of Imperialism..... | 67 |
| Reorganizers Unfold Their Plans..... | 68 |
| The Duty of Democrats..... | 70 |
| Employer and Employee..... | 72 |
| Reorganizer Doctrine | 75 |
| The Merger Decision..... | 76 |
| G. O P. Dictation..... | 81 |
| Cotton King Sully Falls..... | 82 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Forward, March! | 82 |
| Why Not Own Them?..... | 85 |
| Parker Not Available..... | 86 |
| Kansas Is in Line..... | 89 |
| The Officeholder's Opinion..... | 90 |
| Commercialism in the Church..... | 91 |
| A People's Victory..... | 93 |
| Helen Keller's Sermon..... | 93 |
| An Appalling Showing..... | 94 |
| Why Not Now?..... | 97 |
| Not Harmony, But Surrender..... | 98 |
| As to Patents..... | 99 |
| The Implement Trust..... | 100 |
| Not an Argument..... | 100 |
| Attempting to Retire Silver..... | 101 |
| Ministerial Speculators | 103 |
| Commercialism and Mr. Bryan..... | 103 |
| "Commercialism and Mr. Bryan"..... | 111 |
| The New York Platform..... | 112 |
| Political Honesty | 126 |
| "Sanity" | 129 |
| Labor Bills Postponed..... | 130 |
| Afraid of Their Record..... | 131 |
| The Massachusetts Platform..... | 132 |
| The Gresham Law..... | 133 |
| Philippine Independence | 133 |
| A Narrow Escape..... | 134 |
| Judge Reagan's Letter and the Answer..... | 136 |
| Will Shaw Explain?..... | 143 |
| Labor's Splendid Example..... | 144 |
| Gage's Defense of Wealth..... | 145 |
| Trust Defenders | 147 |
| The Cleveland Bond Deals..... | 149 |
| Tariff Question in 1896 and 1900..... | 158 |
| Try It | 159 |
| Equipping a Country Home..... | 160 |
| Democratic Success | 162 |
| Democracy and Socialism..... | 163 |
| Praise from the Chronicle..... | 169 |
| Judges Are Human..... | 171 |
| As to Bolting | 172 |
| Democratic Opportunity in Wisconsin..... | 173 |
| Money in Politics..... | 174 |
| Burglarious Methods | 176 |
| Society's Prodigal Son..... | 177 |

Contents

ix

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Pledged to Wall Street..... | 179 |
| Waiting Until Election Is Over..... | 181 |
| A Bill to Improve Currency Conditions..... | 182 |
| Subsidiary Coinage | 184 |
| Lawlessness | 184 |
| Nebraska's Vote in 1892..... | 185 |
| "Running Amuck" | 186 |
| Platform of the Nebraska Democracy..... | 188 |
| "Woodman, Spare That Tree"..... | 191 |
| A Popular Platform..... | 194 |
| Six Year Term..... | 195 |
| Preparing for Hard Times..... | 197 |
| Bread Labor | 198 |
| Government Paper vs. Notes..... | 202 |
| Conscience as a Prosecutor..... | 204 |
| Hill's Summersault | 205 |
| "By Their Works"..... | 206 |
| The Colorado Situation..... | 207 |
| Church Sets Example..... | 208 |
| Shall the People Be Allowed to Rule?..... | 208 |
| Predatory Politics | 210 |
| The Virtuous Trusts..... | 210 |
| Faith With Works..... | 212 |
| Equality | 213 |
| "There Are Others"..... | 215 |
| The Republican Platform..... | 216 |
| La Follette's Fight..... | 220 |
| The Democratic Opportunity..... | 221 |
| Measuring Gold by Itself..... | 223 |
| The Doctrine of Thrones..... | 226 |
| Justice the First Essential..... | 227 |
| Two Men I Honor..... | 228 |
| Indefensible and Intolerable..... | 231 |
| Liberty a Supreme Good..... | 232 |
| The Democratic Ticket..... | 233 |
| The Democratic Platform..... | 236 |
| Cannon's Complacent Philosophy..... | 237 |
| Alton Brooks Parker..... | 240 |
| Henry G. Davis..... | 240 |
| The Convention's Dramatic Close..... | 241 |
| The Democratic Platform..... | 247 |
| The Resolutions Committee..... | 256 |
| Democracy Must Move Forward..... | 267 |
| Those Little Questions..... | 278 |
| Philippine Delegates Not Admitted..... | 279 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Death of Paul Kruger..... | 280 |
| Chronicle Lays Aside Mask..... | 281 |
| The Writing of the Platform..... | 282 |
| Those Labor Planks..... | 283 |
| "Frenzied Finance" | 284 |
| Mr. Bryan's Speech at the St. Louis Convention..... | 287 |
| Mr. Bryan's Speeches During Closing Hours of Convention..... | 296 |
| The Amendment Withdrawn..... | 307 |
| Mr. Bryan's Speech on the Illinois Contest..... | 308 |
| Mr. Bryan's Second Speech on Illinois Contest..... | 315 |
| Von Plehve's Assassination..... | 316 |
| Mr. Roosevelt's Threats..... | 318 |
| Shall They Rule or Be Ruled?..... | 319 |
| Electing Postmasters | 321 |
| The President's Acceptance..... | 322 |
| Ex-Governor Pattison Dead..... | 323 |
| State Ownership of Railroads..... | 323 |
| Popular Election of Senators..... | 325 |
| Are We to Have a "Yellow Scare" Instead of a "White One?"..... | 326 |
| Hail, Jensen, Hero!..... | 329 |
| State Ownership of Railroads..... | 329 |
| Mr. Bryan's Speech..... | 332 |
| Unemployed Labor | 333 |
| Joking Is Unsafe..... | 335 |
| Judge Parker's Acceptance..... | 336 |
| Jeffersonian Principles | 337 |
| Canadians Attack Tobacco Trust..... | 339 |
| The "Oil" Literature..... | 339 |
| An Answer to Criticism..... | 342 |
| The Navy League..... | 343 |
| Wasted Time | 344 |
| Judge Parker's One Term Pledge..... | 345 |
| The Criminal Clause..... | 349 |
| Davis on Labor..... | 350 |
| The Dingley Rates..... | 351 |
| The Bennett Will..... | 352 |
| Power of Gold..... | 352 |
| The Free Pass..... | 355 |
| Imperialism Bearing Fruit..... | 357 |
| "Anxious to Fight"..... | 359 |
| Boer Address and Reply..... | 359 |
| Finding Success in Failure..... | 362 |
| Judge Parker on Imperialism..... | 367 |
| Russia's Awakening | 369 |
| State Ownership of Railroads..... | 371 |

Contents

xi

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| The Colorado Situation..... | 372 |
| Judge Parker's Letter..... | 374 |
| Nevada vs. Colorado..... | 376 |
| The Philippine Issue Emphasized..... | 377 |
| "Others" | 381 |
| Silver Democrats Vindicated..... | 382 |
| Dinner Pail-Coffee Pot..... | 383 |
| Menace of Militarism..... | 384 |
| Independence Not a "Scuttle" Policy..... | 386 |
| Insulting the Flag..... | 387 |
| Mistaken Friends | 389 |
| Democracy vs. Plutocracy—The Election's Lessons..... | 390 |
| Self-Government | 396 |
| Roosevelt's Great Opportunity..... | 398 |
| Sharing the Punishment..... | 402 |
| The Stay-at-Home Vote..... | 405 |
| The Individual's Part..... | 406 |
| Rev. Hillis Attacks Plutocracy..... | 409 |
| The Pass Evil..... | 410 |
| Democracy Must Advance..... | 412 |
| The "Real Politicians"..... | 413 |
| The "Imprudent Benefactors"..... | 414 |
| The Meadowlark | 415 |
| Municipal Ownership | 416 |
| Booker Washington's Advice..... | 417 |
| The Value of Constancy..... | 418 |
| The President's Message..... | 427 |
| Reforms Within Reach..... | 436 |
| Christmas—Love's Festival | 444 |
| That "Unprecedented" Victory. | 446 |
| The Religious Argument..... | 450 |
| Memory | 456 |
| The Complete Returns..... | 458 |
| Hope | 459 |
| Democratic Plan Endorsed..... | 461 |
| State Insurance | 464 |
| Reducing Southern Representation.... | 465 |
| A Lesson in Imperialism..... | 467 |
| When Should Congress Convene?..... | 468 |

THE COMMONER CONDENSED.

A CONSCIENCE CAMPAIGN.

(Abstract of speech by Mr. Bryan at New Haven Jackson Day banquet, January 11, 1904.)

The word campaign suggests warfare. We use terms with which we are familiar in physical struggles to describe those political contests in which we appeal not to visible force, but to those invisible influences which are stronger than the arm of man. And it is especially fitting to use military phrases tonight when we assemble in memory of Andrew Jackson, who showed in civil contests all of the courage and purpose that he displayed on the battle field.

It is good tactics to strike the enemy where he is weakest, and use the weapons which are most effective. The weak point of every bad policy is that it sacrifices human rights to selfish interests, and today to prove a system evil we have only to show that it violates that sense of justice which is satisfied with nothing less than equal rights to all and special privileges to none. The only appeal which is permanent in its effectiveness and enduring in its usefulness is the appeal to conscience, and while it may seem weakness to the brutal and folly to the sordid it arouses a response which at last sweeps everything before it.

The conscience controls human actions whenever it is weakened, and it is only weakened by a voice from another conscience. If we would touch the consciences of others we may get evidence that our own consciences have been quickened. The great issue at this time is the issue between man and mammon, between democracy and plutocracy. All surface

questions of national policy, of taxation, of regulation and of finance, are but phases of that century-long, that world-wide struggle between the common people and organized wealth.

To say that it does not pay a nation to violate the rights of a people of another nation involves so much of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division that many are lost in a maze of mathematics, but to say that the wages of sin is death is to give an epitome of history that accords with each person's experience. To say that taxation which confers immediate benefits upon the privileged few who secured the enactment of the law does not find its way back by indefinite and devious ways to the pockets of the many may confuse the minds of some, but to say "Thou shalt not steal" either by law or in defiance of it, can be easily understood. And so in dealing with principles, with finance, with labor problems and all the other questions at issue, we may view them from a moral standpoint and arraign every evil at the bar of public conscience.

Will it win? Nothing less can give permanent success. As the martyrs who, eighteen hundred years ago, kneeling in prayer while hungry beasts devoured them, invoked a prayer mightier than the legions of Rome, so today it is not only possible, but necessary to appeal to that moral sentiment of a nation which, when aroused, will prove more potent than the press.

A DEMOCRATIC PRAYER.

In a brief autobiographical sketch, Amos Luck, who represented a New Hampshire district in congress some fifty years ago, describes the growth of the cause with which he identified himself and the success of those who espoused that cause. In the course of his comments he gives expression to a sentiment which deserves to be emphasized at this time. He says that these men had "some title to be considered far-sighted, though," he adds, "they simply had faith in the wisdom of doing right." This truth has been expressed before, but it is

doubtful whether it has ever been expressed as concisely, as simply and as forcibly. The dictionaries ought to define political foresight as "faith in the wisdom of doing right." What a contrast between this candid recognition of the triumph of the truth and the miserable, short-sighted doctrine of expediency! There is no basis upon which one can calculate expediency; there is a standard of morality and conscience by which one can measure every public question. One seeks for expediency as the hunter searches for game, uncertain where he will find it and fearful that even when discovered it may yet escape him, but as the farmer follows the plow, confident that sun and soil will reward his industry and that in spite of local flood or drouth the earth will yield its increase, so he who attaches himself to a truth knows that he works in harmony with immutable and irresistible laws.

Let the hosts of democracy take courage; let them appeal to the honest and the conscientious even if in doing so they risk the alienation of the selfish and the sordid. Let them put their trust not in corruption or deception, but in that sense of justice which is at once the source and the guarantee of good government.

As we approach the important work of writing a platform and nominating candidates, we may well adopt as a democratic prayer—and it is a prayer fit for any party: "O, Lord, give us faith in the wisdom of doing right."

STATISTICS IN STOCKS.

A writer in the *Chicago Record-Herald*, a republican paper, says that during the last eighteen months, fully fifty corporations capitalized at from \$1,000,000 to \$50,000,000 each have gone completely out of existence. This writer says that he saw a list of 287 corporations some of which have collapsed and many of which are now pretty near dissolution. He explains that most of these 287 corporations were formed during the last four years; that their issues of stocks amounted to the stupendous total of \$5,800,000,000, and their bond is-

sues amounted to \$1,169,000,000 more, a total of nearly \$7,000,000,000 of security. He says that the actual market value of this prodigious product of the printing press to date is probably about 25 cents on the dollar and that the rest was water and the water has been squeezed out.

If this is the showing when the republicans are shouting prosperity, what will be the condition when an era of bad crops reduces the ability of the producer to stand trust extortion?

The only lesson that some republicans will draw from the statistics presented is that the trusts will die of themselves without any necessity for legislation, but that is a very complacent conclusion. What of the stockholders who lose by the decline in prices and by the final collapse? What of the honest industries that have been bankrupted by trust methods? What of the people who have been the victims of trust prices? And what, too, of the demoralization of public sentiment and the degradation of business ideals? These things cannot be remedied by patiently waiting for natural causes to remove the trusts. As well permit a highwayman to pursue his avocation in the hope that an early death will put an end to his career and give the community a rest—until a new highwayman takes his place.

If the administration will not do its duty and protect the public, the individual can protect himself, at least to the extent of refusing to buy trust stock.

As a matter of principle one should not hold stock in any trust, but in addition to that he can find a sufficient reason in the fact that it is not safe to hold trust stock. It is necessary to oppress the public in order to make dividends on watered stock and the holder of such stock is, therefore, either imposing on others or suffering loss himself. If honest people will boycott trust stock and leave such investments to the unscrupulous, they will not only avoid the risks naturally incident to such enterprises, but will make it easier to secure effective anti-trust legislation. Just now there are many other reasons of a business nature for avoiding the stock market.

ENFORCE THE LAW.

The *Lincoln (Neb.) News*, a republican paper, had an editorial entitled "The Meat Plot." This republican paper draws a striking pen picture showing that the consumer, the stock dealer, and the butcher are in the pen which has only one opening, and that one leads into the slaughter house where the man with a steel mallet stands and strikes the endless procession dead.

"Like cattle, the producer, butcher and consumer," says this republican paper, "have been driven into the pen. The individual pays the price and the tyranny of the packers and their enormous profits will be uninterrupted as long as the individual continues to walk into the pen the packers have built for him."

This republican newspaper should not forget that men and women must live and so long as a coterie of men have obtained a monopoly upon a great necessity of life, even though they carry that monopoly to a cruel end, the individual must pay the price. But what has this republican newspaper to say of the republican administration that fails to protect the individual in the right to live? What has this republican newspaper to say of an administration that refuses to enforce the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law, a clause which provides a potent weapon against men who would conspire against the life of the people?

Boasting of its fight against the trust system, and particularly against the beef trust, the Roosevelt administration has availed itself of a merely incidental provision in the Sherman anti-trust law. The first feature of that law is not the civil proceeding. The very first section of that law provides for criminal prosecution; and a few criminal indictments against these arrogant monopolists would be worth more than all the injunctions that have ever been obtained, and worth more, indeed, than all the injunctions that ever could be obtained.

Is it not strange that when a republican newspaper recognizes solemn facts, to the extent that it feels justified in drawing the striking picture which this republican newspaper has

presented to its readers, it does not insist that the official representatives of its party shall enforce the plain provisions of a law which was devised to meet just such emergencies as these?

THE TRUST LOTTERY.

The following editorial, from the *New York Mail and Express*, is a sample of the arguments now being circulated through republican papers in defense of the trusts:

“Three years ago a New York and a Nebraska democrat made the simultaneous announcement that in the modern industrial combinations the young man does not ‘get a chance.’ The discovery was of equal validity with the accompanying discoveries that ‘the gold bugs’ were wasting our substance and ‘the empire’ was coming swiftly down the pike. All three contentions have been woefully battered by the event, none more so than the presumed disadvantage of the young man in an industrial world where the trust idea is rife.

“The final coup, it may almost be said, is administered by the appearance of another young man to relieve a young man of the active duties of leadership in the greatest ‘trust’ in the world. W. E. Corey, who has been designated to perform those managerial functions because of the continued ill health of Charles M. Schwab, is 36 years old. When Mr. Schwab was made president of the United States steel corporation, about three years ago, he was 38 years old. The other most active figure in the trust, Mr. George W. Perkins, has turned 41.

“Here are three men who when they came to the top of the corporation were still ‘youths,’ according to the Roman definition. With all their exceptional qualifications, they would be plodding along during these years with small returns and a limited outlook in almost any profession they could have chosen, looking ahead to the years that lie on the shady side of 40 for the full measure of opportunity and recognition. Their youth and the circumstance that they began, each in his own way, quite at the bottom, and worked up from grade to grade, have not handicapped them.

“Rather, they have helped them. The higher the organization and the broader the scope of a business enterprise, the keener must be its search for energy and ability, wherever they may be found; the more absolute must be its divorce from favor or family influence, or the mere routine processes of selection that give the elder man the preference because he is the

elder. A 'trust' run by a family, as certain conservative and retrograding businesses are in England, or carried along with no other momentum than the experience of the veteran, would not keep its vast operations together much less meet the competition of rivals."

Here are three young men drawing large salaries from a trust, but what about the men who were at the head of the independent companies before the consolidation? It is true that the trust enlarges the salaries and the opportunities of a few men at the top, but it does so by crushing the hopes and destroying the independence of a much larger number. As well defend an unlimited monarchy on the ground that it gives great power and a huge income to one man, regardless of the fact that it makes subjects of all the rest.

The trust is an industrial monarchy; it rules with an iron rod and sacrifices the multitude for the advancement of a small minority.

The trust may also be likened to a lottery in which a few draw large prizes, while the vast majority draw blanks. And it is not a fair lottery either, because the drawing is manipulated for the profit of the ones in charge. The article above quoted is in line with the policy of the republican papers. They are trying to prepare the public mind to acquiesce in the do nothing policy of the administration. They occupy their time, now asserting that the republican party will kill the trusts, now praising the trust as a beneficent institution. How long can the people be deceived by such double dealing?

THEIR MASK IS TORN OFF.

Mr. Bryan's speech at the Lincoln banquet has had the desired effect—it has unmasked the reorganizers and shown that their pleas for harmony were mere pretense. Professing a great desire for reconciliation between those who voted the democratic ticket and those who opposed the party, they had a concealed condition, namely, that the bolters should be permitted to write the platform, nominate the candidate and control the organization. It is well that their real purpose should be made known so early. They profess a strong desire to defeat President Roosevelt, but it is evident that they do not

want him defeated unless they can bring about that result with a democrat equally acceptable to the great corporations which put up the money necessary for the debauching of elections.

The *New York World* proposes as a democratic platform the following declarations:

First—Democratic principles had their inception in the Declaration of Independence. They are built on the bedrock of the constitution.

Second—They include just and economical government, equal rights for all, special favors to none.

Third—Taxation for public purposes only.

Fourth—A sound and stable currency.

Fifth—Respect for the judiciary—enforcement of the laws.

Sixth—A civil service divorced from politics.

Seventh—An isthmian canal.

Eighth—Reciprocity in trade.

Ninth—Opposition to monopoly.

Tenth—Friendly relations with all nations, entangling alliances with none—neither toadying to the strong nor bullying the weak.

A republican paper, referring to the *World's* proposed democratic platform, well says: "The average reader will be much puzzled to note what particular plank in the above could not be inserted with grace in the republican platform."

That describes the situation accurately. The purpose of the men whom the *World* represents is to reorganize the democratic party so it will differ from the republican party in name only. They pretend to be in favor of harmony, and yet the *World* declares that it will be the duty of the men whom it represents to "put down with a firm hand" those who believe in the principles enunciated in the Kansas City platform. They talk about "getting together," and yet they become highly indignant when the faithful democrat demands to know what they are "getting together" for and whether through the "getting together" process the democratic party is to defend the rights of the people or is to enter upon a course of pillage.

Having helped the republican party into power, the *World* assumes to fix the conditions upon which the democratic party should be allowed to enter a contest with the republican party. The *World* can come nearer writing the republican platform than it can the democratic platform, but it insists upon writing both.

MUST BE HONEST.

Replying to a question submitted by the *New York World*, Allie W. Young of Morehead, Ky., and democratic national committeeman for that state, said:

"I am in favor of any compromise that does not involve the surrender of the future hope and welfare of the millions of laborers and freemen of this country to the money powers in exchange for office. For this reason I am opposed to Mr. Cleveland and his associates dictating the next national platform for the democratic party. The principles underlying the gold standard are either right or wrong, and I want to see our party, now, as always heretofore, brave enough to go before the American voters with the faith that is in it clearly stated. It will and should live longer defeated, retaining the confidence of its followers and supporters, than to temporarily triumph by deception."

This is an interesting reply. Will those who object to the reaffirmation of the Kansas City platform, because to do so means that the party shall declare itself in favor of bimetallism, be willing for the party to make itself clearly understood upon the money question?

Do those who insist that the principle of bimetallism has been destroyed and who say that the single gold standard is right, want the platform to be so framed as to deceive the people?

If the principles underlying the gold standard are right, are these gentlemen willing that the party be brave enough to go before the American voters with the faith that is in it clearly stated? If they want the party to abandon bimetallism on the theory that the single gold standard is right, are they willing that the democratic platform shall declare unequivocally for monometallism?

Mr. Young is eminently correct when he says that the democratic party will live longer defeated, retaining the confidence of its followers and supporters, than it would by acquiring temporary triumph through deception.

MR. BRYAN AS A "BOLTER."

It is difficult to understand why a newspaper that circulates among intelligent men will persistently resort to misrepre-

sentation in the hope of gaining a point. Sooner or later the truth must become known and when the truth is known, the publication responsible for the falsehood must suffer irreparable damage.

On many occasions the *Chicago Chronicle* has declared that Mr. Bryan bolted the democratic national ticket in 1892. Repeatedly, the falsity of this charge has been brought to the attention of the editors of the *Chronicle*. They have never had the honesty to correct their false statement, but, on the contrary, have continued to reiterate it.

In a recent issue, the *Chronicle* says that the democratic convention of 1896 "nominated a bolter in the person of Mr. Bryan," and it adds: "Mr. Bryan and his populists in Nebraska bolted Mr. Cleveland in 1892, and Mr. Bryan came to Chicago four years later as a member of a bolting delegation." The *Chronicle* further declares: "The fact is, of course, that Mr. Bryan was not then, and is not now a democrat * * * So far as bolters are concerned, Mr. Bryan should be the last man on earth to complain about nominating one of them. All that he is or has been in politics may be attributed to bolting."

THE COMMONER has on several occasions presented the facts. This is a good time to present them again.

Mr. Bryan was the democratic nominee for congress in 1890 and again in 1892. In each campaign he was opposed by a populist candidate.

In 1892, many democrats in Nebraska voted for the Weaver electors at the request of the democratic national committee. That request was delivered in a confidential letter sent out by James E. Boyd, then governor of the state of Nebraska, and since then one of the prominent members of the gold contingent. Governor Boyd's letter follows:

"Lincoln, Neb., Oct. 17, 1892.—(Personal and confidential.)
—Dear Sir: I have just returned from the east where I was honored by a consultation with the national committee and leading men of our party, with regard to the best policy to be pursued in Nebraska this fall in dealing with the electoral ticket; and they agreed with me that the wisest course would be for democrats to support the Weaver electors; the object being to take Nebraska out of her accustomed place in the republican column.

"Information has reached me that a number of independents who were formerly republicans contemplate voting for the Harrison electors. With the republican strength thus augmented it would be impossible for the democrats to carry their own electors' ticket to victory. It is therefore the part of good judgment and wise action for democrats to support the Weaver electors in as large numbers as possible. For democrats to do this is no abandonment of principle; on the contrary, it is a definite step toward victory, and the ultimate triumph of Cleveland and Stevenson, and the principles they represent."

It may not be out of place right here to say that in the spring of 1893, when the democrats in the Nebraska legislature were confronted with the choice between a republican senator and a populist senator, a committee of democratic United States senators, among whom were Arthur P. Gorman and John G. Carlisle, sent telegrams to the democratic members of the Nebraska legislature, urging them to unite with the populists in the election of Senator Allen.

It will be seen that the democrats who voted for the Weaver electors in Nebraska in 1892 did so at the request of the democratic national committee, and are not at all chargeable with having bolted the national ticket when they acted on lines presumable at that time to be favorable to the ticket.

The charge that Mr. Bryan went to Chicago in 1896 at the head of a bolting delegation is also preposterous.

The split in Nebraska came in 1894. The corporation democrats were then in control of the party machinery in this state. Democrats who had grown weary of corporation domination in democratic party affairs organized for the purpose of wresting the party from corporation control. They succeeded and won the democratic state convention by an overwhelming majority. That convention was called to order by the retiring chairman of the state committee, who was one of the gold contingent. The convention was permanently organized, a platform was adopted, and then when the convention, by a large majority, nominated for governor Silas A. Holcomb, who had previously been nominated by the populists, a dozen men walked out of the convention. They repaired to a hotel room and on their way gathered up a half dozen men, none of

whom had been elected as delegates to the convention. These eighteen men, two-thirds of whom had bolted the democratic convention, and some of whom had never even been delegates, proceeded to organize what they called "the democratic party of Nebraska."

Upon that organization these people held a convention in 1896 and chose delegates to the democratic national convention.

The delegation which Mr. Bryan led was chosen by the regular democratic organization, from which these pretenders had bolted.

The pretensions of these bolters were so absurd that their claims were promptly rejected by the democratic national convention, and that was the last heard of the organization built up by these pretenders. It went to pieces, a few of its followers voted the regular democratic ticket, while others went over to the republican party.

Many newspapers, notably the *Cincinnati Enquirer* and the *New York World*, have reproduced the false accusations made by the *Chronicle*. These and other newspapers whose editors claim to have no disposition to misrepresent, ought to see to it that the truth with respect to these accusations is laid before their readers. THE COMMONER does not, however, expect the *Chicago Chronicle* to tell its readers the truth. No falsehood is too absurd for the use of the *Chronicle* in its fight against those whose views antagonize the special plans of the great financier who happens to own the *Chronicle*.

ATTENTION! \$100 REWARD!

In order to show how impossible it is for the opponents of the Kansas City platform to construct a new platform, satisfactory even to themselves, THE COMMONER offers the following reward: One hundred dollars (in gold, silver, or paper, as they may choose) will be given for a democratic platform for 1904 covering ten subjects (including imperialism, trusts, money, tariff, and labor) upon which the *New York World*, the

Boston Herald, the *Brooklyn Eagle*, the *Richmond Times*, the *Chicago Chronicle*, the *St. Paul Globe*, the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, the *Nashville American*, the *Memphis Commercial-Appeal*, and the *Atlanta Journal* will agree. If they cannot all agree on the same platform, a proportionate sum will be given for any platform on which two or more of the above named papers will agree. If no two of them can agree upon the same platform the sum of ten dollars will be given to any one of the above named papers which will prepare and print in its own columns such a platform, provided no republican paper of equal circulation within ten days claims such platform as a republican document. Five dollars extra will be given to anyone of the said papers which will secure a letter from either Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Gorman or Mr. Parker indorsing all of the platform proposed by it.

If these papers cannot agree upon a platform, how can they expect to dictate a platform acceptable to those who voted the ticket in 1896 and 1900? If their failure to agree is due, not to differences of opinion, but to disinclination to make their views known, how can they contend that they favor honest methods and are trying to appeal to honest people? The Kansas City platform is a clear and concise statement of the party's position and its reaffirmation will show that the party is still true to the interests of the people and its further utterances will have weight, but no weight can attach to the utterances of those who are willing to indorse anything that seems to be temporarily popular or abandon anything that seems temporarily unpopular. Let these leading papers among the reorganizers present their platforms or confess either that they are hopelessly divided among themselves or that they prefer to plot in secret.

WATCH THE PRIMARIES.

The battle between the plutocratic and the democratic elements in the democratic party must be fought out at the primaries. It will not do to leave the matter to the national con-

vention. The delegates to the various conventions—county, state, and national—should be instructed to reaffirm the Kansas City platform. If any one objects to reaffirmation let him be challenged to present a platform embodying his views. Honesty will appeal to honest men and in any crowd the honest men generally outnumber the dishonest ones. Watch the dodger. He is a good man to leave at home when delegates are being selected. If the democratic party is to win the confidence of those who desire reform it must do so by a straightforward course dealing candidly with all the issues before the country. Organize, go to the primaries and instruct. Wall street will control the republican party; let the democratic party accept the challenge and make the issue plain. A failure to reaffirm will be equivalent to a return to corporation rule, for those who are willing to abandon any part of the party creed in order to conciliate those who opposed the party will not be courageous enough to make a stand for anything. Sound a man opposed to reaffirmation and you will find that, as a rule, he has no definite position that he is prepared to announce and defend.

THE MORAL ISSUE.

Abstract of speech delivered by Mr. W. J. Bryan at Concert Hall, Madison Square Garden, New York, Tuesday, January 26, 1904:

Ladies and Gentlemen: You were invited to this meeting because I wanted to present for your consideration a subject which I deem important—the moral issue which you cannot evade even if you desire to do so, and which I am sure you would not purposely ignore if you could.

I have preferred to speak independently of any organization because I do not care to embarrass any friend or supporter who may differ from me in opinion. No one is under any obligation to model his course to suit mine, or to permit what I say or do to influence him unless his judgment and conscience lead him to the conclusion at which I have arrived.

Those who supported me in two campaigns have done so, I presume, because they thought my election would be beneficial to the country, and I have in return given the best service of which I was capable. Both I and they, therefore, are left to pursue in the future as we have in the past the course that seems to us best.

I do not speak with authority; I am not a candidate for any office; I am neither asking favors at your hands nor am I in a position to bestow favors upon you. I am only a private citizen and I can prove by the editorial pages of nearly all of your leading dailies that I have excellent prospects for remaining a private citizen during the remainder of my life.

But think not that this prospective obscurity had been forced upon me by unfortunate circumstances or by cruel fate. These same infallible (?) witnesses have told you how I have twice thrown away the presidency by voluntary adherence to certain policies which are obnoxious to these papers. I can even prove by an interview which appeared in yesterday morning's papers that I have recently renounced a prominence that was within my grasp—a prominence easily mine, if I had only followed the advice of one of your distinguished financiers, Mr. Joseph C. Hendrix, who is accepted as authority by all who make money their god. He is quoted as saying:

“If Mr. Bryan had come here from Europe and said that he had learned a great deal in his trip abroad, and declared that he was convinced that it would be a desirable thing for all democrats to get together, he would be a great man, and his influence would have been greatly increased. By his present course he is killing himself.”

Not only have I lost an opportunity to be great—spurned, as it were, real greatness, greatness 24 carat fine, with its weight and purity plainly stamped upon the bar, but I am “killing myself.” Surely, if Mr. Hendrix is to be believed—and I quote him not because he deserves special notice, but because having left us in 1896 he is a fair representative of those who for the last seven years have been giving our party advice instead of votes—if he is to be believed my words tonight ought to challenge your attention and arouse that interest which usually attaches to an ante-mortem statement when

the speaker is sobered by the thought of impending dissolution.

Why have I flung away ambition? Why have I rejected this proffered greatness and been deaf to the entreaties of those who talk only of "getting together?" Because they are indefinite in their language. I want to know what they are getting together for, whether to defend rights or to enter upon a course of pillage.

A visitor to an old graveyard once ran across an epitaph on a neglected tomb stone which concluded with the lines:

"As I am now so you shall be,
Prepare, my friend, to follow me."

Being a cautious man and not willing to share the company of the deceased without first investigating his surroundings, he penciled the following postscript:

"To follow you, I am not content
Until I know which way you went."

I am not willing to borrow greatness from Mr. Hendrix and his associates without first inquiring what security will be required of me, and what rate of interest will be demanded on the loan. Neither am I willing to put the size of the army above its aim or to regard mere numbers as of more importance than the cause for which the army was enlisted.

I did profit by my trip to Europe. Jefferson said a century ago that in the last analysis there were but two parties in any country: a democratic party and an aristocratic party—a democratic party which believed in government by the people and for their own interests, and an aristocratic party which believed in a government by the few for the benefit of the few. In every country in Europe there is a party, sometimes small, with its face towards the rising sun of democracy and there is everywhere, also, a party which opposes, even when it cannot wholly obstruct, every effort to make the voice of the people potent in government and the interests of the people paramount in legislation.

This line of cleavage is discernable in the United States. There will always be some party which espouses the cause of

the common people and that party will necessarily present a moral issue and make its appeal to conscience, for no other appeal can permanently attract the masses or give resistless force to the latent power which in free governments the masses possess. I want my party to take this position and yet I am anxious that every other party shall, if possible, be brought into the same attitude. When I tell you that the first and most important object of government is not money-making or the extension of commerce or even the care of property, but rather the protection of human rights, I am not asserting an original proposition, I am not promulgating a western theory; I am simply giving expression to a fundamental truth that very many have recognized in the past. Emerson, who was not only not a western man, but was even more eastern than New Yorkers, said—and he said it twenty years before I was born:

“Truly the only interest for the consideration of the state is persons; property will always follow persons; the highest end of government is the culture of men; and if men can be educated, the institutions will share their improvement, and the moral sentiment will write the law of the land.”

To those who still believe in a Declaration of Independence, it ought to be sufficient to define the purpose of government as it is therein defined, namely, to secure to the individual the enjoyment of his inalienable rights. Human rights not merchandise, should be the chief concern of the government—the development of manhood and womanhood, not the worship of mammon. This cannot be construed as hostility to property, or to those who possess property. It is simply a recognition of the relation that must exist in all well organized society between man, the creator of wealth, and the wealth which he creates. Lincoln, in 1859, declared that if the man and the dollar came into conflict, the man was to be preferred to the dollar.

If you think I am radical when I condemn plutocracy and plead for a democracy that will recognize man as the master and money as the servant, let me prove the moderation of my language by quoting the language of Carlisle (Thomas, not John G.). He said some sixty years ago:

“Aristocracy of feudal parchment has passed away with a mighty rushing; and now by a natural course, we arrive at aristocracy of the money-bag. It is the course through which all European societies are at this moment traveling. Apparently a baser sort of aristocracy. An infinitely baser; the basest yet known * * * What generous heart can pretend to itself, or be hoodwinked into believing, that loyalty to the money-bag is a noble loyalty? Mammon, cries the generous heart out of all ages and all countries, is the basest of known gods, even of known devils. In him what glory is there that ye should worship him? No glory discernable; not even terror; at best detestability ill-matched with despicability.”

The trouble with our government today is that it is too much influenced in its operations by men whose only loyalty is loyalty to the money-bags. Who will say that this is or can be a noble loyalty? And yet in this great commercial center—in the very city of New York—this worship of the money-bags has been carried as far as it has anywhere else in this country. How many prominent men have you in this city, either in the democratic party or the republican party, who are brave enough to defy the influence of the “money-bags,” or place restrictions upon it? Occasionally a protest is heard from the pulpit against the business methods of Wall street. Last Sunday one of your Episcopalian clergymen said:

“Who are the heroes that are held up for the admiration of the rising generation? They are the gambling stock brokers, who, with their stock watering processes, their corners and their devious deals, are worse than the old feudal robbers. The clearest evidence that the American people are money-mad is that they will tolerate the robber king of gambling finance. These conscienceless rogues fling the whole code of honesty to the winds, defy the laws, rob men of their hard earnings, and then try to throw a sop of their ill-gotten gains to the church as ‘hush money.’”

This is harsh language, so harsh that I would hesitate to employ it. And yet, is it not deserved?

Occasionally a voice is raised against some particular manifestation of commercialism, some new evidence of the degradation that it has wrought; but why are your leaders in religion, in business and in politics not grappling with the

vicious principle that is responsible for the present demoralization of political life—namely, the theory that government can properly be used as the means of bringing pecuniary advantage to those who control it? “Will it pay?” has been substituted for “Is it right?” and as a consequence our legislative assemblies, city, state, and national, are becoming auction rooms in which governmental privileges are knocked down to the highest bidder. Is it strange that two senators have been indicted for selling their political influence? Is it strange that government officials, and members of congress have been interesting themselves in government contracts? Is it strange that boodle investigations are bringing to light wholesale corruption in state and municipal government? Is it strange that those who use the government as a business asset employ a part of their ill-gotten gains to purchase further legislation or further immunity? Is it strange that many obscure voters use their suffrage, the only political asset they have, as a source of pecuniary profit, when they see more prominent citizens using the government for private gain? Is it wrong for the voter to sell his vote? Certainly, but he cannot sell unless there is a purchaser and there would be no purchaser but for the fact that the government has been turned from its true and legitimate channel and made the instrument by which some enrich themselves at the expense of the rest of the people.

When great corporations, which are known to be careful and economical in their expenditures, contribute large sums for the election of certain candidates, or for the support of a particular party, can you doubt that they expect and will receive a return in the way of governmental favors?

(Here he gave several evidences of bribery and corruption.)

One evidence that our party was honestly seeking to secure justice to the masses in 1896 and in 1900 is to be found in the fact that our campaign funds were insignificant in both campaigns, although more individuals contributed than had ever contributed before. And what further evidence is needed of the corrupt bargain made by the republican party with the corporations than you have in the prompt enactment of legis-

lation desired by the protected interests and by the financiers, and by the failure of that party to interfere with the rapacity of the trusts?

In 1892 the democratic party collected a large campaign fund from the corporations. It spent more than \$1,000,000 in the two states of New York and Indiana. One trust contributed \$175,000, and in all the close states there was money to buy every purchasable voter; and what was the result? The most plutocratic administration this country had ever known. We witnessed a surrender to organized and predatory wealth so abject and so complete that seven years of exile from power have not entirely removed the stain from the party. You ask why I am opposed to the reorganization of the democratic party. Because I want my party to define the rights of the people; I want it to be the fearless champion of their interests; I want it to present the moral issue involved in public questions, and to appeal to the public conscience. It is because I love my party and want it to deserve the confidence and respect of an awakened and patriotic citizenship that I am not willing to lend my influence, be it much or little, to the mortgaging of the party to the money changers. I would be glad to see those who left us in 1896 return; and those who are democratic in sentiment and in sympathy have either already returned or will return when they understand the situation; but I verily believe that if during the past seven years our leaders had spent half as much time reasoning with honest republicans as they have spent in trying to conciliate corporation democrats, our party would be very much stronger today. What we need, to give our party assurance of ultimate and substantial victory, is not concession or conciliation or compromise, but a platform so clear and strong, and candidates so democratic that the platform and candidates together will drive out of the party the mercenary representatives of Mammon whose actions belie the promises of the party, whose utterances are used to convict the party of insincerity and whose very presence profanes the temple of democracy. I beg you, republicans as well as democrats, laymen as well as ministers, to consider whether it is not time to pitch our cam-

paigns upon a higher plane and apply moral principles to public questions.

Imperialism presents a moral issue. The main question involved in imperialism is not whether the income from the Philippine islands will equal the expenditure required for a colonial system. Such a question involves so much of mathematics that no one can measure exactly the pecuniary effect of the policy on himself or his neighbors, but the moral issue can be made so plain that all can understand it; for at the bar of conscience no plea of profit, individual or national, can justify the killing of human beings, in order to extend trade or to force a foreign government on an unwilling people. In the action of our government in the Panama case, what principle controls? Was it a jealous care for our so-called commercial interests, or a scrupulous regard for national honor and the rights of the people of Central America? The isthmian canal has been delayed years to please the trans-continental railroads. Could we not have delayed a few weeks rather than subject our government to the suspicion of coercing a little republic for our own gain?

Instead of inquiring whether a trust magnate can possibly be benevolent, or whether a trust does not sometimes reduce prices temporarily; instead of spending our time trying to discriminate between bad trusts and trusts not quite so bad, we should rather ask ourselves whether any economic advantage that a private monopoly can bring can compensate for the destruction of individual independence and individual enterprise—whether any group of men can have a moral right to dictate to the rest of the people, and stand as it were like robbers by the highway, giving their victims a choice between surrendering money and losing life.

In discussing the money question, instead of asking merely whether one standard will help one class or another, one section or another, the aim should be to adopt that system of finance which will give us the nearest approach to justice as between man and man, and this end cannot be reached by delegating this question to financiers—a class which, with occasional exceptions, has in all history thrown its powerful weight

against reforms. It is not a question of gold or silver, these are but incidents. It is a question whether the money changers shall control the volume of money and the national treasury. The financiers confess themselves either hostile to the welfare of the people, or that they lack confidence in their intelligence, when they refuse to submit to the judgment of the masses of the people the financial measures which they favor.

The whole protective tariff system is built upon supposed pecuniary profit to those who vote for it. The manufacturers are to be paid for their support with higher prices, the laboring man with better wages, the wool growers with a more remunerative market for their wool, and the others who vote for high tariff are fed with the delusion that the money which goes out of their pockets through tariff taxation returns in some invisible way, bearing compound interest with it. A direct bounty, which our supreme court has called larceny, under the form of law would be much less harmful than a protective tariff, because its evils are more easily estimated. Instead of calculating whether a 42 per cent tariff will pay more than a 47 per cent tariff, we should ask ourselves whether the government, acting for all the people, has any moral right to turn the taxing power over to any class on any ground whatever. And we should also consider whether a protective tariff could possibly offer a business advantage which would compensate for the demoralization caused by the lobbyists who infest Washington, and by the corruption funds that have been fried out of the tariff barons.

In dealing with the labor problem, moral principles and moral principles only are applicable. Capital and labor cannot be reconciled by high-sounding platitudes about law and order and vested rights. Violence must be punished, no matter by whom the violence is committed, and property must be protected; but those who would incarcerate a laboring man for a small offense and then allow the rich violators of the law to go unwhipped, should be made to see the inconsistency of their position, that they may blush for their hypocrisy. The dust-begrimed hands of the nation's toilers are raised, not

in threats against property, but in prayer for just treatment, and their offspring plead with us against child labor and the sweat-shop. We are told that the common people heard Christ gladly; and the ministers who today fail to reach the hearts of the common people may find the explanation in their failure to emphasize the simple, but persuasive doctrine of brotherly love.

How can we restore respect for the doctrine of self-government, how can we fight the trusts, how can we obtain a just financial system, how can we oppose a high tariff, how can we safeguard the rights of labor, or secure the election of senators by popular vote—how can we do anything that is needful, or appeal to conscientious people, if we are willing to put the party in the hands of those who profit by present laws, and stand ready to strangle any movement that gives the people hope of relief in any direction? Honesty appeals to honesty, and high purpose attracts those who themselves have high purpose. The democratic party must be more than an organization bent upon feeding its members out of the flesh pots. The democratic party must not be converted into a variety company, with an entire change of program promised for each campaign.

The first step forward for any party is to write an honest platform; and how better can an honest purpose be proven than by an honest platform?

The Kansas City platform was an honest platform and it dealt honestly with the people. In that platform imperialism was declared to be the paramount issue. Is imperialism less objectionable today than it was four years ago; have its principles changed? Some believe, and I am among them, that we should reaffirm the position taken four years ago on that subject; let those who oppose reaffirmation submit their views and ask judgment from the voters of the party at the primaries.

Are the trusts less dangerous now than they were in 1900? I believe they were when the Kansas City platform was written. Some—and I am among them—believe that we should maintain against the trusts the position taken four years ago,

and make the platform even stronger if possible—let those who oppose reaffirmation, whether they favor the trusts or favor a different remedy, present their views clearly and definitely.

The Kansas City platform, following the Chicago platform, declared for bimetallism, and pointed out the means of securing it. Nothing has arisen to discredit the principle of bimetallism. The increased production of gold, and the better times that have followed an increase in the circulation, have, on the contrary, vindicated the quantitative theory of money, although the world has not yet been relieved of the necessity for silver. This nation must be bimetallic or monometallic, and if monometallic it must consider what the effect will be if we assist in driving all the world to a gold standard, and compel twice as many people to use gold as use it now. And the ratio? If we are to have bimetallism at all, what other ratio is there than the present that is seriously supported? The money plank of the Kansas City platform covers every phase of the money question, and in principle condemns the financial measures now before congress. Let no one deceive himself, or be deceived by the argument that the money question is settled. The proposition to make silver redeemable in gold, the proposition to retire silver, or withdraw its legal tender qualities, the proposition for an asset currency, the proposition for branch banks, the proposition, known as the Aldrich bill, for the loaning of public money to favored banks—all these are parts of the money question and no concession will please the financiers that does not cover all of these questions and make Wall street influence supreme in the councils of the party. That is evident from the fact that those who want to ignore the money question are very careful to advocate for president only those who are known to take the Wall street view of finance. Some, I among them, believe that the money plank, as well as the other planks of the Kansas City platform, should be reaffirmed. Let those who are opposed to this plan offer a platform which suits them. Will they indorse the gold standard outright? They dare not do it. Will they declare for bimetallism at some other ratio? They have no intention of

doing so. Those who oppose bimetallism at the present ratio do not want bimetallism under any circumstances. They prefer to dodge the question of metallic money in order that the people may be lulled to sleep, while they continue to carry out their secret plans. Will they denounce the national bank issue and defend the greenback? No. That would offend the very financiers whose favor they are so anxious to court.

What will they do? If they have their way they will attempt a confidence game upon the people—they will prepare a platform so ambiguous, so uncertain and so meaningless that, like the platform proposed by one of your New York papers recently, it would suit the republican party as well as the democratic party.

Shall we modify our position on the labor question to suit the employers' association, and then dilute tariff reform in order to avoid that "disturbance of business" that is always put forward as an argument by those who have what they want, and don't want to be deprived of it?

When the next democratic convention convenes and undertakes to write a new platform, it will find the last one a model of clearness and conciseness and of square dealing; and I hope that the delegates to the convention will be instructed by the various states to indorse it. And if they indorse it they will then be prepared to make additions to it, applying to new questions.

And how about candidates? It does not matter much what the name of the presidential candidate is, but it does matter what he stands for. It does not matter much from what section he comes, but it does matter in what direction he is going to lead the party.

This is not a sham battle in which we are about to engage. It is intensely real, and terribly earnest. We need candidates whose records are such as to inspire courage in democrats—such as appeal to the conscience of republicans. Love, a great philosopher has declared, is not stupid, and those who love democratic principles will certainly not be so stupid as to select a candidate whose past is indefensible, whose present

position is inscrutable, or whose future conduct can be a matter of conjecture.

And how shall our committee conduct the campaign? Not by the purchase of votes, or by the corruption of citizenship, but by an open and honorable appeal to the hearts and minds of the American people. Let the republican party be challenged to meet the moral issue presented—this is democratic, this is patriotic. Let this be done, and unless reason and love of country have fled we shall fight without being ashamed. If we lose it will be but a temporary defeat and will bring no disgrace with it. If we win, the victory will mean much for our country and for the world.

THE PARAMOUNT ISSUE

The reorganizers, with the dishonesty that has always characterized their political movements, are shouting that "Bryan wants to make 16 to 1 the paramount issue." They have read what he says and they have read the platform adopted at Kansas City and they know that 16 to 1 is not regarded as the paramount issue by Mr. Bryan or by the other advocates of that platform. The money question was declared to be the paramount issue in 1896; in 1900 it was expressly declared not to be the paramount issue, but that it is an issue is perfectly evident to any one who will read the papers published by the reorganizers. These papers show that they regard the money question as an issue in two ways: First, they make that the test in the selection of candidates. The man may favor high tariff or low tariff or he may have no opinion at all on the tariff question, but he must believe in the gold standard and be willing to allow the financiers to do his thinking for him. And so with other minor questions, but on the money question the candidate to obtain favorable mention must be sound according to Wall street standards. This proves that with the financiers the money question is not only one of the issues, but really the paramount issue. Second, why are the reorganizers so alarmed when silver is mentioned? If it is a dead issue, why make such a fuss over every reference to it? If it is life-

less and has no supporters, how can it justify "conservative democrats" in bolting? The very fact that the reorganizers are so afraid of the money question is proof that there is life enough in it to prevent its burial by its friends.

The truth of the matter is that the reorganizers are trying to deceive the rank and file of the party and it makes them mad to be discovered and exposed. They know that some phase of the money question is always before congress, and lacking the courage to meet the issue honestly they seek an advantage under cover of deceit. They also know that back of all the surface issues is the controlling one, namely, whether the money changers or the people shall control the government. To surrender the money question would not conciliate the reorganizers. Take the result in Ohio. Tom Johnson expressly denied that he favored free silver and yet he was as bitterly denounced as if he had been an original silver man. Why? Because he was opposed to the rule of corporate wealth. Mr. Clarke, the democratic candidate against Mr. Hanna for the senate, was against the party in 1896; he helped the republicans that year and last fall avoided the money question. Was that satisfactory to the financiers? Not at all. In spite of the fact that all the republican papers reproduced his speeches against free silver he was beaten worse than any senatorial candidate in recent years. Why experiment longer? Concessions and compromises are not expedient even if they were right. Try to draw a platform without reaffirming the Kansas City platform and see what the result will be. No honest statement of the party's position can be made without indorsing the position taken in 1900. The whole aim of the reorganizers is to secure an ambiguous platform with which to fool the people and a presidential candidate under secret pledge to the money magnates.

Mr. Bryan will not co-operate with them in this effort and therefore he is the recipient of their abuse and malice. But neither abuse nor malicious misrepresentation will avail. The issue must be met.

A DICTATOR

The reorganizers are with one voice accusing Mr. Bryan of trying to "dictate" to the democratic party. What has Mr. Bryan done to justify the charge? He has expressed it as his opinion that the Kansas City platform should be reaffirmed, and for this he is now being censured by the bolters and by those who are trying to put the bolters in control of the organization. If Mr. Bryan had declared himself in favor of abandoning the Kansas City platform would they have accused him of dictating? Not at all. He would have been praised by the gold organs and they would have abused any one who dissented from him. "Dictating," it would seem, is defined, not as the offering of suggestions, but as the offering of suggestions objectionable to the men and newspapers to whose opposition the party owes its recent defeats. Mr. Bryan has a right to agree with them, but no right, they think, to differ from them.

Mr. Cleveland has been offering advice; he has declared that the party ought to return to what he calls "sanity" and yet none of these organs have denounced Mr. Cleveland as a dictator. They have not even questioned the propriety of his expressing an opinion on party policy. The fact that Mr. Bryan has twice been the candidate of his party would, according to their logic, compel him to keep silent, while the fact that Mr. Cleveland has twice thrown his influence to the republican party gives him a right to speak. Even republican papers can seriously counsel the democratic party without arousing a protest from those editors who mask their plutocratic designs under a democratic name, but it is regarded as utterly reprehensible that a former candidate should confer with those who voted for him.

What is the explanation of this bitter and unreasonable criticism? Simply that the reorganizers are attempting to deceive the public and it makes them angry to have their plans exposed. Mr. Bryan has not sought to force his opinion on any one. He has expressed himself, as every citizen has a right to do, and he has no desire to influence his co-workers except insofar as his arguments are found to be sound. It is

not Mr. Bryan that they have to meet, but the honest convictions of the millions of democrats who have maintained their integrity in spite of threats and bribes. A little child can, by quoting the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," throw a crowd of would-be burglars into confusion. They would fear not the child, but the doctrine he proclaims. And it would seem that Mr. Bryan's suggestion of an honest platform has brought similar consternation among the men who are plotting a betrayal of the people. If theirs was an open and an honest work they would not abuse Mr. Bryan—they would be content to announce their platform, give their reasons for it and appeal to the voters of the party, but instead of that, they fly into a passion and deny the right of any one to differ from them. They may as well know that their scheme will be opposed and that they will be compelled to come from under cover.

For seven years the corporation newspapers and the leaders of the reorganization movement have been working for the most part under ground—they have lauded every tool of organized wealth and attempted to assassinate the character of every one who would not join them. They have made a constant assault on democratic principles and were expecting to complete their plans at St. Louis, but they now realize that they must face the indignation which their repeated perfidy has aroused.

Their chief argument is that they can point the way to victory and they have impressed a few who have forgotten the disastrous defeat of 1894 when the reorganizers last led and the rout of the Palmer and Buckner ticket which they supported. They have won over a few whose hunger for spoils is stronger than desire for reform, and promising a large corruption fund, they, of course, attract those who want to handle the money, but they have not reached the incorruptible mass that furnishes the votes. As the fight progresses it will become more and more apparent that it is a battle royal between the money power and the common people. The line will be drawn between those who want to make the party the defender of monopolies and those who desire to keep it the

champion of popular rights. We lost some of our leaders in 1896—and some went over into the republican party. We shall lose some more this year, but we shall obtain recruits from among those who recognize the demoralization wrought by commercialism and desire the restoration of higher ideals. If to urge the democratic party to be true to its principles and honest in its methods is to subject Mr. Bryan to the charge of trying to dictate, he will bear the accusation with fortitude.

“DIVISION AND SILENCE”

The *Nashville Banner* gives its readers a splendid sample of the political immorality of the reorganizers. It complains because Mr. Bryan points to the corrupt use of money by the democratic leaders in 1892 and protests against a repetition of the methods then employed. The *Banner* says:

“His persistent accusations of corruption against the democratic party of 1892 come with poor grace from a man who has twice been the nominee of the party, and who now professes to be a democratic leader anxious for the party’s success. If he knew such things to be true, as he alleges, it would become him to keep quiet. Revelations of that kind should be left to the enemy.”

If there is any lower moral plane than this the *Banner* ought to point it out, for unless it does, its readers will be justified in believing that it has reached the bottom. This would seem to be on a par with the boodler’s maxim of “division and silence.” There is even greater reason for a protest from democrats than from republicans for the same reason that one should be more anxious to correct wrong-doing in his own than in his neighbor’s family. It is impossible for the democratic party to condemn corruption in the republican party so long as it countenances corruption within its own ranks. The trouble with the *Banner* is that it is committed to the cause of organized wealth and recognizes that money must be used to purchase privileges. It naturally resents, therefore, any effort to purify politics or to lift campaigns to a higher plane.

REORGANIZATION MEANS CLEVELANDISM

The democrats of the country are under obligations to Mr. Cleveland's friends for the frank avowal of their purpose to make Mr. Cleveland the nominee in case the reorganizers obtain control. The *Montgomery Advertiser* publishes an interview given by the president of the *Memphis Commercial-Appeal* company to the *Brooklyn Eagle*. These three papers, all prominent among the reorganizers, join in lauding Mr. Cleveland as "the man" to be nominated. The president of the Memphis paper, after declaring that he spoke for himself rather than for his paper, is reported as saying: "Mr. Cleveland should be nominated." "Mr. Cleveland has no elements of weakness as a candidate." "I do not believe Mr. Cleveland would refuse to run. He would probably refuse to run if his candidacy was a mere proposition of politics, but it is a national emergency which calls for his services. The democratic party should go ahead and nominate him without asking his consent, and in notifying him should say: 'We have nominated you because the country requires your services and because the democratic party desires to restore the country to the basis of safety and solidity which you gave it as president.'" Here is the opinion of the president of the Memphis paper. It is drawn out by the *Eagle*, whose editor claims to be the political Columbus who discovered Mr. Cleveland's new availability, and it is reproduced in the *Advertiser*, whose editor was postmaster under Cleveland, gratitude for which finds daily editorial expression. The bolting newspapers are full of such interviews and it is plain to any one who cares to see that it is neither harmony nor success that the reorganizers desire, but a return to Clevelandism.

But that is not all. The Memphis man gives away another secret, namely, that the objection to the reaffirmation of the Kansas City platform is not opposition to silver alone, but opposition to the party's position on imperialism and the trust question as well. He says:

"The south is unalterably opposed to the reaffirmation of the Kansas City platform. The south knows that the democratic party cannot be successful so long as it goes before the

country on those issues. There is no issue of expansion. That issue is dead. ' To argue against expansion is to argue against the commercial development of the south."

So imperialism (he calls it by the more euphonious name of expansion) is also dead! The paramount issue of 1900 is, in his opinion, no longer a debatable question. All the party said about human rights and self-government must be repudiated if the party would be "successful." No republican paper has advocated commercialism more boldly than this man who is described by the interviewer as "one of the staunch southern old-school democrats." It would seem, then, that a carpet-bag government is not bad in itself, but that it depends on who appoints the carpet-bagger. A system which was objectionable when enforced by the north against the south is, according to this "staunch, old-school democrat," all right if enforced by the United States against the Filipinos in the interest of the commercial development of the south. This certainly does not represent the sentiment of the south, but it is reproduced to show how complete is the surrender demanded and upon how low a plane the next campaign is to be fought if the reorganizers have their way in the convention.

On the trust question, also, the *Commercial-Appcal's* president opposes the last national platform. He says:

"Mr. Bryan is not a factor at all. He is not a democrat. He has never been a democrat. He would exterminate the trusts by destroying the business of the country. He would prevent a business house, incorporated in our state, from carrying on business in other states. If he found a bug in the house he would tear down the house. I am not a defender of the trust system in any of its illegal or oppressive aspects, but I am a business man, and I do not consider Mr. Bryan's prescription for business either sound or democratic."

He refers to that plank of the platform which denounced a private monopoly as indefensible and intolerable and proposed as a remedy, not that a corporation should not be allowed to engage in interstate commerce, but that before doing so it should show that it has no water in its stock and that it is not trying to monopolize any branch of business. That is a remedy that means something—a remedy that would be effective,

and, of course, it is opposed by those who favor the trusts. They want to get rid of the Kansas City platform and then write an ambiguous one which would permit a campaign of deception. He speaks as though it were Mr. Bryan only who favored the anti-trust plank which he first misrepresents and then condemns, but it is a platform remedy which received the support of more than six million voters. He does not like Mr. Bryan because the latter still stands by the platform and still opposes the trusts.

As an evidence that the reorganizers will give no quarter it is asserted by the *Eagle's* correspondent that while the delegates may differ as to the most available reorganizer to nominate, no man favorable to the Kansas City platform will attend the next convention as a delegate.

This is an example of the "harmony" which is so much talked about and suggests what may be expected when a "re-organized" administration begins to deal with those who were faithful to the ticket. The old Clevelandism was bad enough, but it would be an hundredfold worse if to the sordidness that characterized it before there is added the spirit of vengeance which animates it now.

SURRENDER DEMANDED

Some of the reorganizers profess to believe that the silver question is the only obstacle in the way of harmony. As evidence that complete surrender is demanded it is only necessary to cite the recent experience in Ohio. The democrats of that state made a fair test of this matter last fall. Mr. Clarke, the man named for the United States senate against Mr. Hanna, was a bolter in 1896 and made speeches for the Palmer and Buckner ticket. On other questions he was with the party and had shown his sympathy with the people by supporting the reforms for which Johnson was contending. Believing that his sympathies were right, the democrats, at the request of Mr. Johnson, nominated him and the silver men as a rule supported him, but in spite of the fact that the republican pa-

pers took pains to advertise that he had not changed his opinion on the silver question, he was defeated by an overwhelming majority. His advocacy of the gold standard did not save him, nor did it conciliate the reorganizers. They make a great deal of noise about 16 to 1, but they are not content with a surrender on that point. They insist that the platform, candidates and the party organization shall represent organized wealth on all points and that the democratic party shall be a miniature edition of the republican party. Nothing less than this will restore the kind of "harmony" they want.

INSTRUCT

A casual reading of the corporation dailies is enough to convince any one that there is a concerted plan on foot among the reorganizers to prevent instructions. "Select good, conservative men," they say, "and leave them free to act according to their judgment." In every district they are working for a delegate who will follow the dictation of Wall street and if they can succeed in sending these men uninstructed, Wall street will write the platform, name the candidates and control the organization. If the voters are heard at all they must be heard in the primaries and in the county conventions. A motion to instruct for the reaffirmation of the Kansas City platform will draw the line between those who want to make an honest fight and those who want to surrender the party into the hands of the financiers.

WALL STREET IS IN LINE

Those who imagined that Mr. Roosevelt could be depended upon to hold out against Wall street and that he would meet with the antagonism of the Wall street magnates, have had their day of awakening.

Recently it was announced that James Stillman, president

of the National City bank at New York, had dined with the president at the White house. Then we were told that A. J. Cassatt, the Pennsylvania railroad magnate, had announced his loyalty to Mr. Roosevelt. Then the dispatches informed us that Mr. Blythe, attorney for the James J. Hill railroad interests, had assured the president that his railroads were for Roosevelt.

The story is well told by Walter Wellman, Washington correspondent for the *Chicago Record-Herald*. Mr. Wellman is understood to stand very close to Mr. Roosevelt, and he seems to know what he is talking about. Over the Wellman dispatch the *Chicago Record-Herald* prints this headline, "Wall Street in Line."

Mr. Wellman says that it is asserted confidently by friends of Mr. Roosevelt that during the coming six weeks there will be a great change of sentiment in Wall street as to the desirability of Mr. Roosevelt's re-election. He says that these Wall street magnates, who have opposed Mr. Roosevelt, "do not know just what to base their antagonism upon." He adds that while some of these people flew into a rage when the Northern Securities case was ordered, in their calmer moments they have been compelled to admit "this was not such a revolutionary and radical action as they at first thought it." A great many people in this country have been at a loss to understand just what basis Wall street had for any opposition to Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Wellman further says, "I am credibly informed that the hostility to the president in Wall street is not as extensive or as bitter as it has been represented." A great many people have had the same impression.

Mr. Wellman tells us that "even the Rockefellers are coming round to take a more rational view of the president's character and policy, and that at least one of the Rockefellers is disposed to be more than fair and go so far as to be distinctly friendly."

Then this wonderfully frank republican correspondent says, "Those persons who imagine that Mr. Roosevelt is not a pretty good politician may soon have occasion to revise their judg-

ment." In order to show what a good politician Mr. Roosevelt is, Mr. Wellman adds:

"It requires genius of a high order to carry on a little crusade against Wall street and through it gain immense popularity with the masses of the people as the foe of the trusts, and then to turn round and gain the approval, and possibly the help, of a considerable share of Wall street itself."

This is a very frank statement, indeed. It admits just what many democrats have said, that Mr. Roosevelt's "little crusade against Wall street" was begun in the hope that through it Mr. Roosevelt might "gain immense popularity with the masses of the people as the foe of the trusts," Mr. Roosevelt all the time intending to "turn round and gain the approval, and possibly the help, of a considerable share of Wall street itself."

The Walter Wellman dispatch here referred to should be reproduced in every newspaper throughout the United States. It will materially aid the American people in placing a proper estimate upon the words of the present occupant of the White house, which words, according to his own statement, are of little value because they are not "backed up by deeds."

OPPOSE POPULAR GOVERNMENT

If the corporation bulletins which circulate as daily papers keep on they will convince even the blindest that the real objection to the Kansas City platform is not that it contains a silver plank, but that it contains a plea for popular government. THE COMMONER has already pointed out that the re-organizers, while pretending opposition to 16 to 1 only, are really against the greenbacks and in favor of everything demanded by Wall street. They also favor imperialism and have no intention of interfering with the trusts, but it is not often that they are indiscreet enough to admit their secret opposition to popular government.

The *Nashville American* has carried its boldness so far as to castigate Mr. Bryan for asserting the right of the people to

have what they want in government. In his Nashville speech Mr. Bryan said: "The people have a right to have what they want. They have a right to have a high tariff if they want it and to raise it until they get tired of it, and then they have a right to lower it. They have a right to have the gold standard or the double standard. They have a right to have the trusts if they want them or to kill them if they desire to do so." The *American*, quoting this, says:

In his speech at the Tabernacle Saturday night, Mr. Bryan said:

"The people have the right to have what they want. They have a right to have the tariff if they want it and raise it until it is so high they will tire of it, and then they have the right to lower it. They have the right to have the gold standard, or the double standard. They have the right to have the trusts if they want them, or kill them if they desire."

"This is the usual plea of the demagogue, the man who is attempting to curry favor with the masses, the man who wishes to ride into public favor and when once there to stay there, buoyed up by the clamor of many voices.

"It is the same speech that was made to the Roman populace 1,900 years ago, and it has been made ever since, in every country almost, by the seeker for public favor. It is not the speech of the student or thinker or the man who unselfishly loves his fellowmen and would attempt, by his advice, to better their condition. It is the harangue of the flatterer, not the counsel of the true friend.

"Who and what are the 'people' of whom Mr. Bryan speaks so glibly? One would think, from the way in which he uses the term, that it is the mass—men, women and children—to whom he would refer any question, and if they want what is proposed they can have it, if the majority of them so hold.

"Bismarck's objection to a democracy was that it was 'like a household ruled by the children.' It is such a household as Mr. Bryan, seemingly, from the loose manner in which he uses the term 'people,' would have this government. He would not place the counsel, the advice or the opinion of the matured, the educated and the wise above that of the ignorant, the unenlightened, the unrestrained. He would, it does not seem, place any value upon enlightenment and education."

This is a harsh rebuke and would be keenly felt but for the fact that the paragraph quoted from Mr. Bryan's speech contains no original sentiments. It is only a paraphrasing of

what has been said by Jefferson, Jackson and every other public man with democratic instincts. It ought to be a revelation to the rank and file of the party to have this would-be leader of democratic thought seriously quoting Bismarck's argument against democracy.

The editor of the *American* wants a government of the "matured, the educated and the wise" and it is fair to assume that he considers himself as answering to that description—at least he would not suggest a suffrage qualification that would exclude himself—and yet whose rights would be safe in a government in which men of his opinion had absolute control? All the evils that afflict the body politic today grow out of the fact that such men have too much influence in shaping legislation. They are the champions of that theory of government which turns organized society over to exploiters and then countenances the debauching of elections to secure a continuance of governmental favors. The problems of government are not so difficult that they must be left to experts; they involve moral principles upon which the masses are competent to decide. The manufacturers claim to be "matured, educated and wise," but when they make tariff laws they sacrifice both consumers and employes to their own interests. The money changers claim to be "matured, educated and wise," but if put in charge of the temple they would again convert it into a den of thieves. The trust magnates claim to be "matured, educated and wise," but who would make them custodians of the people's right? The employers are "matured, educated and wise," according to the *American's* definition, but who would trust them to make laws for the wage-earners?

The *American* believes in an aristocracy—not in a democracy—and it would be an aristocracy in which wealth rather than intelligence or virtue would control.

It attempts to defend its position by citing the suffrage qualifications of the south, but it does the southern people injustice in assuming that these amendments prove a lack of faith in the principles of democracy. It is the race question that gives rise to those amendments. They recognize that the black man has been governed by prejudice against the white

and have sought to protect themselves against that prejudice, but there is not a state in the south that would adopt an educational qualification if the race question were eliminated. The trouble with the papers that represent the reorganizers is that they do not trust the people, but, on the contrary, would first deceive them and then betray them.

DRAWING THE FANGS

The *Chicago Tribune* draws a striking picture of the evils of the anti-toxin trust. The *Tribune* shows that the mortality among patients treated with anti-toxin by the Chicago health department is 6.44 per cent; that the mortality among patients who are not treated with anti-toxin is about 35 per cent. The *Tribune* says, "These are the facts which lend terror to an industrial, monopolistic conspiracy between commercialized manufacturers." Then the *Tribune* says:

"How can the fangs of this conspiracy be drawn? Only by the local production of anti-toxin under a non-commercial system. What is needed for the inauguration of such a system? Only the money for a laboratory and for a horse pasture. The laboratory having been built and the horse pasture having been opened, all running expenses could be met by the sale of the product at cost.

"Can it be possible that this enterprise is too vast for the citizens of Chicago?"

But is there not another way of "drawing the fangs of this conspiracy?" What about the law providing for the prosecution and imprisonment of those who thus conspire against the lives of men, women and children?

Is it possible that the criminal indictment is "too drastic a measure," as one republican has termed it, for the treatment of men, who out of pure greed would make it well-nigh impossible for physicians to obtain a remedy for a dread disease—a remedy which, according to the *Tribune's* figures, reduces the mortality from 35 per cent to 6.44 per cent.

The *Tribune* tells us that the Massachusetts state board of health manufactures at a cost of 20 cents a bottle anti-toxin

for which the trust charges \$1.33. The *Tribune* says that the difference between 20 cents and \$1.33 is all profit to the trust, and declares that this profit is the product of an industrial conspiracy.

Is it possible that in the presence of such evils as these the American people must remain helpless, although there is upon our statute books a law providing for the imprisonment of men who engage in such conspiracy. It is clear that so long as we have men in authority who are either unwilling or afraid to avail themselves of the criminal indictment in the contest against such conspiracies as this the people are, indeed, helpless.

ONE PLANK PROPOSED

The *New York World*, in arguing against reaffirmation of the last national platform, refers to the platform of 1868 and says that it began:

“The democratic party, * * * recognizing the question of slavery and secession as having been settled for all time to come by the war or the voluntary action of the southern states in constitutional conventions assembled, and never to be renewed or reagitated, do with the return of peace demand,” etc.

The *World* thinks that the next convention ought to follow the example set by the convention of 1868. If the convention to be held at St. Louis accepts the *World's* suggestion, the money plank will be about as follows:

“The democratic party, recognizing the money question as having been settled for all time to come by the war made upon the party by the *World*, the flesh, etc., and never to be renewed or reagitated, do,” etc.

Now, such a plank would at least have the virtue of being frank and candid. If the money question has been settled “for all time,” “never to be renewed,” the party ought to so declare, but if the financiers are trying to make the silver dollar redeemable in gold, with a view to retiring them afterwards; if they are trying to retire the greenbacks and authorize an asset currency; if they are planning for a branch bank and the loaning of an enormous surplus to pet banks, how can the

party honestly say that the money question is "settled for all time?" The *World* and its co-laborers want the democratic party to keep still while the financiers carry on their schemes for the spoliation of the public.

ENFORCING THE CRIMINAL LAW

The conviction of Whittaker Wright, the English promoter, has attracted considerable attention in this country. The *Chicago Tribune* directs attention to the fact that Wright was convicted under what is known as the larceny act. The 1899 balance sheet of Wright's company showed an item of "\$2,500,000 cash at bankers." This sum was presumed to be available for dividends and was represented as being the result of a year's work by the directors to strengthen the company. A few days after this report had been made it developed that there was no cash in the hands of the bankers, and that Wright was required to lend the company \$1,500,000 to save it from insolvency. The \$2,500,000 item was a sham.

Commenting upon this showing, the *Tribune* says:

"There have been instances in this country where false reports of the condition of companies have been given to the public by men who knew them to be false, and whose object was unquestionably to induce persons to invest in the securities. In one case a company was credited with \$500,000 which it did not have. As the statement of the company was certified by accountants to be correct the public had some reason to believe it could be trusted.

"Persons who have been deceived and defrauded by false prospectuses and reports and doctored accounts can begin civil suits for damages against those who have despoiled them, though their chances for recovering anything are small, but why cannot the criminal law be invoked here as it has been in England to punish swindling promoters? If some American member of the fraternity could be visited with as severe a sentence as the one Whittaker Wright escaped only by suicide there would be fewer attempts to float fraudulent enterprises."

These are good suggestions and the *Tribune* might have directed the Roosevelt administration's attention to some instances in which it could make experiments along this line.

In Chicago, recently, two men, known as the Jager brothers, were arraigned before a federal commissioner on the charge of having sent through the mails certain circulars, in which circulars they misrepresented their mining properties. It was announced that the government would vigorously push the prosecution in these cases.

But it seems that the manipulators of the shipbuilding trust misrepresented their properties and frequently used the mails for the purposes of such misrepresentations. Yet, it does not seem to have occurred to anyone connected with the federal administration that the criminal law should be enforced against the men responsible for the shipbuilding trust scandals.

The Roosevelt administration has, in several instances, commenced civil proceedings against men who have violated the Sherman anti-trust law; but the chief feature of that law is the criminal provision and it does not seem to have occurred to anyone connected with the Roosevelt administration that the criminal clause was made to be enforced.

The *Tribune* might do a service to its party, as well as to the people generally, if it could persuade the republican administration to undertake the enforcement of the criminal law against the rich rascals of the country.

THE WISDOM OF DOING RIGHT

(Speech delivered by Mr. Bryan at Jacksonville, Fla., on February 16, 1904. As it is impossible for him to go into every community and make a verbal protest against the plans of the reorganizers, this speech is reproduced that the readers of THE COMMONER may be fully informed as to the line of argument pursued. In explanation of the first paragraph of the speech it may be added that a gentleman by the name of William J. Bryan introduced the speaker and Governor Jennings occupied a seat on the platform.)

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very glad to be here. If there is any state in which I ought to feel at home it certainly is a state in which I can be introduced to you by a man who has my first and last names, and in a state whose

governor has my middle name. I am here because I am interested in national politics, and I might say, to relieve all from embarrassment, that I come at my own invitation. I come to Florida as I have gone elsewhere—to discuss subjects in which I feel an interest. I shall speak to you upon the same line that I followed when I spoke in New York a few weeks ago, where I engaged the hall and introduced myself. I am not coming to present to you any peculiarly southern doctrine, or a western doctrine, but a democratic doctrine. I am glad that there is a democracy that is as broad as the nation—a democracy that can be proclaimed in any part of this country; and a democracy that is not as broad as the nation is not a democracy that can hope to draw to itself the patriotism and intelligence of the American people. As I understand democracy, it means the rule of the people—a democracy that is founded upon the doctrine of human brotherhood—a democracy that exists for but one purpose, and that the defense of human rights. That kind of democracy can be proclaimed wherever man lives, and is willing to respect the rights of his fellow-man.

I am glad to be here because we are entering upon a campaign of vital interest to the democracy and to the American people. I am interested in that campaign; and I think I am in a good position to talk politics now—in a better position in fact, than I have been for a good while. In several campaigns I have been a candidate. I was a candidate for congress in 1890 and, therefore, when I spoke people might have thought that I was personally interested in the election. I was a candidate again in 1892 and there again I spoke under the disadvantage of being a candidate. In 1894 I was a candidate for the senate and when I canvassed my state they might again have thought that I had a personal interest in the result. In 1896 I was a candidate for the presidency and then, too, they might have felt that my zeal was due to my personal interest in the election. In 1900 also I was a candidate, and the people who then listened to me listened to me as to one who aspired to office; but I come to you now, not as a candidate, and yet more interested in the result of the election, more interested in the triumph of democratic principles than I ever was when I was myself a nominee. I am not only a private citizen, but I can prove by every gold paper in the United States that I have excellent prospects of remaining a private citizen all the rest of my life. And now because, as a citizen, I attempt to speak the sentiments that are in my heart, they say that I am trying to dictate. They seem to be very much afraid of dictation. Those who have stood on the outside of

the party and tried to dictate to it for eight years are afraid that some one on the inside of the party may attempt to make suggestions to the party now. The anxiety that they feel lest the party be dictated to reminds me of something I read a short time ago. A man was all crippled up; he was limping and had his arm in a sling and patches on his face. Some one asked, "What is the matter?" and he replied, "I was coming downstairs and my wife told me to be careful, but I won't allow any woman to dictate to me." He would not be careful just because his wife cautioned him to be careful, and some of these people feel about as much exercised. I ask them to be honest—but they would rather suffer than follow such advice. Now, my friends, I am not trying to dictate; I am not in a position to dictate. What authority have I, or what power, to coerce anybody? If I was the head of a railroad corporation I might have the power to coerce or to withdraw employment from those who would not vote as I desired; if I was a manufacturer and employed a large number of men I might do what many manufacturers did in 1896, namely, give the employes a choice between voting a given ticket and idleness. But what power have I? I have none, and I have no desire to dictate. I have no power to grant favors to you; if anybody does what I advise, he must do it, not from hope of reward from me, but from hope of reward from his own conscience. I have no power, I repeat, to confer favors on you; I have no power to give you office. If I had that power there would be many men with me who are now talking about harmony and the reorganization of the democratic party.

What is it that they are afraid of? I will tell you. If a group of men assembled in a room contemplating larceny and a little child comes in among them and says, "Thou shalt not steal," he will put them all to rout. They will not be afraid of the child, but they will be afraid of the doctrine that he proclaims. And so, it is not because I have power to coerce, or to command, or to dictate, but because the doctrine of honesty is a doctrine that the reorganizers have never yet dared to meet and which they will not meet in this campaign. I want to preach the doctrine of honesty and I want to preach it, first, because it is right and because people ought to do right without stopping to count the consequences; and, second, because I believe that in doing right we lay the best foundation for complete and permanent success. So, whether you reason from the standpoint of expediency or from the standpoint of principle, you will be brought to an honest course in this campaign. You have heard some say that I am disturbing the harmony of the party. I have had men within

the last few days tell me that instead of criticising things that I believe to be wrong, instead of pointing out dangers that I believe to exist, I ought to "pour oil on the troubled waters"—I have examined the oil that they want me to use and find that it is Standard Oil. I am not willing to use that kind of oil; I am not willing to harmonize on that basis.

I desire to present to you what I believe to be a moral issue and to appeal to you to fight this battle upon the moral issues involved. I want to appeal to you to make the democratic party the champion of morality in politics. I want you to help to put the democratic party in a position where it will arouse the conscience of the American people—the conscience which is the most potent power in the world when it is once awakened. What we need today in this country is not so much the convincing of republicans that their policies are wrong as the convincing of republicans that if in power we would do differently. A great many republicans are convinced that commercialism has paralyzed their party and is paralyzing the country, but when you point out what the republicans are doing the answer comes back, Would you not do the same thing if your party was in power? And, my friends, they use the utterances of men who call themselves democrats to give the lie to every promise of reform. They use the conduct of these so-called democrats to convict us of hypocrisy and insincerity. When men tell me that the time ought to be spent in trying to persuade and coax people to come into the democratic party regardless of their convictions and regardless of their conduct when they come in, I am reminded of a story told on a minister. He was talking about a revival in his church and somebody asked him how many he added to the roll. He said, "I did not add any. I struck off 150." When men tell me that we must surrender our principles; that we must make our party satisfactory to those who do not believe in democracy, or in a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, I tell them that what we need is not so much to get in men who are not democrats as to drive out of the party those who pretend to be democrats, but whose conduct is a living lie. Just as the church is stronger when it expels men whose lives belie their profession—as a church is stronger when it is composed of a few, but all of them trying to live up to their profession than when composed of more, but of persons weaker in character, so a party is stronger if it has fewer members and all of them trying by their lives to exemplify the principles written in their creed. I believe it is possible for the democratic party to win, and not only that, but for the democratic party to win a victory that means

something for the American people. You ask me how it can be done? Here is a plan: Whenever a democratic official betrays his trust do not apologize for him; brand him and drive him out of the party and make him join the republican party or go off alone. They cannot investigate boodling in a city now without catching democrats in the net; they cannot investigate boodling in a legislature without gathering in democrats; they cannot investigate boodling anywhere but what they find some democrats who are involved like the republicans, and these men do more to hurt the democratic party—these men do more to injure our chances of success than any plank that was ever put into a platform.

I have had an experience like this, and after you have had it a few times you will agree with me; I have been talking to an audience and pointing out what the republican party had done that was hostile to the interests of the people and I have had some well dressed fellow to answer back, "Well, you had control of the government from 1892 to 1896, did you do any better?" And I have had to answer, "No, we did just as the republicans do," and then I have told why, because the victory of 1892 was secured through the influence of the great corporations and with the campaign fund that they contributed. Our party having won its election in that way was mortgaged to the syndicates and for four years our administration betrayed the party and betrayed the people for the same reason that the republican party has betrayed the people. And when I have pointed out these things they have called me a disturber of the peace and one of the corporation papers, the *Nashville Banner*, that used to claim to be a democrat, but has not been working much at its profession for some time—it criticised me and said that if I did know that there was an enormous campaign fund collected and expended in 1892 I ought not to say anything about it, but that I ought to let the republicans find that out. I am more interested than a republican in finding out and criticising democratic wrong-doing, and why? Because I am interested in the democratic party. There is not a man in this country who has more reason to be interested in the democratic party than I. What man in this country has received more at the hands of the democratic party than I? What man owes more to the democratic party than I owe, and what man by his history and training ought to be more thoroughly democratic than I am? My father was a democrat and his father and his father's father; my mother and her parents on both sides were democrats. As far back as the history of the family goes it has been democratic, and my wife's family on both sides was democratic. I envy my

boy because he has one more generation of democracy behind him than I have. But, my friends, the democracy that was taught to me was not the democracy of office-holding; it was the democracy of principle, and I want to see my party win a victory by deserving a victory. When it wins such a victory it will not be like the one of 1892, that left the party divided at the end of four years and made it carry the sins of a bad administration like a mill-stone about its neck in two campaigns. When we win a victory, a victory that is deserved and a victory that means something for the principles of the democratic party, it will be a victory that will put our party in power and keep it there for a generation.

The public conscience can be awakened and now I want to show you that there is a moral question involved in all issues before the country and I want to emphasize one thing—and I want the newspapers to emphasize the fact that I have emphasized it. I have been trying to make it strong and plain—and I cannot get a single one of these corporation bulletins that are issued daily and called newspapers, to take up the proposition upon which I build my remarks, namely, that the secret of the demoralization of the parties of our country—the cause of the corruption that has spread over our land and affected our government, is that instead of regarding a government as an organization framed by the people for the protection of the rights of the people, the government has come to be regarded as a private asset in business. That is the trouble. There can be no purity in politics until we raise our ideals of government and fight our battles on a higher plane. There is corruption everywhere. I was down in Delaware and I found that in Delaware, in some precincts, a majority of the people had received pay for their votes and in some precincts even three-fourths of the people had received pay for their votes. The *Baltimore Sun* declared after the election of 1900 that in one county in Maryland 25 per cent of the voters could be bought. The governor of Rhode Island has given statistics to show the extent of corruption there. I received a letter from a man in New York who asked, "How can we hope to win when a man with a quarter section of land demands \$1.50 for his vote?" In West Virginia a man told me that when he was on the committee a democrat came fourteen miles the day before the election to announce that he would not vote the next day unless he got a dollar. The public conscience has become so demoralized that I heard of one case where a town wanted to secure the county seat and not being able to get the county seat away from another town the idea of building a new county around the town was conceived. The leaders of

the movement prepared a bill and took it down to the legislature and they raised a fund of \$50,000 among the honest and respectable business men with which to corrupt the legislature; and to be sure that the money was conscientiously expended it was put in the hands of two prominent church members to divide among the bribed legislators. That was in another state, but if I dared to touch on domestic matters in this state I might possibly find cases that would parallel anything I have mentioned. Corruption is so common that people who know what is going on are seemingly indifferent to the effect that it is going to have on our country.

I received a letter from a man in Indiana. He said in substance: "Mr. Bryan, why don't you get out of the leadership of the democratic party and let us have money in Indiana again? Before 1896 we had all the money we wanted, but we have not had a dollar since you were nominated." Poor fellow, he had come to consider the money he received on election day as part of his regular income for the year and he regarded me as a public enemy because I stood between him and a corruption fund. If I cannot do anything else, I shall thank God if I can help to keep the democratic party from mortgaging itself to the great corporations to secure a campaign fund. Why is it that men spend money in trying to corrupt elections? It is because they expect to get it back out of the government and if you doubt it let me remind you of the testimony that was taken before a senate committee. This testimony is so strong and so much to the point that if I quoted it without giving my authority I am afraid some of the reorganizers might question it, but you will find it in the record of the proceedings of the committee of the United States senate that investigated the charge that some senators were engaged in speculating in sugar. They brought Mr. Have- myer before the committee and asked him if the sugar trust ever contributed to campaign funds and he said it did; they asked him to which campaign fund; he said that it depended upon circumstances. They asked to which fund it contributed in New York, and he said to the democratic campaign fund; to which in Massachusetts, the republican campaign fund; and to which in New Jersey, and he said, "New Jersey is a doubtful state and I will have to look at the books to see which party secured the money." This is the testimony of the head of one of the great trusts of this country, admitting that the trust did contribute to campaign funds, admitting that its contributions went to the party most likely to win. When he came to a doubtful state he had to look at the books. Now, why did the trust contribute? To buy immunity from the

party in power. In 1892 the democratic party collected \$175,000 from a single trust and it spent in two states, New York and Indiana, more than one million dollars. In every state that was doubtful it had all the money that it wanted, and I know of one city in Connecticut where, as one of the men who knew of the fund told me, after they had spent all they could on election day they had money left over to turn back to the committee. What was the result? The mortgaging of our party and then we saw the administration carrying out the obligations that were incurred in the campaign, and our government under the administration of the democratic party did not set an example of reform, or give hope or inspiration to those who desire to have the government administered in behalf of the people.

Take the tariff question that we have discussed now for something like one hundred years, and what is there back of the tariff? During the time that we have had a protective tariff we have had the laws written on that subject by the men who received the benefit of the laws. They talk now about tariff commissions; who will be on the commission if one is ever appointed? The men who pay the taxes? No. The men who are interested in the industries that are protected by tariff—these only will be eligible to appointment. When I went to Washington I had a letter to a democrat, to one who in 1896 went out and helped the republicans under the pretense of helping the Palmer and Bucker ticket. I had a letter of introduction to him from one of his friends in the west and when I presented it, he said: "Mr. Bryan, I shall be very glad to do anything I can for you; just call on me whenever I can help you in any way." I was afraid I might not see him again right away, so I called on him then and said: "I would like to be on the ways and means committee, and if you can help me I shall appreciate it." He said: "That is impossible; we put men on that committee who are from the manufacturing states." I said: "Why not put on somebody from the state that use the manufactured articles?" He replied: "That is not customary." A United States senator, speaking of the McKinley bill, said that he had submitted the bill to the manufacturers of his state and had found that in every instance but one the schedules had been prepared by the manufacturers themselves. Having made the laws and laid the taxes on the people these manufacturers have contributed to campaign funds and these campaign funds have been used to corrupt the politics of the country. John Burns, the great labor leader of London, objects to the protective tariff that they propose to establish in England, and why? He calls it a moral issue and

points out that the members of the English parliament are now above suspicion, not because they are better men than are found in the American congress, but because parliament has not undertaken to make men rich by law. He warns Englishmen that, if parliament assumes the responsibility for creating industries, aiding enterprises and voting aid to business undertakings, then the halls of parliament will be thronged with lobbyists like the halls of the American congress, and that the same demoralization will be witnessed in parliament that is witnessed in our congress. Are you surprised at what is going on in this country? Are you surprised that two United States senators have been indicted for making a profit out of politics? Are you surprised that a member of congress has been convicted? Are you surprised that government officials have been interested in government contracts and making money on the side? How can you be surprised at these things when you see a system of legislation devised for the purpose of helping men to get rich by law by putting their hands into the pockets of others? That is what is going on, and the result? People have come to regard government as a scheme for private enrichment and when questions come up they ask, not, Is it right? but, Will it pay? Our attorney general in Nebraska started to enforce the law against a trust which had a branch in one of our cities. The people of the town got together in public meeting and protested against the enforcement of the law. If a laboring man protests against the enforcement of a law he is called an anarchist, but business men can protest and they are called patriots and are said to have the interests of their community at heart. This is what you find. It is because the public conscience has been seared; it is because of the demoralization that class legislation has brought into American politics. If we are going to fight the tariff question I believe we must fight it upon the moral principle involved, and what is the moral principle involved? I have spoken of the demoralization that comes from having lobbyists around the halls of congress, but there is another moral principle involved, and for fear you may think that I speak too harshly and use language too strong I will refer you to a supreme court decision. I am so conservative that when I want to be emphatic I quote what somebody else has said, and when I want to be very severe I quote what some republican has said, either on the bench or elsewhere. The court said that to take money from the people by taxation and give the money to some industry in the town was larceny under the form of law. Now, is larceny immoral? The command, thou shalt not steal, was being violated, according to that decision.

Now, the moral principle involved in the protective tariff is the same as the moral principle involved in a bounty. If I were to propose to tax the people in this audience one dollar each, and collect it forcibly, and then give the money to some man upon this platform, you would rise up and say it was larceny under the form of law, and yet, my friends, a protective tariff that makes it impossible for you to buy abroad without paying a certain amount as a fine embodies the same principle. Some of the manufacturers conspire to take advantage of the tariff and charge you that much more on the goods that they produce and that you must buy, and I insist that the principle is exactly the same and is more dangerous because its operation is less visible to the eye than the operation of the direct bounty. If instead of giving a protective tariff we had given a bounty all these years it would have cost the people of the country less and the laboring people would have received a larger percentage of the money voted. We have given it to the manufacturers and the manufacturers have grown strong and rich and powerful, but the laboring men have not received their share. It would have been hundreds of millions of dollars cheaper in the form of a bounty instead of a tariff. If we are going to appeal to the conscience of the American people on the tariff question it must not be a question of schedule, whether it is 45 per cent or 43 per cent or 41 per cent or 39 per cent. If we are going to win our battle on this question, instead of discussing mere figures we must challenge the republican party to defend a system that turns over the functions of the government to private individuals and allows tribute to be collected according to the selfish interests of those who make the laws.

There is a moral issue involved in the trust question also, and I want to speak on this question for a moment. To hear some men talk you would suppose that we had two kinds of trusts, good trusts and bad trusts, and the ones you hear about are generally good ones, according to these people. You would suppose that there were benevolent trust magnates and stingy ones, and you have even heard men justify a trust magnate in collecting millions from the people and then giving back a small proportion to churches, schools and libraries. They talk about the benevolence of these trust magnates and they tell you that the trusts sometimes reduce prices. If a trust ever reduces the price of an article it controls, all the trust papers tell it over and over and roll it "as a sweet morsel under the tongue." If you could get ten trusts out of 200 to reduce the price of their products, the papers would be full of what the ten trusts had done and have nothing to say about

what the other 190 trusts were doing. When they got through the list of ten they would commence and go over it again. I once had a great deal of faith in Lincoln's saying that you can fool all of the people part of the time and part of the people all of the time, but that you cannot fool all of the people all of the time. That is what he said and I got encouragement from it until some person suggested that it is not necessary to fool all the people all of the time; that you can fool some of them the first year, some the second and some the third year and that by the fourth year you can go back and fool the first ones over again. So it is with the trust defenders. After they have talked about one trust, and then about another trust, and then about the third trust, they can go back and begin again. They tell you that production on a large scale is going to make production cheaper. If we were going to answer from the low plane of dollars and cents we might suggest that, when the head of the concern is so far from the men who toil that the authority must pass through several heads of departments, there will be so much leakage at each joint that it will cease to be an economic advantage to produce on that scale. But let us say, rather, that no amount of economy that a private monopoly can bring, even if it brings it to the people and not to the men who own the stock—that no amount of economy can compensate for the evil done by a private monopoly. Suppose you tell me that I can live cheaper with 1,000 people in a hotel, will that make me sell my home and take my family to a hotel? No; I tell you that I would not give up the blessings of home life for all the economy hotel life could promise. I believe in the family; I believe in its sacred associations and I would not be willing to barter the home life of this nation for any economy that might be shown to result from any other kind of living; and so no economy that a private monopoly can promise will compensate for the destruction of individual independence, of the citizen's right to think as he pleases, to act as he pleases and to be his own master.

We cannot long have a government of the people, by the people and for the people when we have the great mass of the people merely the agents and employes of a few men at the top. We cannot long maintain a republican form of government when the masses have nothing to look to but continuous toil and dependence, while those at the head of the monopolies transmit untold wealth from generation to generation. I object, therefore, to the trusts because there can be no good private monopolies and no matter how benevolent some trust magnates may be, I believe it is not safe to establish an industrial despotism that leaves the American people at the mercy

of trust magnates, however kindly disposed the trust magnates may be. If we are going to fight this battle we must challenge the republican party to meet the moral issues involved, and if I can suggest, without being called a dictator, I will add that if we are going to destroy the trusts we must handle them without gloves and charge them with the same violation of moral law that we charge against the highwayman who stops you at night and demands your money or your life. The man at the head of a coal trust who, when the people are shivering by a fireless hearth, attempts to extort from them under threat of withholding from them the fuel that they need, is demanding the money or life of his victims. The men who control the food of the country, the food that people must have when they are hungry, the men who extort from the people because they have the power to do, demand money or life from the victims of the monopoly. It is time for the democrats to challenge the republican party on the moral issues involved. Instead of crawling on the ground and trying to get campaign funds from these men whom we ought to fight, let us see to it that the democratic party refuses to receive a single dollar of trust blood-money with which to carry on its campaign.

There are some who say that the money question is dead and that we ought to drop it. Well, I have heard that so often that it does not bother me like it used to. You know a person can become so accustomed to even sad things that they cease to worry. They say that soldiers in the midst of carnage become so accustomed to the sight of bloodshed that those who at first would have been shocked at the sight of such suffering at last become hardened to it.

In 1892 my opponent for congress said we would never hear of the money question after the election, but it was up again in 1894 and they buried it again—and nearly buried the democratic party with it, and yet the party was in the control of these same reorganizers who promise to lead us to victory now when they led us to overwhelming defeat before their sins were fully discovered. In 1895, in 1896, in 1897, in 1898, in 1899, in 1900, in 1901, in 1902, and in 1903 they said that they buried it, but the funeral is still in progress. I have sometimes thought that if the men who say the money question is dead really believed it they would not watch the corpse so carefully as they do.

Let me show you that the money question is not dead. I will give you proof of it that ought to satisfy any reasonable man. Ask a reorganizer—one who says that the money question is dead—ask him to name ten candidates for the presi-

dency who are in his opinion eligible and then look over the list and you will find some high tariff men, some low tariff men, some imperialists and some opposing it, some on one side and some on the other side of other questions, but they will all be gold men and will look to Wall street for their inspiration. Isn't it strange, if the money question is really dead, that they make it a test when they come to select a candidate for the presidency? Not only that, but let me give you another fact. They say that you must not mention it in your platform; that it is dead. If they really believed it dead they would not care whether you mentioned it in the platform or not. We want to know what a man thinks about those things in dealing with which his action will have some force and yet these men who say that the money question is dead are the men who would vote the republican ticket and risk the rule of the trusts and the turning of our republic into an empire because they fear an issue that they said is dead. Is that reasonable? No: and as long as there is enough life in the money question to frighten the reorganizers there is enough to give hope to the friends of bimetallism. Let me give you an explanation of it. It is not because the question of silver is as important as it was eight years ago. If anybody says this is a change of opinion, let me ask him to read the Kansas City platform adopted nearly four years ago and he will find that in that platform it was expressly declared that the money question was not the paramount issue, and we have not insisted for the last four years that it was the paramount issue. But we insist that there is some phase of the money question always before the country and we insist that the democratic party cannot afford to declare in favor of the gold standard. The democratic party must either favor bimetallism or the gold standard. If you want to scare the reorganizers out of their wits go into one of their meetings, and ask them to declare that the gold standard is a good thing. They do not want to do that—they simply ask that we dodge the question.

They want to practice a confidence game on the people. While they tell the people that the question is settled or is immaterial they want to elect a president who will follow the dictates of Wall street and carry on by secret means the crusade against silver. We have six hundred million silver dollars in circulation. You have them in your pockets, or certificates representing them, and they pass for money everywhere. The people of this country see more of these silver dollars than they do of gold coin. The gold men want to make these millions of silver dollars mere promises to pay gold, but they dare not so declare in the platform. They want first to make

the silver dollars redeemable and then they want to retire them with an issue of bonds.

They want to destroy silver as a standard money and make gold the only legal tender money that remains. They want to adopt the European system where the only legal tender is gold and where bank notes are the only paper; they would make the enormous business of this country rest upon a narrow base of gold. Then if by any exigency the gold is drawn out, the whole system will collapse. They are asking us to build the business of our country upon a quantity of yellow metal that is not sufficient for this purpose. There is not a nation in the world that has sufficient gold in its control today, and less than half the people of the world are now using gold. I do not say that less than half the nations use gold; I say that less than one-half the people use gold. It is true that the silver-using nations do not use as much per capita as we do in Europe and the United States, but these nations use enormous amounts of silver and there is not enough gold in the world today to furnish the standard money that the people need, not to speak of the amount necessary to retire the four billions of silver now in use.

This crusade against the white metal is going on and if this nation deliberately takes its stand on the side of gold there is no assurance that we may not in a short time reach another era of falling prices, and we cannot afford to take that position. There is no necessity for taking that position. If our party is to stand by the rights of the people it must insist upon a volume of money that will keep pace with the demands for money and it must not be controlled by Wall street and made the mere tool of the financiers. There never was a time when it was safe to let the money changers control the nation's finances.

I have been called a disturber of the peace because I am not willing that the democratic party shall be made an ally of the republican party in practicing deception on the American people on the money question.

You will find that aside from these measures which relate to silver alone there are others which relate to paper money, and the people who tell you that the money question is dead because of the increased production of gold have nothing to say against the asset currency, against the branch banks and against what is known as the Aldrich bill. The secretary of the treasury has called the attention of the country to the fact that we must now consider whether we will have a perpetual debt as a basis for bank notes or some other basis; and what is the other basis? The assets of a bank. And how long will

an asset currency be good? As long as the cashier is good and stays at home, but if he takes the money and absconds, what becomes of your asset currency? I suppose you never have bank failures down here, but we have had them out in our country. We had a little bank there and one night after dark the cashier put the assets of the bank in his valise and left, and did not come back, but if we had had an asset currency issued by that bank we would have had the currency even after the assets had gone.

A banker in Omaha made a speech recently; he said that he left the democratic party in 1896 in order to save the country from a fifty-cent dollar and that he might have to return to the democratic party to save the country from an asset currency that might not be worth anything on the dollar. Those who tell you that the money question is dead are not going to offend the financiers by arraying themselves against an asset currency. And what about branch banks? It means a great central bank in New York with branch banks throughout the land and when the system of branch banks is established the branch bank will run out of town every other bank and will then have the business of the community at its mercy—another bank like that which Andrew Jackson destroyed. When they tell me that we must now make friends with the financiers, that we must now let them write our platforms, nominate our ticket and control our organization in order to win, I ask them if they remember what Andrew Jackson did when he was likewise tempted. The same temptation that is presented to the party today was presented to Jackson. Biddle, the president of the bank, went to Jackson and told him that he had it in his power to elect him president again or to defeat him. What did Jackson reply? Did he talk like the reorganizers do now and say, "Well, we need you; we will make terms with you, and let you run the government." No, when Andrew Jackson was offered a choice between their opposition with prospective defeat or an election, with their aid, what did he do? He said in substance: "If your bank has the power to elect a president or to defeat him, it has a sight more power than any corporation ought to have in the United States and more than it will have long if I have power to take it away."

He had the patriotism and the courage to oppose the money power of his day and I am praying that the spirit of Andrew Jackson will come into the hearts of the democrats of this state and of this nation and make them rise up and say: "By the Eternal we will not sell the democratic party to the money changers at any price." That is what is needed today, and

you will find that if you surrender upon one phase of the money question you will have to surrender on all phases. If you are willing to leave out the ratio of 16 to 1, what ratio will you adopt? The republicans complained of 16 to 1 eight years ago, but they have had power in the house, in the senate and in the White house and they have not changed the ratio. We have the same silver dollar today and the same 16 to 1 ratio. If the ratio is wrong, why don't they change it? They dare not change it. If you are going to surrender the ratio, what ratio will you substitute? Are you going to leave out bimetallism entirely? Then the fight will come on the asset currency and the branch banks. If you dare to resist their demands you will have the same people to fight on other questions. If you are willing to leave out every phase of the money question and give them branch banks, an asset currency and the Aldrich bill (a bill that will loan three hundred millions of money to the pet banks and give these banks enough profit to lay the foundation for an enormous corruption fund)—if you gave them all of these things you would not make peace with these men for, after you had surrendered everything, they would ask you to be easy with the trusts. No matter what you are willing to surrender you cannot make peace with these men. You will not find a single issue upon which you can fight the people's battle if you must first get the consent of the financiers to your platform.

As a rule those who are opposed to the reaffirmation of the Kansas City platform will not write a trust plank that will hurt a trust. The very men who tell you that they simply want to get rid of silver are the men who are planning to write an ambiguous, uncertain and meaningless platform, and then nominate a man whom they know to be in the control of the syndicates, and then they expect to collect a big campaign fund from the trusts. This is the policy that I am fighting. These men who say they are opposed to the Kansas City platform are not only against the people on every phase of the money question and trust question, but they are also against any real tariff reform. Some of them emasculated the Wilson tariff bill and made it a mockery and a by-word. Many of them voted for a high tariff presidential candidate in 1896.

Neither are they prepared to take the people's side on the labor question. We have in this country today a labor question. We have capital and labor arrayed against each other, and you will find that the people who do not want to reaffirm the Kansas City platform have something else that they want to get out of that platform. It is the plank providing for the arbitration of differences between capital and labor; they also

want to get rid of the plank that condemns government by injunction. If there was one plank in that platform that lost me more votes than any other plank, it was the labor plank. Many have hidden behind the pretense that they were opposed to free silver who objected to that platform mainly because it breathed the spirit of brotherly love and demanded that the laborer and his children should be recognized as made in the image of God. Because we were not willing that the laboring man should be placed at the mercy of a United States court and denied the right of a trial by jury we incurred the enmity of the great corporations; and you will find that the men who want to take out of that platform all reference to the money question also want to take out all reference to the labor question. You will find more than that; you will find that the men who want to destroy that platform on the pretense that they are just opposed to 16 to 1 are also opposed to the indorsement of the Declaration of Independence and the doctrine of government by the consent of the governed. It was only a few days ago that I read in the *Montgomery Advertiser*, one of the reorganizers' papers, an interview that appeared in the *Brooklyn Eagle*, another reorganizers' paper, with the president of the *Memphis Commercial Appeal*, another reorganizers' paper, and thus the interview received the indorsement of three papers in different parts of the country that are exponents of the reorganizers' sentiments. What did the *Commercial Appeal's* president say? He said that the Kansas City platform must not be reaffirmed, and why? He pointed out the objections to the trust remedy of that platform, and then pointed out the objections to the plank on imperialism; and he said that expansion was no longer an issue; that expansion was an accomplished fact, that to argue against what he called expansion was to argue against the commercial development of the south. You will find that as a rule the men who do not like that platform are so steeped and dyed in commercialism that they would sell the principles of American government for a few dollars' worth of merchandise. They put merchandise above manhood and womanhood, and I am hoping that the democrats of the south will join with the democrats of the north in declaring to the world that we raise something in this country more important than cotton or corn; that we raise men and women and that we will not make merchandise of their blood. Certainly the people who had a taste of carpet-bag government a generation ago will not be in favor of giving the Filipinos a taste of carpet-bag government now. A man who is willing to send a carpet-bag governor 7,000 miles across the ocean and hold him in office by

an army sent equally far cannot consistently complain of carpet-bag government in the south. If we are going to condemn carpet-bag government we must condemn it not because we are the victims, but because of the principle involved, and I believe that it is time to challenge the republican party to defend the moral principle involved in this question. If they tell me that they are going abroad on a missionary crusade and are going to kill men for the love of God, I ask them to go back and read their Bibles again. They will find that the Author of our religion was not a warrior, but the Prince of Peace, and that at His coming the angels sang Peace on earth, good will to men. If they think that we can win a victory for Christianity by shot and shell let them go to the ruins of ancient Rome. As they stand by the walls that have for two thousand years defied the ravages of time their thoughts will run back to that time when Nero gathered the Christians from their humble homes and delivered them to wild beasts, and as they recall how helpless those people were, how helpless among the wild animals, made hungry by having their food kept from them for days for this purpose, how helpless and how hopeless those Christians were as they knelt and sang and prayed until life was gone, let them take courage. Let them remember that on their knees those Christians invoked a power more potent than the legions of Rome. Let them take courage when they remember that these defenseless Christians prayed to the God of love and offered no resistance to their tormentors; let them remember how these men by their silent suffering overcame those who tormented them and how the stateliest edifices of the Christian church were reared upon the ground reddened by martyrs' blood. Those who came to watch the sufferings of the Christians went away asking themselves, "What is it that makes these people willing to die for their religion?" The very heroism of the martyrs brought converts to their faith. And today we need more democratic heroism. If the democrats of the country would live for democracy and, if necessary, die for democracy, our party would soon win an overwhelming victory. We must challenge the republican party to meet these moral issues and if they tell you that we are going to add money to our treasury by the exports of the Philippine islands; if they tell you that we are going to increase our commerce, tell them that the shedding of human blood can never be justified as a means of extending trade. You can no more justify yourselves in shooting people to make them trade with you than a desperado can justify himself in going armed with a revolver into a store

and demanding that the storekeeper trade with him. That which is criminal in principle when done on a small scale is criminal when done on a large scale. I believe that we ought to challenge the republican party to show title to the Philippine islands. I deny that we have any moral right to govern the Filipinos. What right have we? Did we buy them or get them by force? I deny the right of our government to buy people at \$2.50 a head and then kill them because they do not like to be sold. You tell me we got them by force—I dare you to practice the doctrine at home. If you are a big republican and go out and thrash a little democrat and then claim to own him, you will soon be taught better. If a big republican cannot thrash a little democrat and then own him, I deny the right of seventy-five millions of people to thrash eight millions of people and then own them. I believe we can present these issues and compel the republican party to meet them. All it requires is faith in the triumph of a righteous cause. I recently read a statement made by a man in regard to the triumph of a cause; he told how it grew slowly at first, but was triumphant at last. He told of the success that came to those who attached themselves to the cause and then he said that while they deserved some credit for foresight, “they simply had faith in the wisdom of doing right.” Mark the words—“faith in the wisdom of doing right.” If you are a merchant in business, have you faith in the wisdom of doing right? If you are a professional man, have you faith in the wisdom of doing right? As a citizen, have you faith in the wisdom of doing right? If you are a democrat, why should you not have faith in the wisdom of doing right? I come to you, my friends, to appeal to you to maintain the integrity of the democratic party; I come to urge you to do what you can to lift the party to a plane where it can appeal to the conscience of the American people, and challenge discussion of the moral issues involved in all these problems. If I were authorized to frame a prayer for the democratic party—a prayer good enough for any party, it would be: “Oh, God, give us faith in the wisdom of doing right.”

UNEXPECTED CANDOR

The *Cincinnati Enquirer* is guilty of unexpected candor. In a recent editorial entitled “Dollar value,” the *Enquirer* says:

"The *New York World* introduces its editorial paragraphs with this observation in capital black letters: 'The bullion value of a standard silver dollar at yesterday's quotation was 43½ cents.'

"Go to. This is not the campaign of 1896 or of 1900. That sort of comment was 'worked' and 'overworked,' when the silver question was an issue. It is not now. And nobody can explain why it is not except by allusion to the great product of gold for a few years back, and the prospect that there will be lavish production for a good while to come.

"Is it correct to say that the silver dollar has bullion value at all? Its value as a United States coin appears to be 100 cents. It goes for that throughout the country. Everybody is glad to get the silver dollar, or the paper certificate representing it at 100 cents. Men may say that it is sustained by the operation of the (so-called) gold standard; but silver dollars and silver certificates are not redeemable in gold.

"Perhaps, after all that has been said and done, there is something in what the laws of the United States say shall constitute a dollar.

"Anyhow, it seems to be ridiculous to say that a confused lump of silver with 43½ cents is worth no more than that after it has been coined and legally stamped by the United States. Everybody who has sense enough to go in out of the rain knows better than that, from his everyday experience."

The *Enquirer's* remarks about the money question indicate the wish of the proprietor rather than a knowledge of the fact; but its suggestion that the legal tender law is responsible for the 100-cent value of the silver dollar is eminently sound. For ignorance of the science of money, the *New York World* probably excels all its contemporaries, and the *Enquirer's* rebuke is well merited.

PLATFORM OF 1892

Reorganizers have recently had much to say concerning an alleged pledge in the democratic platform of 1892 to the effect that the Sherman act of 1890 would be repealed. The *Louisville Post* touches on this point when, in referring to the attitude of the democrats in 1892, it says:

"They were pledged in 1892 to the repeal of the Sherman silver act, but the democrats then would not have repealed that act; it took republican votes to carry out the pledges of the democratic platform.

"Mr. Cleveland acted himself most honorably in that whole contest. He stood for the prompt redemption of the party pledges, and he sacrificed party in order to protect the credit of the country."

The statement that the democratic party pledged itself to the repeal of the Sherman act is but a half truth. Mr. Cleveland did not stand for the prompt redemption of the party pledges. He stood for the redemption of such portions of the pledges as would best suit the purpose of the financiers with whom he seemed to be in league.

It might be well for those interested in obtaining the truth to take a look at the democratic platform of 1892. One paragraph in that platform is devoted to "Coinage." The opening sentence reads: "We denounce the republican legislation known as the Sherman act of 1890, as a cowardly make-shift, fraught with possibilities of danger in the future which should make all of its supporters, as well as its author, anxious for its speedy repeal."

If the coinage plank had stopped there there would have been reason for the claim, but the democratic party did not pledge itself to the unconditional repeal of the Sherman act. The party did not promise the people that the Sherman act would be repealed without promising also the substitution of a bimetallic law.

It will be seen that the second sentence in the coinage plank reads as follows: "We hold to the use of both gold and silver, as the standard money of the country and to the coinage of both gold and silver, without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage."

Then follows the declaration that "the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic exchangeable value, or be adjusted through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in payment of debts,"

and then it was said: "We demand that all paper currency shall be kept at par with and redeemable in such coin." "Such coin" meant gold and silver.

Mr. Cleveland, during his second administration, never undertook to carry out these pledges. He did insist upon the repeal of the Sherman act because the financiers wanted that act repealed; but instead of making any effort to keep both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, instead of making any effort to bring about "the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage," Mr. Cleveland devoted his energies in an effort to discriminate against silver and enhance the price of gold. He obtained his election upon a platform that was interpreted for the rank and file of the party to mean bimetallism. Then after he was installed in office he carried out the one pledge in that platform which financiers desired should be redeemed and he utterly ignored his obligation to his party to establish bimetallism after the "make-shift" had been repealed.

GAMBLING IN FUTURES

The list of suicides has recently been increased by the names of a number of men who, having lost trust funds in market speculations, were unwilling to face the disgrace. This usually follows an ebb in prices and indicates the extent to which gambling on the exchange is carried. The south has not suffered so much as the north from the evil, but just now the high price of cotton is alluring many into this dangerous habit. A considerable portion of the amount gained by the south in higher cotton seems likely to be lost in futures. Speculation is a disease that is nearly always fatal when it gets a firm hold upon its victim for it demoralizes as well as impoverishes. Market speculation is not nearly so safe as a lottery because market manipulators have power to raise or lower prices at will—not power enough to keep prices low when the crop is short or to make prices high when the crop is large, but power

enough to cause fluctuations that will wipe out margins even when the speculator guesses rightly as to the general trend of the market. If a man feels that he must gamble he can break himself of the habit by purchasing a small wheel of fortune and letting his wife run it. He will find that she will gradually accumulate while he will gradually lose. After a while he will learn how impossible it is to win permanently at games of chance and the money paid for the experience will remain in the family. It may spoil the wife, though.

But even when one has ceased to gamble it takes some time to get the poison out of the blood and to overcome the tendency to get something for nothing. The slow accumulations that come from honest labor and from the exchange of things of equal value are not apt to satisfy those whose imaginations are influenced by the prospect of winning a thousand dollar prize with a lucky ticket or with the hope of making a fortune by a favorable turn in the market. If the child is to be fortified against gambling he should be taught both by the father's example and by the father's precept that honesty in business requires that he shall give a dollar's worth of work for a dollar's worth of pay.

WHY THE WAR?

American sympathy seems to be somewhat divided, some hoping that Japan will thrash her big antagonist, some hoping that Russia will be victorious. Some sympathize with Japan because of her wonderful progress in recent years, some because she is the smaller nation, and some because of the belief that she is the victim of Muscovite greed. Some sympathize with Russia because they believe she has no sinister designs on China or Japan, but only wants an ice-free outlet to the sea, some because the Russians belong to the white race, and others because the Russians belong to one branch of the Christian church.

There are, however, a good many, and the editor of THE COMMONER is one of them, who desire to know just what the

fight is about. It may be natural for us to take sides according to prejudice or partiality without stopping to ascertain the cause of the controversy, but it is hardly a defensible position. There must be some point on which the question hinges—some demand of Russia to which Japan will not or should not accede, or some demand on the part of Japan to which Russia will not or should not accede. It is the duty of outside nations to find out the real point in dispute and use their influence to secure a settlement which will be just to both nations. Sympathy will not settle the controversy and if one nation whips the other and enforces an unjust demand they will have bitterness that will foment a future war. When the diplomatic correspondence is given to the world it will be possible to see which nation is to blame and to determine on which side the right is.

It is proper that our nation should observe strict neutrality, but it should also endeavor to find the real point at issue and join other nations in advising such an adjustment of the differences as will prevent further bloodshed and remove the ground for future friction.

Both nations have been friendly toward the United States and our nation is in the very best possible position to proffer its good offices to secure peace based on justice.

THE BEEF TRUST'S WORK

Representative Martin of South Dakota, speaking before the house committee on interstate commerce, made an interesting showing concerning the operations of the beef trust. According to Mr. Martin's statement the facts appear to be as follows:

The price of cattle since early in 1903 fell until last December, when it reached the lowest price in five years.

The price of dressed beef during the first six months of 1903 correspondingly declined; but about the 1st of July it began to recover, and during the fall of 1903 it reached a point, at

which the spread between the price of cattle and dressed beef was from \$12 to \$15—a difference greater than any preceding record.

Dressed beef is bringing as much now as in 1901, while cattle are much lower.

Consequently, there is a great loss to producers of cattle in the west. Many of the stockmen have become embarrassed at the present condition of affairs, which cannot be attributed to natural causes.

The foreign market for American beef is good, and the local market is probably the best in many years.

In August, 1903, the price of dressed beef was \$8.37½ per 100 pounds, although it cost but \$5.17 on the hoof.

In February, 1901, dressed beef sold at the same price, but beef on the hoof cost \$6.50.

In one instance a cattle raiser shipped a consignment to the Chicago stock yards. He found no competition whatever, and, in fact, the absence of a real market. This cattle raiser called upon the various concerns, but secured a bid from only one. He finally accepted this. His curiosity had been aroused, and he resolved to see what the reason was that they did not bid. That night the steers sold to the one firm by this cattle raiser were separated into seven equal lots and distributed among the seven different concerns.

In the face of this showing what do the republicans propose doing? They propose to authorize the secretary of commerce and labor to investigate in order to determine whether a trust exists. That fact is already clearly shown by the affidavits filed by the federal law officers in the injunction proceedings against the beef combine.

These republican leaders realize, however, that something must be done by way of a pretense at remedying the evil, and so they have provided for an investigation that will be, necessarily, long drawn out. It is a wholly unnecessary investigation, because the facts are already clearly set forth in the papers filed in the federal court at Chicago.

If these republican leaders were sincere, if they really intended to curb the beef trust, instead of providing for a long

drawn out investigation they would instruct the attorney general to commence criminal proceedings and call every one of these different trust magnates before a court of justice, under the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law.

COST OF IMPERIALISM

In the discussion of the naval appropriation bill Senator Hale of Maine submitted a few remarks which ought to attract widespread attention. He objected to the plans of the naval board, saying that to carry out the plans of the board would soon require \$200,000,000 per annum. He thought that it might require as much as \$120,000,000 next year. He said:

“The naval officer is a naval officer pure and simple, and the American navy bounds his complete horizon. To him the navy is everything and the naval board has run too much in the direction of enormous ships. In some respects the naval officers are like the farmer who wants to raise the biggest pumpkins. They don't want Great Britain or Germany to excel the United States.”

Of course, the naval officer wants the biggest navy in the world, but why should the taxpayers submit to such a scheme?

According to the press reports the senator “admitted that the last extensive additions to the navy had been made necessary by the acquisition of the Philippines,” and he added that he would like to “get rid of those islands.” He declared that in case of war we have to spend “hundreds of millions in the Philippines.”

The cost of imperialism is enormous and it is collected from the whole people. The benefits of imperialism are insignificant and are gathered in by a comparatively small number of people. The exploiters who are “developing” the islands will get rich; army contractors will make money; railroads and steamships will profit by transportation charges; shipbuilders and manufacturers of armor plate will fatten as the navy increases and a lot of new officers will find life positions, and

the people will foot the bills. But expensive as imperialism is, when measured by dollars and cents the greatest injury is that done to the honor and reputation of the nation. We cannot sympathize with the oppressed anywhere without being rebuked by the oppressors and we cannot emphasize at home principles that we are violating in the Orient. The democratic position on the subject is being vindicated by events and sooner or later it will be accepted by the country. If the democratic leaders would only show a little moral courage and challenge the republicans to defend the moral principles involved in their policies we would soon have the republicans on the defensive. Instead of being a source of strength to our nation the Philippines are a source of weakness. They would be subject to attack immediately if we became involved in a foreign war and the natives would rise up against our carpet-bag government. Heretofore we have been invincible and have been saved the expense of a large army and navy. Now we are immensely weakened notwithstanding an increased army and navy expenditure of nearly one hundred millions a year.

Can this criminal and costly folly continue longer?

REORGANIZERS UNFOLD THEIR PLANS

The *Detroit Free Press* in its issue of March 2 publishes the following editorial under the title, "A Decent Candidate":

"The *Wall Street Journal* prints what purports to be a correct description of Mr. Cleveland's attitude in the national campaign. It says:

"We are in a position to state two things with respect to Mr. Cleveland and the presidency.

"The first is that his determination not to be a candidate is unalterable and fixed against any and all contingencies that may be imagined.

"The second thing is that Mr. Cleveland has very slight expectations of the democratic party nominating what might be called a "decent" candidate for the presidency this year, and he has expressed to friends his opinion that in the circumstances and failing a "decent" democratic candidate the re-

election of President Roosevelt is the best possible thing for the country.'

"No great gift of credulity is required to believe that the *Wall Street Journal* has accurately defined Mr. Cleveland's position. It is the attitude, we think, of nearly all the conservative, old-fashioned democrats of the country. They would like to see their party nominate a 'decent' candidate for president. By that they mean a man whom they can support without insulting their intelligence or sacrificing their self-respect. By the term 'decent candidate,' they exclude both the scheming politician whose conservatism is assumed to suit his purposes, as well as the honest, but misguided political fanatic who thinks a party platform is a bed of Procrustes. If the party could be induced to name an honest, respectable, intelligent, sane candidate, they would like to vote for him. Otherwise, they will support Theodore Roosevelt as they supported William McKinley. Many of them are far more reluctant to vote for Mr. Roosevelt than they were to vote for his predecessor. Some of his aggressive, pushing policies are decidedly unpalatable; but as between Theodore Roosevelt and populism, they are for Theodore Roosevelt."

This editorial is reproduced because it illustrates the rule or ruin policy of those who, having twice contributed to the party's defeat, are now determined to republicanize it or again cast their influence against it. Whether Mr. Cleveland's attitude is correctly set forth by the *Wall Street Journal* is not so material, although the *Free Press* accepts it as authentic, but what is most significant is that the *Free Press* should indorse the views attributed to the ex-president and justify "the old-fashioned, conservative democrats" in supporting the republican ticket if they cannot control the nomination. This far in advance of the convention, when no one can say who will be nominated or what the platform will contain, the party is informed by the bolters that they will dominate the party or, if they fail in that, destroy it if they can.

This is Clevelandism and it is strange that true and loyal democrats can be deceived by the harmony talk indulged in by those who are not so frank as the editor of the *Free Press*.

With all the impudence and insolence of the managers of the Nick Biddle bank the present gold worshipping democrats assume to offer victory to the party as a reward for the be-

trayal of the public, and some weak-kneed democrats, who lack the spirit of Jackson, seem ready to make a bargain. Such a contract, even if the financiers were able to guarantee the victory, would disgrace the party. What reason is there for a democratic party if not to perpetuate a government of the people, by the people, and for the people? There can be no real harmony between the plutocratic and the democratic elements in the democratic party. There is no basis for compromise; they are going in opposite directions. Mr. Cleveland selected his officials from the minority element in his party and delivered the organization over to Wall street. When the voters of the party protested and by an honest and democratic trial of strength at the primaries repudiated the administration, the president and all the salaried officials whom he could coerce went over to the republican party. For nearly eight years the party has been trying to conciliate deserters and coax them to return. The party has been pandering to the plutocratic element, and that element has grown in arrogance. Now let it "pander to the moral sense of the country," as some one has aptly put it. Let it make up its mind to alienate now and forever every champion of special privileges, every defender of organized wealth, and every beneficiary of corporate greed; let it appeal to the conscience of the country and appeal with a sincerity and a consistency that will win to the party the lovers of liberty, the friends of honest government and the champions of human rights. All that the reorganizers can offer are crooked methods, a corruption fund with which to further debauch politics and a praise that would blight rather than bless the party. The *Free Press* editorial, by its brutal frankness, ought to strengthen the party for the great struggle now before it—a struggle which is to determine whether the party is to deserve success, and succeeding, is to realize the hopes of the masses.

THE DUTY OF DEMOCRATS

The decision in the merger case imposes a duty on democrats as well as upon the administration. The anti-trust law is

held to be sound and effective, but it must be enforced before it can bring relief to the public. The democrats must now insist upon the enforcement of the law. Justice Holmes in his dissenting opinion says that indictments "logically ought to follow the decision," and the democrats in congress ought to insist that the attorney general either prosecute or explain why rich and powerful violators of the law are given immunity while poor and obscure violators are promptly punished. Not only should the law be enforced against those who violated it in the merger case, but it should be enforced against those who are violating it in the almost innumerable trusts. Are not the steel trust, the coal trust, the oil trust, the beef trust, the salt trust, the sugar trust, the cracker trust, the tobacco trust, the whisky trust, the harvester trust, etc.—are not all of these violating the Sherman anti-trust law? Why are they permitted to live and prey upon the country? The democrats should press this question. If the administration answers that the decision does not reach a single corporation, but only a combination of corporations, the democrats should insist upon new legislation covering all private monopolies, whether they operate as a single corporation or as a group of corporations. The Kansas City platform presents a remedy and the merger decision vindicates the principle involved in that remedy.

Congress has power over interstate commerce and that power alone can deal effectively with the trusts. As long as a corporation confines itself to the state from which it derives its charter the people of that state can be trusted to deal with it, but when it crosses the state line and invades interstate commerce it comes under the supervision of congress. Congress has made it a criminal offense for two or more persons to conspire to restrain trade. This ought to cover conspiracy by persons in one corporation as well as conspiracy by persons in control of separate corporations. If it does not do so, it is easy to prepare a bill that will. The Kansas City platform proposes a measure making it unlawful for a state corporation to engage in interstate commerce without first securing a federal license or permit, and it proposes that the license or permit shall be granted only after proof that the stock of the corpor-

ation is not watered and that the corporation is not trying to monopolize any branch of business or the production or sale of any article of merchandise. Here is a simple remedy; a remedy easily applied. It does not interfere with any legitimate corporation, but, on the contrary, aids every legitimate corporation by destroying the greedy and conscienceless monopolies.

If the democrats expect to win the confidence of the people they must propose an effective remedy. It is not sufficient to rail at republicans or to ask them for a remedy. The people are looking for relief and they demand positive, aggressive action. The trust question can be made an important issue in the coming campaign if the democrats will do their duty. Let them call the attention of the country to the question by refusing to consider anything else until satisfactory action is taken. If the republicans are required to bring in a rule for every measure and are each time reminded that the trusts still live, they will be forced to decisive action or to abject apology. Cato, after visiting Carthage, resolved never to make a speech without declaring it as his opinion that Carthage should be destroyed. The democrats in the senate and house might well paraphrase Cato's famous saying and each day demand a vote on a resolution declaring that "private monopolies must be destroyed." The Kansas City platform points the way—will the democrats live up to that platform or run from it?

EMPLOYER AND EMPLOYEE

The Employers' Association is busily engaged combatting the reasonable request of the laboring men for legislation which will give them an eight-hour day, arbitration of differences and relief from the menace of government by injunction.

Do the members of the Employers' Association know what they are doing? Have they counted the cost? Are they willing to establish a gulf of ill-will between themselves and their employes? The natural and necessary effect of the fight now being made by the employers against the wage-earners is to

convert hopefulness and ambition into sullenness and discouragement. The employes have wives and children—usually more children per family than the employers—and these men are interested in the welfare of their families and in the welfare of their country. They have been asking for an eight-hour day in order that they may have more time for physical recuperation, more time for intercourse with their families and more time to devote to their own intellectual development and the study of the problems of government. Is not their effort a laudable one? Can it be consistently opposed by men who are able to care for their families much better and to spend much more time with their families. To say that some workmen would spend their idle hours in a saloon is no answer to the argument in favor of shorter hours. With shorter hours will come movements for the improvement of the wage-earners—movements that are impossible so long as men are driven from bed to work and from work back to bed again. Some sons who inherit money from their parents not only squander it, but are injured by it—will the Employers' Association for that reason attempt to repeal the statute of inheritance?

The laboring men want arbitration of the differences between themselves and their corporate employers. Can the employers afford to oppose this? As well advocate a return to the wager of battle as a means of settling disputes between individuals as to argue that differences between great corporations and their employes can be settled only by strikes, lock-outs and boycotts. When the employer was an individual, had a few employes and worked with his men, there were personal acquaintance and mutual sympathy, but now the man at the head of the corporation does not know many of the employes, does not come into contact with them or know how they live. Often large salaries are to be provided for and generally there are dividends to be paid on watered stock. "Good times" are worked for all they are worth and sometimes the employe is expected to bear the brunt of hard times. The law must supply through a board of arbitration the element of justice which is now wanting. Employers ask, Have we not a right to control our own property? Certainly, so long as

they attempt to control nothing else, but when in controlling their own property they also seek to control the lives and liberty of their employes, they subordinate human rights to what they call property rights and this is as dangerous to their own descendants as to the descendants of those who work for them. No method has yet been devised for insuring the employers' children against the possibility of being among the wage-earners of the next generation. No person, or class, therefore, can afford to legislate for a year or even for a generation or to place its immediate advantage above the permanent good of society, and the employers do this when they object to arbitration.

The laboring men are seeking relief from government by injunction. Why? Because it is employed by corporations to deprive their employes of the right of trial by jury. If a man is accused of larceny or assault he is entitled to trial by jury, why should this right be denied a laboring man when he is accused of interfering with his employer's business? It is not sufficient to say that he should not interfere, for the question of fact whether he is interfering is the very thing that the jury should determine.

Neither is it sufficient to say that laboring men, organized or unorganized, make mistakes and sometimes grievously wrong their employers and even each other. To err is human, and the laboring man is human, but let the law fix a limit to his activities and forbid anything that is inimical to the public welfare. Then if a laboring man violates the law, let him be tried like any one else accused of crime, for certainly a man who earns his bread in the sweat of his brow is entitled to every presumption that is given to the confirmed criminal.

The employers have started out on a crusade against labor, ostensibly against organized labor, but really against all labor, for the members of the association are no more willing to safeguard the interests of non-union labor than they are to safeguard the interests of union men, whereas the work done by the members of labor unions has benefited all laboring men, those outside as well as those inside of the labor organizations.

Some employers, smarting under some particular grievance

or supposed grievance, have joined the Employers' Association without fully considering the nature of the movement or the consequences. Those who really sympathize with the masses, but have been misled, will soon become aware of the perils of the course upon which the association has entered and will withdraw. They cannot long remain ignorant of the uncharitable spirit of those who are at the head of the organization.

The laboring men need the capitalist, but the capitalist needs the laboring men also. "Captains of industry," with a genius for organization, are needed, but a captain cannot do anything without the aid of sergeants, corporals and privates. There ought to be confidence and sympathy between employers and employes, and this is impossible without a feeling of brotherly love and an ungrudging recognition by each of the rights of the other. The employers are sowing dragon's teeth when they combine to crush the aspirations of employes who, in peace or war, contribute so largely to the nation's wealth and strength. An association for the bringing of labor and capital together would prove far more beneficent than an association formed to resist the just efforts of laboring men to advance their physical, mental and moral welfare.

REORGANIZER DOCTRINE

The *New York Times* is one of those newspapers that pretend to be vigorously opposed to the democratic platform of 1900, because of the plank relating to bimetallism. It will be found, however, in the case of the *Times*, as in the case of other representatives of the reorganizing element, that it is the spirit of the Kansas City platform to which it objects; that it objects just as vigorously to any plank looking toward the curtailment of the privileges of the representatives of special interests as it does to the plank relating to bimetallism.

For instance, the *New York Times* was the first newspaper in the United States to give cordial approval to the Foraker bill. That bill practically nullifies the Sherman anti-trust law, repeals the criminal clause of that law, and in other ways

cripples anti-monopoly legislation. The *Times* says that the Foraker bill "probably marks the termination of a period of strained relations and bad humor between Wall street and the White house which has brought audible discord into the councils of the republican party and been the cause of harrowing anxieties to the president and his friends. Wall street is republican—and by Wall street we mean the great corporation interests of the country, wherever they may carry on their business."

The *Times* says that congress ought to adopt the Foraker bill without delay. Referring to the Sherman anti-trust law, the *Times* says:

"It therefore behooves congress, if it has a due regard for the public welfare, to amend out of this ill-considered and mischievous act of 1890, its disturbing and pernicious qualities. Senator Foraker's amendment declares that nothing in the interstate commerce act or in the anti-trust act 'shall hereafter apply to foreign commerce or prohibit any act or contract in restraint of trade among the several states, if such restraint be reasonable;' and that forfeiture of property or imprisonment shall not be among the penalties imposed for violations. The courts will be left to decide what restraints are unreasonable.

"The passage of this amendment in advance of the decision in the Northern Securities case would put the business interests of the country in a position to await the court's action with less anxiety."

When one sees how readily the reorganizing democrat and the republican politician can get together upon legislation which men generally regard as iniquitous, is it any wonder that the platforms proposed for the democratic convention by these reorganizers are so similar to the republican platform that if adopted by the democrats that party would differ from the republican party in name only.

THE MERGER DECISION

Justice Harlan, speaking for a majority of the United States supreme court, has sustained, in the most emphatic language,

the circuit court decision against the Northern Securities railway merger. The opinion delivered by Justice Harlan covers all phases of the case and announces the doctrine that any combination tending to restrain commerce between the states or with foreign nations is unlawful. According to Justice Harlan's decision, it is not necessary to show that the restraint is complete. When the natural effect of an agreement is to prevent competition, the agreement is in restraint of trade and prohibited by law. To prove that a combination or monopoly exists within the meaning of the law, it is not necessary to show that the immediate effect is to suppress competition or establish a monopoly. It is sufficient to show that they tend to bring about these results.

Justice Harlan very clearly shows that the opinion of the court does not interfere with the rights of the states and that no other power than the federal is competent to deal with interstate trusts. On this point Justice Harlan says:

"Is there, then, any escape from the conclusion that, subject to such limitations, the power of congress over interstate and international commerce is as full and complete as is the power of any state over its domestic commerce? If a state may strike down combinations that restrain its domestic commerce by destroying free competition among those engaged in such commerce, what power, except that of congress, is competent to protect the freedom of interstate and international commerce when assailed by a combination that restrains such commerce by stifling competition among those engaged in it?"

Referring to the contention that interference by the federal government with the affairs of a state corporation would be an invasion of the rights of the state, under which the company was chartered, Justice Harlan said:

"We reject any such view of the relations of the national government and the states composing the union. It cannot be given effect without destroying the just authority of the United States. Every corporation created by a state is necessarily subject to the supreme law of the land. And yet the suggestion is made that to restrain a state corporation from interfering with the free course of trade and commerce among the states, in violation of an act of congress, is hostile to the reserved rights of the states.

"The federal court may not have power to forfeit the charter of the securities company; it may not declare how its

shares of stock may be transferred on its books, nor prohibit it from acquiring real estate nor diminish or increase its capital stock. All these and like matters are to be regulated by the state which created the company. But to the end that effect be given to the national will, as lawfully expressed by congress, it may prevent that company, in its capacity as a holding corporation and trustee, from carrying out the purposes of a combination formed in restraint of interstate commerce."

It is particularly important to observe that Justice Harlan leaves no ground for the violators of the anti-trust law to stand upon. Evidently, in his opinion, lawlessness is lawlessness and there can be no such thing as a "reasonable" violation of the law.

Justice Harlan said that whether the free operation of the normal laws of competition is a wise and wholesome rule for trade and commerce is an economic question which the court need not consider or determine; but he adds:

"Many persons, we may judicially know, of wisdom, experience and learning believe that such a rule is more necessary in these days of enormous wealth than it ever was in any former period of our history; indeed, that the time has come when the public needs to be protected against the exactions of corporations wielding the power which attends the possession of unlimited capital."

He pointed out that the law declares to be illegal "every contract, combination or conspiracy, in whatever form, of whatever nature, and whoever make the parties to it, which directly or necessarily operates in restraint of trade or commerce among the several states, or with foreign nations."

The following extracts from Justice Harlan's opinions on this point will be of interest:

"That the act is not limited to restraints of interstate and international trade or commerce that are unreasonable in their nature, but is directed against all direct restraints, reasonable or unreasonable, imposed by any combination, conspiracy or monopoly upon such trade or commerce.

"That railroad carriers engaged in interstate or international trade or commerce are embraced by the act.

"That combinations even among private manufacturers or dealers whereby interstate or international commerce is restrained are equally embraced by the act.

"That congress has the power to establish rules by which interstate and international commerce shall be governed, and by the anti-trust act has prescribed the rule of free competition among those engaged in such commerce.

"That every combination or conspiracy which would extinguish competition between otherwise competing railroads engaged in interstate trade or commerce, and which would in that way restrain such trade or commerce is made illegal by the act.

"That the natural effect of competition is to increase commerce, and an agreement whose direct effect is to prevent this play of competition, restrains instead of promotes trade and commerce.

"That to vitiate a combination, such as the act of congress condemns, it need not be shown that such combination, in fact, results or will result in a total suppression of trade or in a complete monopoly, but it is only essential to show that by its necessary operation it tends to restrain interstate or international trade or commerce or tends to create a monopoly in such trade or commerce and to deprive the public of the advantages that flow from free competition."

The opinion of the court as delivered by Justice Harlan is the most striking arraignment of the trust system that has ever been made in the history of this country. In effect, it holds with the democratic national platform that "private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable."

The only weak point in the attitude of the majority is in the opinion delivered by Justice Brewer. While agreeing with Justice Harlan and his associates in the conclusion reached in this particular case, Justice Brewer discriminates between reasonable and unreasonable restraint of trade. Justice Brewer holds that the purpose of the lawmakers "was to aid a statutory prohibition with prescribed penalties and remedies to nullify those contracts which were in direct restraint of trade, unreasonable and against public policy."

Justice Brewer intimated that he held with the majority because he looked upon the Northern Securities merger as "an unreasonable combination in restraint of interstate commerce—one in conflict with state law and within the letter and spirit of the statute and the power of congress." But, Justice Brewer

said that some of the recent decisions of the supreme court in the anti-trust cases had gone too far, and he added:

“Instead of holding that the anti-trust act included all contracts, reasonable or unreasonable, in restraint of interstate trade, the ruling should have been that the contracts there presented were in themselves unreasonable restraints of interstate trade, and therefore within the scope of the act. Congress did not intend by that act to reach and destroy those minor contracts in partial restraint of trade which the long course of decisions at common law had affirmed were reasonable and ought to be upheld.”

It will be seen, therefore, that while Justice Brewer concurred in the judgment of the court in this particular case, he is distinctly at variance with Justice Harlan and his associates in the clear and striking interpretation they put upon the law. Should Justice Brewer's theory prevail the entire question as to what the law prohibited would be left to the court and would be determined by an inquiry into the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the violation; and so, while this decision is of the greatest importance, we may find in the next case Justice Brewer joining the four justices who took their stand on the side of the trust system, and holding that the restraint is “reasonable” and therefore lawful.

Aside from this particular consideration, large significance attaches to Justice Brewer's opinion. The Brewer theory relates to the Foraker bill recently introduced in the senate.

The dissenting opinion of Justice Holmes is, in at least one particular, of great importance. Justice Holmes said that, logically construed, the decision should be followed by the criminal prosecution of the parties at interest. That is quite true and it remains to be seen whether the administration will avail itself of the powerful weapon within its reach. It may be said, however, that there is no likelihood that criminal prosecution will follow in any case. On the contrary, republican newspapers, speaking evidently with authority, say that it is not the purpose of the administration to proceed against other trusts or in any wise engage in an anti-trust crusade.

Emphasis has been laid upon the fact that of the four justices who dissented from the opinion of the majority of the

court, three are democrats. These are Chief Justice Fuller, Justice White and Justice Beckham. Democrats may not fairly be held responsible for the attitude of these three justices. They were appointed by Mr. Cleveland and evidently reflect the sentiments of the Cleveland element. It is fair to say that the attitude taken with respect to the trust question by these Cleveland appointees would be reflected in any administration controlled by the Cleveland wing.

G. O. P. DICTATION

The *Pittsburg Post*, which used to be quite a reliable democratic paper, has fallen so far as to quote with approval the platform suggestions made by the *Nashville Banner*, a republican sheet. The two suggestions quoted are that the democratic platform should "demand the greatest freedom of the inhabitants of our new possessions," and "urge the enactment of laws to suppress those combinations of capital which bear heavily upon the people, without endangering the stability of other combinations which are proving beneficial."

The *Post* says that the *Banner* "has clear ideas of what the democrats should do," and it adds: "They embody the common sense of the party." If the reader will examine these suggestions covering the two issues most discussed in 1900 (and they have nothing to do with the money question) he will find that a republican convention could adopt both planks with consistency and enthusiasm. On the question of imperialism the *Banner* and *Post* would accept a colonial system as a permanent policy and promise to treat the Filipinos well. On the trust question the *Banner* and *Post* plank is as indefinite as any republican convention could ask. Any trust magnate would be willing to advocate such a plank if he was allowed to name the president who would construe it. The *Post* refers to "dead and gone issues." Is imperialism, the paramount issue of 1900, dead and gone? And is the trust fight merely a sham battle? Of course, the *Banner* wants a republican plat-

form, but why does the *Post* accept it as a guide and indorse its suggestions? Whenever a democratic paper shies at the Kansas City platform it is sure to get over onto republican ground. The more these papers indulge in platform suggestions the more sure they are to display their leanings toward republican policies and the more inclined they are to accept republican dictation. It is useless for the *Post* to rail at Roosevelt and tear its hair over the trusts if it is satisfied with a platform that Morgan and Rockefeller could stand on.

COTTON KING SULLY FAILS

The failure of "Cotton King" Daniel J. Sully furnishes another illustration of the uncertainty that hedges about a speculative career. Mr. Sully was more than usually successful, phenomenally so, in fact. He became the most conspicuous cotton operator in the world and was supposed to have made a large amount of money—but all at once he suspends. If he, with his wide knowledge of the subject and his power to influence the markets, could not succeed, how can the curb-stone brokers and penny speculators hope to win? The story of Sully's spectacular career has lured thousands and tens of thousands into gambling in cotton futures—will his failure be a warning to as many?

It is a sad commentary on American morals that it is necessary to make against gambling the argument that it does not pay. That it is not right should be a sufficient reason and will be when young men learn that character and manhood are of more value than money and that real success is measured by one's contribution to the welfare of the world rather than by the amount of the world's wealth that he absorbs.

Would it not be well to prohibit gambling in stocks and farm products?

FORWARD, MARCH!

How will the democratic party meet the present issues? Or, rather, how will the democratic party meet the present

issue, for there is in reality but one issue, and that issue runs through all questions? The great and overshadowing question presented by all the issues discussed is, Shall the corporations or the people control the government of the United States? Today the corporations are in absolute control. Even when the supreme court decides that the government has power to destroy the trusts the attorney general rushes forward and assures the combinations that the administration has no intention of disturbing them. The rule of these corporations is unlimited and complete. The president refuses to enforce the law as it stands, and the republican congress refuses to enact new legislation. The government is being used for the enrichment of the few at the expense of the many, officials are making money by the sale of their influence, and corruption is rampant in city, state and nation. The public conscience has been stupified by commercialism until the grossest offenses against liberty and good government do not awaken the protest that ought to be made against even trivial departures from the path of rectitude. The government is used as a business asset by those who can control it and enormous campaign funds are contributed by the financiers of class legislation and distributed as bribes to the people. Republicans as well as democrats recognize the menace of such a condition, but when confronted with the acts of their own party, make but one reply: "But will the democratic party, if entrusted with power do any better?" And to give force and reasonableness to their inquiry, they point to the administration of Grover Cleveland. Whenever an attack is made upon republican wrong-doing, there is always a response from some republican, and that response is always the same: "You had your chance under Cleveland and you did the same." It is vain to point out the inconsistency of such an answer, vain to point out that the republicans rather than the democrats ought to shoulder the responsibility for Mr. Cleveland's administration. To the ordinary republican Cleveland stands for democracy—because he is the only democratic president we have had. They overlook the fact that his assistance gave the country a republican administration that followed in his foot-

steps as he followed in the footsteps of his republican predecessors.

Secretary Shaw, in a recent speech, emphasized the fact that Mr. Cleveland did nothing on the trust question. That is no justification of the inaction of the present administration, but it is a taking reply and imposes upon the democratic party the necessity of making democracy mean something entirely different from either Clevelandism or republicanism. The fact that the great dailies which bolted in 1896, but which still claim to be democratic, present Cleveland and Clevelandism as representing democratic principles and democratic aspirations, is a great embarrassment. It remains for the convention to show, as it has twice before, that these papers controlled by the influence that controls the republican party, do not speak for the democratic masses.

Just now the republicans are making merry over the merger decision, but what is there in it to cause exultation among republicans? Why does not the president enforce the law if the law is good? Why are the numerous great trusts allowed to continue business? If the governor of a state enforced the law against one horse thief in ten or twenty or one hundred, could he excuse himself for not enforcing it against the other nine or nineteen or ninety-nine? The reason for the republican inaction is plain to be seen. The party receives campaign contributions from trusts. Trust officials and financiers lend to the republican leaders their power to coerce employes and to intimidate borrowers. Will the democratic party imitate republican methods and invite confidence only to betray it, or will it take a firm and strong stand against the commercialism of the day and make a resolute attempt to restore the government to its old foundations and to purify politics? The democratic party has two paths before it. It can follow the republican party upon the downward path or it can take the path leading to higher ground. In the last two campaigns the party has made a strenuous fight for higher ideals, but its way has been obstructed and made hard by the perfidy of men once high in the party's councils and by the betrayal of men of whom it had a right to expect nought but fidelity. It must

continue its struggle or forfeit its claim upon the conscience of the country. There is every inducement to a righteous course. It cannot only secure to its members the satisfaction that comes from noble effort, but it can lay the foundation for permanent and overwhelming success. Indications point with increasing clearness to the control of the next national convention by the democratic democrats of the party, but to make the certainty sure, every believer in democratic principles, every fearless exponent of the rights of the people, ought to work incessantly until the convention meets. This is no time for over-confidence or idleness. If the party would realize the hopes of its founders and prove an effective instrument for the improvement of government and the betterment of political conditions, the order must be no compromise, concession or surrender, but forward, march!

WHY NOT OWN THEM?

Secretary Taft has appeared before the insular committee of the house and made an argument in favor of the proposition to give the projected Philippine railroads a guarantee of 4 or 5 per cent on the investment. He thinks that a land grant would not attract capital, but that the guaranty of dividends would. Will Secretary Taft favor the plan adopted in France twenty-five years ago? There the government guaranteed a certain dividend and a certain contribution to the sinking fund, but at the end of a fifty-year term the government is to own the roads. If the government, representing the people, is to take all the risk, why not secure to the people the enjoyment of the benefits? Where is our boasted progress in the science of government if we do not protect the rights of the people as carefully today as the French government did the rights of the French people a quarter of a century ago? If railroads are demanded in the Philippines and private capital will not build the roads, it would be better for the government to build them and give the public the benefit. Far better to do this

than to pledge the revenues to private corporations with no compensation in return. If the Philippine commission guarantees dividends, this guaranty will be made an excuse for continued possession to "protect vested rights." If, however, the government builds the roads for the people, they will belong to the people when the Filipinos are given independence.

Secretary Taft seems to be quite thoroughly saturated with the idea that the main purpose of government is to look after capital and to offer it such tempting advantage as to overcome its proverbial timidity. He would build society from the top, on the theory that the capitalists will take care of the people if the government will only take care of the capitalists.

PARKER NOT AVAILABLE

Mr. Cleveland's nomination is out of the question, although he is the first choice of the plutocratic element in the democratic party. Mr. Olney has removed himself by his advocacy of Mr. Cleveland's nomination, and Mr. Gorman's chances seem reduced to a minus quantity by his failure to secure the co-operation of the democratic senators in his position on the Panama question. Mr. Hill is not a possibility, but he has taken up the candidacy of Judge Parker in the hope of making himself the "power behind the throne." As some of the democrats are considering Judge Parker as a "harmony" candidate it is important that the real nature of his candidacy should be examined. He is first of all Mr. Hill's candidate, and that in itself would be sufficient to raise a suspicion in regard to his position on public questions. The Hon. David B. has a legislative record that enables us to easily ascertain his position on public questions—a record so antagonistic to the democratic party that he refused to give any open support to the ticket in 1896, and did not even disclose, until some two years after the election, how he voted. In a letter written shortly before the election he told a New York republican that he had not decided what he would do, concluding with the statement, "I am a democrat still—very still."

Mr. Hill has made himself the champion of Mr. Parker in New York, and it is not likely that he would do this without having an understanding with Mr. Parker as to his own position with the administration. It can be safely taken for granted that in case of Judge Parker's nomination and election Mr. Hill would be the controlling figure in the administration, and that would mean that those who attempted to reach the White house would have to wade through peanut shells knee deep.

Mr. Hill stands for everything bad that Mr. Cleveland stands for, and lacks the brutal frankness that has given Mr. Cleveland most of his popularity. But Mr. Hill's support, dangerous as it is, is not so detrimental to Judge Parker as the corporate support, which is gradually gathering about him. The *Washington Post* recently described the situation as follows:

"In the meantime, Parker stock has been having a little boom. It is now almost generally conceded by democrats here in Washington that he is the most likely candidate. Many matters have taken shape to help him, although the attitude of the New York democrats still worries the party leaders. Judge Parker—so it is learned here from men who are in close touch with the thought of the financial and business world—has, through appropriate channels, given assurances that if nominated and elected president, his administration will be conservative. He will see to it that the large interests are fairly treated. This campaign of enlightenment from Judge Parker is described as progressing methodically, but with dignity. The judge's attitude on many of the questions before the public are not well known, but, none the less, business men in high places are being acquainted authentically with his views in outline.

"The criticism of the magnates against Judge Parker has been that he had not been tested. They could not tell what he might do should they turn out and seek by heroic efforts to place him in the White house. Should their efforts succeed, he might not, after all, be able to conduct 'a safe administration.' But there is distinctly a better feeling in business quarters toward him."

There is no doubt that the corporate interests have an understanding with Judge Parker, for without such an understanding they would not think of supporting him. The de-

cision in the merger case shows how important it is that the president should be in sympathy with the people rather than in sympathy with the corporations. The three judges appointed by Mr. Cleveland dissented from the opinion of the court, and as Judge Holmes stood with them, it would only require one more judge to change the decision, even if Judge Brewer's separate opinion does not already indicate the probability of an adverse decision in another case.

If Judge Parker were nominated by the influence of the corporations and elected with the aid of their contributions, is there any doubt that his appointees would be corporation men? Can the democratic party afford to lend itself to a movement to so make up the supreme court as to nullify the efforts of the people at reform? To secure remedial legislation the people must have not only the house, the senate, the president, but the supreme court also, and as the members of the supreme court hold office for life, that department of the government is hardest to change. As president, Judge Parker might appoint one, two, or even three supreme justices, and his appointments might bar the way to relief for ten or fifteen years. Can the party afford to take such a chance. Judge Parker has been before the country as a candidate for a year, and in all that time he has never expressed himself upon a single public question or indicated his views on a single issue. Can we afford to nominate a question mark? If so, we need not be surprised if the voters indulge in exclamations.

Democracy's contest with plutocracy is not a sham battle or a make-believe fight. It is a terribly earnest struggle, and the decision in the merger case has pointed out with great distinctness the possible result of a mistake in the selection of a candidate. There are hundreds of democrats whose sympathies are with the masses of the people and whose opinions are known—men who have had more experience in political life than Judge Parker, and who would poll more votes on election day. Some of these men have been mentioned; others have not. Surely among those who have been proposed or might be proposed it is possible to find someone who will give

voice to the democratic conscience, and lead a charge against the cohorts of organized and predatory wealth.

The republican party is controlled by the corporations; it is dominated by the trust magnates and financiers. The president has signally failed to enforce the criminal section of the anti-trust law, and his attorney general hastens to allay any fears that the merger decision might have excited. The president will have the support of Wall street unless the democratic party nominates a man nearer to the corporations than he is. Could the democratic party afford to get between the republican party and the trusts, even if it were possible to do so? If Mr. Parker were a man with a record, if his convictions were known and his position on public issues clearly defined, Mr. Hill's championship of his cause might not be sufficient to entirely destroy his availability, but with his opinions unknown and his aspirations in the hands of Mr. Hill, it is not unfair to regard Mr. Hill as the keeper of his conscience, and who is so poorly qualified to keep any one's conscience?

The fact that Mr. Parker is an enigma ought to remove him from consideration, and the situation is made still worse by the blight of Mr. Hill's support. When to this is added the overshadowing danger which the merger decision has pointed out, is it not time that the honest, earnest, loyal democrats awake from their lethargy, lay aside the thought of compromise, and begin an aggressive campaign to save the democratic party from the menace of corporate control?

If Mr. Parker is nominated it must not be as a "harmony candidate"—it must be with the knowledge that he represents the same element, the same influence and the same methods which during Mr. Cleveland's second administration led the democratic party through "the valley of the shadow of death."

KANSAS IS IN LINE

The democratic state convention of Kansas, recently held, came out with a ringing indorsement of the platforms of 1896 and 1900 and demanded the nomination of candidates in sympathy with those platforms. Good for Kansas! The reorgan-

izers can find no comfort in that state. An indorsement of the Kansas City platform would have been sufficient, for that platform contains an indorsement of the Chicago platform, but the Kansas convention indorsed both. In its courageous maintenance of democratic principles the Kansas convention has set an example that other states may well follow. If the same spirit pervades the St. Louis convention we shall have an aggressive campaign in which the republicans will be upon the defensive all along the line.

While Mr. Bryan appreciates the complimentary reference made to him by the Kansas convention, he does not desire to have the harmony of any democratic convention disturbed by a resolution commendatory of him. He is not a candidate for anything, and it matters little what any convention thinks of him, but it does matter a great deal what a convention thinks of democratic principles.

THE OFFICEHOLDER'S OPINION

A press dispatch from St. Louis says that "Judge L. R. Wilfley, attorney general for the Philippines," returned to his home recently, and then he is quoted as saying:

"The government of the islands or the question of possession or autonomy should not be an issue in the coming presidential campaign. I believe that the islanders should be allowed to reach, under the present form of government, a position which would qualify them for self-government. I believe that the idea advanced by many of our prominent and conscientious public men—President Eliot of Harvard, for instance—that the islands should be made free, as Cuba is, should not receive recognition in the platforms of the parties.

"The question is not, shall we keep the islands? It is, how shall we best govern them? It is not, did we do right in taking them? It is, what is the best way to uplift them? The Philippines have no place in partisan politics."

It is not strange that those who find a profit in governing the Philippine islands are opposed to giving independence to the people, but why are they unwilling to make the matter an issue and submit it to the judgment of the people? In 1900 the republicans denied that they intended imperialism; they

denounced us in unmeasured terms because we accused them of contemplating imperialistic plans and methods. Even after the election of 1900 President McKinley declared that there was no thought of imperialism in the American mind. During the campaign people were told that we could not negotiate with men in arms; that the Filipinos must lay down their weapons and submit to our authority, and that then we could discuss the future with them. But as soon as they were overcome by force and strategy, they were told that there was no question to consider, that the question had been settled. Ex-Secretary Long declared the same thing in a speech in Massachusetts, and now a returning office-holder tells us that it is not a question whether we shall keep the islands, but how we shall best govern them. That is exactly the attitude of George III. during the days of the revolution. He refused to consider the question of letting the colonies go, and that, too, upon the same grounds that the republican leaders refuse to let the Philippine islands go. George III. denied that the people were entitled to self-government or capable of it—that is the position of the republicans today, and they confess the weakness of their position when they declare that it is not an issue.

The question of imperialism has never been passed upon by the American people. Will the republicans deny that the people have a right to decide so important a question? If imperialism is right, why do the republicans run from it? If they believe that their policy is defensible, let them write in their platform a plank declaring that they favor a colonial policy in which the Filipinos shall be governed by an outside force, taxed without representation and ruled without their consent. But no, they will do as they did in 1900—deceive the people, dodge real issues, and shout “prosperity,” while the corporations continue to plunder the people in return for campaign funds.

COMMERCIALISM IN THE CHURCH

The *New Haven Palladium* publishes a sermon recently delivered by the Rev. Dr. Ralls of that city which shows how the

commercial spirit is invading even the church, and casting its shadow over religious institutions. The following quotation from the sermon presents the facts as related by the minister:

“Let us illustrate this. A few months ago I preached in this place a sermon against stealing. I pointed out some of its modern forms and showed that some things that passed for high finance were simply robbery on a large scale. I cited several instances. The report of the sermon came to one of these men, one of the most prominent of these modern financiers. He made his complaint to me in two letters. He denied nothing. He simply asserted two things. One was that I should have been silent, for the chief Christian virtue was charity. The other was this sentence: ‘Although I have given several million dollars to the churches, since your attack upon me I have decided to make no further contributions in that direction.’ Now that is what some men call the old, orthodox idea of the gospel. The gospel of Christ means the forgiveness of sins and charity for all. Let the preacher proclaim this and be silent on all else. Let the Morgans and Rockefellers and Schwabs float their watered stock, and then bring their gifts to church and college, and say, ‘We are delivered to do these things.’ Charity is not the chief Christian virtue, but love. And Christian love is no maudlin sentiment. It is the passion of the cross, clear of vision, loving men, hating iniquity, with eternal enmity for all evil. And it is that preaching of the cross applied to all life, rebuking sin and warning and inviting the sinner, condemning the wickedness of men and lifting up the broken-hearted—it is that that we need today. The dangerous heresy today is not a theory about the person of Christ, but the opinion that there is any part of life or of the world from which Christ may be shut out as the king and the rule of life.”

This incident shows how the trust magnates are attempting to coerce the church and its ministers. The Morgans, the Rockefellers and the Schwabs have silenced many a tongue that ought to be thundering against wickedness in high places and against larceny on a grand scale. It is fortunate that we still have many preachers who, like Dr. Ralls, will not be silenced, and who will speak out against the demoralizing and corrupting tendencies of present-day commercialism. The sanctimonious sinners who rob their neighbors all the week and then piously contribute a part of their plunder to the church, talk about old-fashioned religion much as Mr. Cleve-

land and Mr. Hill talk about old-fashioned democracy. Just as democracy is of no value except as it aims at justice in government and equity in legislation, so no religion is of any value that does not lead to virtuous living.

There is a great need today for more ministers who will stand up in their pulpits and apply Christianity to the everyday life of their members, and by so doing withdraw their membership from association with those who debauch elections, bribe legislators and corrupt government for the purpose of exploiting the people afterwards.

A PEOPLE'S VICTORY

On another page will be found a report of the decision recently handed down by the supreme court in the case brought before the interstate commerce commission by Congressman Hearst. Believing that the attorney general was not performing his duty in the prosecution of the coal trust, Mr. Hearst instituted proceedings at his own expense before the commission, but was blocked by the refusal of the railroads and coal officials to testify or to produce their books and the contracts under which they operated. The supreme court has with but one dissenting judge held that the witnesses must answer and produce books and contracts, and the way is now open to break up the combination. The decision is an important one, and Mr. Hearst deserves great credit for his part in forcing this step toward relief from the extortion practiced by the coal trust.

HELEN KELLER'S SERMON

Helen Keller has recently issued through Crowel & Co., of New York, a little book entitled "Optimism." Helen Keller, it will be remembered, is the blind and deaf girl whose wonderful progress has demonstrated how much can be accomplished by one who lacks both sight and hearing—the two avenues through which most of the information from the outside world

reaches us. The little book is really a sermon on Optimism, divided into three parts—Optimism Within, Optimism Without, and The Practice of Optimism. She administers to the pessimist this sound and wholesome rebuke: "Who shall dare let his incapacity for hope or goodness cast a shadow upon the courage of those who bear their burdens as if they were privileges?"

The lessons of hope and courage come with great force from one who might find more reason than most people for taking a gloomy view of life. One is better for having read what Helen Keller says, and those who are inclined to feel proud of the nation's conduct in the Philippine islands, will do well to read her comment on that subject. She refuses to accept colonialism as the settled policy of this country, and prefers to believe that better counsels will prevail than have been thus far followed. She says:

"I know the unhappy and unrighteous story of what has been done in the Philippines beneath our flag; but I believe that in the accidents of statecraft the best intelligence of the people sometimes fails to express itself. I read in the history of Julius Caesar that during the civil wars there were millions of peaceful herdsmen and laborers who worked as long as they could, and fled before the advance of the armies that were led by the few, then waited until the danger was past, and returned to repair damages with patient hands. So the people are patient and honest, while their rulers stumble. I rejoice to see in the world and in this country a new and better patriotism than that which seeks the life of any enemy. It is a patriotism higher than that of the battlefield. It moves thousands to lay down their lives in social service, and every life so laid down brings us a step nearer the time when cornfields shall no more be fields of battle. So when I heard of the cruel fighting in the Philippines, I did not despair, because I knew that the hearts of our people were not in that fight, and that some time the hand of the destroyer must be stayed."

AN APPALLING SHOWING

In his book entitled "The Truth About the Trusts," John Moody says that the grand total of all trusts, industrial, fran-

chise and transportation, is \$20,379,162,511. According to Mr. Moody, the seven great industrial trusts are the United States Steel corporation, the United States Tobacco company, the American Smelting & Refining company, the Amalgamated Copper company, the International Mercantile Marine, the American Sugar company, and the Standard Oil company. These seven companies control 1,528 plants and have an aggregate capitalization of \$2,662,752,100. Mr. Moody also names 298 lesser industrial trusts controlling 3,426 plants, and having a total capitalization outstanding of \$4,055,039,433. He likewise gives a list of 13 industrial trusts which are now in process of reorganization or readjustment.

These control 334 plants and have a total capitalization of \$528,551,000. These include the American Milling company, the Consolidated Lake Superior company, the Consolidated Rubber Tire company, the General Asphalt company, the International Fire Engine company, the International Salt company, the New England Cotton Yarn company, the Pacific Packing & Navigation company, the United States Cotton Duck corporation, the United States Realty and Construction company, the United States Shipbuilding company, the Virginia-Carolina Chemical company, and the White Mountain Paper company.

There are, therefore, 318 important industrial trusts in this country, controlling 5,288 plants, and having a total capitalization outstanding of \$7,246,342,533. The eight leading franchise trusts, according to Mr. Moody, are the American Bell Telephone company, the Western Union Telegraph company, the Commercial Cable company, the Federal Telephone company, the Consolidated Telephone company, the International Telephone company, the Interstate Telephone company, and the United Telephone & Telegraph company. These control 136 plants and have a total capitalization of \$629,700,500. There are also 103 leading gas, electric light and street railway consolidations, making a total of 111 important franchise trusts, controlling 1,326 plants, and having a total outstanding capitalization of \$3,735,456,075.

There are six great steam railroad groups, of which the

Morgan group, with a capitalization of \$2,265,116,350 is the largest, the others being the Vanderbilt group, \$1,169,196,132, the Pennsylvania group \$1,822,402,235, the Gould-Rockefeller group \$1,368,877,540, the Harriman, Kuhn, Loeb group \$1,321,243,711, and the Moore group \$1,070,250,939, making a total of \$9,017,086,907. There are also ten allied independent railroad systems having a capitalization of \$380,277,000.

Recounting these facts, the *Wall Street Journal* says:

"Inasmuch as the trusts and their regulation are now the leading subject of discussion in this country, and promise to be the chief issue of the presidential campaign, this summary of their number and financial strength is of interest and value. The total capitalization seems appalling; \$20,000,000,000 is one-fifth of the total wealth of the United States. It must be remembered, however, that this capitalization is nominal. It does not represent the actual market value of the stocks and bonds of these trusts. But even if an accurate estimate were made of the market value, the total would be so immense as to arrest the attention and command the thoughtful consideration of every student of economic conditions."

Then, as though to minimize this "appalling" showing, the *Journal* says it appears there is independent wealth in the country to the value of \$80,000,000,000 and that, therefore, the independent wealth of the United States as compared with the trust wealth is 4 to 1.

The *Journal* does not, however, seem to satisfy itself on this point, for it adds:

"But it should not be overlooked that the trust wealth is the most important in that it largely controls all the other wealth. The trusts are in control of the transportation facilities of the country. They are practically in control of its banking facilities, and they control its main industrial systems. Through control of the banks, the railroads, and the leading industrial companies, the directors of these trusts practically direct the business of the country, and when it is said that of the \$20,000,000,000 of trust capital in the United States, upwards of \$1,000,000,000 is held by one family, and that the greater amount is represented by a group of perhaps a dozen capitalists, one gets some conception of the immense power which is wielded in this country by a few capitalists."

The *Journal* makes a desperate effort to appear non-commit-

tal on this subject and it says: "Now, this may be considered either an element of strength or a source of danger, according to the point of view which one is disposed to take of the trust question." It disclaims any intention of entering into a discussion of the problem. Then like that famous North Carolina snake, it "wiggles in and wiggles out, leaving the watcher still in doubt, whether the snake that made the track is going in or coming back."

But however much this Wall Street publication may "wriggle in and wriggle out," the showing made by Mr. Moody and the facts admitted by the *Journal* itself ought to be sufficient to prompt intelligent men to serious thought.

When the *Journal* admits that the trusts own one-fifth of the wealth of the country and that in spite of the fact that four-fifths is called independent wealth, "it should not be overlooked that the trust wealth is the most important in that it largely controls all the other wealth"—when the *Journal* makes this statement every intelligent person must admit that the showing is, indeed, "appalling."

WHY NOT NOW?

The *New York World*, which seems to claim a lien on the Parker boom (subject only to the Hill and Belmont mortgages), says: "Judge Parker himself has determined to resign his judgeship as soon as he is nominated, and he will then, of course, give his views on all public questions."

But why wait until after he is nominated? Have not the democrats a right to know his views before he is nominated? Is the convention to bargain for "a pig in a poke," and with Hill the custodian of the poke? If it is not important that the democrats know the judge's views before he is nominated, why is it necessary to resign before the election? If it is right to surprise the democrats after the nomination, why deny to the people at large the pleasure of being surprised after the inauguration? If it is a delight to democrats to speculate

about the views of their candidate before they select him, why rob republicans of the delight they would find in speculating about the views of the democratic candidate during the campaign? As, according to the *World*, Judge Parker's views are to be divulged after the convention, why does it not offer to sell pools on the judge's views and turn the profits into the campaign fund?

If professional ethics prevent Judge Parker from expressing his views upon public questions he should either secure freedom of speech by resigning now or cease to be a candidate. The democrats are certainly not so blind as to think it wise to nominate "a veiled prophet," especially when the nomination is urged by men who are more concerned about "profits" than about "prophets."

NOT HARMONY BUT SURRENDER

Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Belmont and the financiers and politicians back of the Parker boom are the men who have in two campaigns contributed to the defeat of the democratic party, and they threaten to defeat it again if they are not allowed to control its policy. If the members of the democratic party desire to revolutionize the policy of the party and make it the tool of Wall street, they have a right to do so, but the reorganizers have no thought of submitting this question to the voters. They will not go before primaries and county conventions with a platform of principles. They rely upon "bosses" and "leaders" to hoodwink the people and secure delegates without any open avowal of the principles for which they stand.

This shows that the reorganizers are not only afraid to present their political views to the people, but it shows also that in trying to republicanize the doctrines of the party they expect to imitate republican methods as well. Under the pretense of desiring harmony they are demanding complete surrender, but will the democratic party surrender? It behooves

the friends of the Kansas City platform to organize immediately in every precinct and make their votes effective at the primaries.

Every primary and convention should indorse the Kansas City platform, and select delegates who can be trusted to carry out its principles. No time is to be lost. The St. Louis platform should be written by the men who supported the platforms of 1896 and 1900. The candidates should be nominated by men loyal to democratic principles, and no candidate should be considered who is not in sympathy with those principles as laid down in recent platforms.

THE COMMONER has pointed out for more than a year the purpose of the reorganizers; it has urged organization and action, and in many places the democrats are on the alert. They must be so everywhere if the party is to be made an effective instrument for the securing of reform.

AS TO PATENTS

Some years ago the editor of THE COMMONER suggested an amendment to the patent laws fixing a value limit as well as a time limit on patents. As the purpose of a patent is to offer a stimulus to invention, why should the patent protect after a reasonable compensation has been secured? Suppose, for illustration, the amount was fixed arbitrarily at \$200,000; would that not be sufficient to bring forth all the inventive genius that we have? As a general rule the inventor dies poor, while the person to whom he applies for assistance sometimes reaps an enormous profit without really having contributed anything himself.

The law might permit the inventor to collect an additional sum himself in case he has, without collusion, parted with the patent for a sum unreasonably small compared with its value. This would give him a protection beyond what he receives today.

A resident of Michigan—S. G. Howe of Detroit—has recently proposed an amendment to the patent law which aims

to prevent a monopoly. His plan is to establish a royalty department in the patent office, and provide by law that any one desiring to use the patent can do so by paying into the department a reasonable royalty, said royalty to be paid over to the person entitled thereto. This would prevent any company from monopolizing the patent, and would also prevent a patent being bought up merely to prevent its use by others. Mr. Howe's suggestion is worthy of consideration.

THE IMPLEMENT TRUST

If the republican farmers will ask the implement agents to show them the instructions sent out by the International Harvester company of America—(the harvester trust, which includes the Champion, Deering, McCormick, Milwaukee and Plano companies)—they will find that all the local agents are required to sell at a certain price, and the letters say to the local agents: "You can sell just as many machines during the summer at the prices we name in this list as you can at a lower price."

Thus does the trust tie up the local dealers and hold the entire purchasing public at its mercy, and yet a great many republican farmers are so partisan that they will go along and vote the republican ticket just the same. But here and there will be found some (may their tribe increase!) who will protest not only against the harvester trust, but against the republican administration that allows it and other trusts to exist.

NOT AN ARGUMENT

Some of Judge Parker's supporters are insisting that the democrats who believe in the Chicago and Kansas City platforms ought to favor his nomination because he supported the democratic ticket in both campaigns. Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that he supported the ticket in both cam-

paigns, that is no reason why the believers in those platforms should favor his nomination. Mr. Hill claims that he supported the ticket in 1896, although he did not publicly admit it for two years afterwards. After the campaign he wrote a vicious magazine article attacking nearly every plank in the platform. Will any one say that the people who believe in those platforms should favor Mr. Hill's nomination, notwithstanding the fact that he, if president, would use the great influence of his office to thwart every democratic reform? If Judge Parker supported the ticket for regularity's sake, without being in sympathy with the platform, why should the people who honestly believe in democratic principles as enunciated in those platforms, favor his nomination? Are real democrats less sincere in their devotion to democratic doctrine than the bolters? Are they less concerned about the country's welfare? The men who bolted are loudly shouting their opposition to the nomination of any democrat who is in sympathy with recent national platforms. Why should the friends of those platforms shout for the nomination of a man opposed to their political views? In other words, why isn't a sure enough democrat as much entitled to work for the advancement of his principles as a sham democrat is to work for the advancement of his peculiar views?

Until Judge Parker declares to the contrary, we have a right to assume from the character of the men and papers supporting him, that he is antagonistic to the vital parts of the Chicago and Kansas City platforms.

ATTEMPTING TO RETIRE SILVER

Congressman Fowler has reported from the committee of the house a bill providing for the recoinage, without limit, of silver dollars into subsidiary coin. Walter Wellman, in the *Chicago Record-Herald*, speaking of the bill, says: "It is proposed to recoin 578,002,099 silver dollars now in the treasury into fractional currency." It is probable that the bill itself does not express this purpose, but that this is the real purpose no one who understands the subject can doubt. The silver

dollar is an unlimited legal tender. The fractional currency is only a limited legal tender. The purpose of this bill, therefore, is to retire \$578,000,000 of legal tender money, thereby reducing the volume of standard money in the country. It is strange that any person, republican or democrat, can ignore so dangerous a proposition. The financiers are determined to reduce the volume of standard money to the smallest possible limit, for they can thereby better control it.

The gold democrats are working in concert with the republicans on this proposition, and they seek to avoid the money question, not because it is dead, but because they want to do by stealth what they dare not attempt openly.

The bill is another confidence game, and in line with the financial measures that have emanated from Wall street. It ought to be vigorously opposed by the democratic minority in congress, if it is brought up for passage, but the chances are that it will lie over until after the election, and then be rushed through, as much bad legislation is.

According to the press dispatches the bill also repeals the law prohibiting the deposit of custom receipts in national banks. This is intended to increase the deposits in the favorite banks. The bill also repeals the three million-dollar limit on bank note retirement. This is also in the interest of the banks and is intended to give them more complete control of the volume of money. Now under the present law the banks altogether cannot retire more than three millions in one month. If this limitation is removed the banks can retire all of the money in one month if they like, and re-issue it when they please.

Every financial measure presented for consideration by the republicans is in the interest of the banks, and of the financiers, and yet there are thousands of democrats who, receiving their information from republican papers—or still worse, from the gold democratic dailies—think that there is no reason for mentioning the money question in the platform. However, there are millions of democrats who have studied the money question and who know what the financiers are trying to do. These will see that the St. Louis convention takes no backward step.

MINISTERIAL SPECULATORS

According to the Associated press dispatches, Judge Utley of Rochester, N. Y., has been wrestling with a case in which the members of a Rochester church sued their minister for commissions on stock in an old venture. In giving his opinion the judge criticised the speculative deal in hand as "one of the worst schemes of deliberate theft" which had ever come to his attention. In criticising the minister he quoted the Scripture, "My house shall be called the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves."

In investigating one of the "get-rich-quick" schemes recently exposed, it was found that a minister had made a large profit on a small investment and had become so interested in the chance for large gains that he induced a number of members of his church to join him in the speculation. These instances are not cited to the discredit of churches in general, but only as an illustration of the extent to which the speculative spirit pervades society.

If a minister feels tempted to lead his flock into any questionable scheme in the hope of speedy profit, he will do well to prepare a sermon on the subject of service, and by the time he has finished his sermon he will be so saturated with the idea that one's life is measured by what he gives—not by what he gets—by what he does for others, and not by what others do for him, that the speculative fever will probably have disappeared.

COMMERCIALISM AND MR. BRYAN

Immediately following will be found an editorial which recently appeared under the above title in the *Record-Herald* of Chicago. It has been impossible as well as useless to take notice of the many criticisms that have appeared in the more partisan of the republican papers and in those papers which, although calling themselves democratic, have been studiously and continuously attacking all who remain true to democratic

principles. But the *Record-Herald* is one of the fairest of the papers calling themselves independent, and for that reason I call the editor's attention to the facts. If he had said that my connection with the Bennett will case had given political enemies a chance to misrepresent me, I might have answered that it is impossible to escape misrepresentation, for whether I speak or remain silent—whether I travel or remain at home—no matter what I do, my action is made the basis of misrepresentation. I have grown accustomed to this, and it does not disturb me. But the criticism which the *Record-Herald* makes, if well founded, is a serious one, because I cannot expect to exert an influence in behalf of moral principles if I can rightfully be accused of conduct inconsistent with the doctrines which I advance in speech and through my paper. I cannot complain that "the public conscience has been stupified by commercialism" if I, myself, am guilty of any act which can be criticised from the standpoint of morals. It is not necessary that one shall himself be blameless in order to criticise others, but it is necessary that he shall endeavor to make his life harmonize with his doctrines and be willing to correct his actions whenever he finds them to be at variance with his utterances.

As I desire not now only, but in all the years to come, to throw whatever influence I may possess upon the side of righteousness, in individual life as well as upon the side of good government and purity in politics, the reader will pardon me for mentioning here enough of the facts connected with the Bennett case to meet the criticism of the *Record-Herald*.

While the *Record-Herald* does not specifically set forth the grounds of its criticism, a careful reading of the editorial indicates that it takes exception to three things—first, to the fact that I drew the will; second, to the fact that the bequest was made in an indirect form, and, third, to the fact that I have taken an appeal to the supreme court. Let me take up these criticisms in the above order. First, as to the drawing of the will. The undisputed facts are that about the 10th of May, 1900, Mr. Bennett made a trip from New York to Nebraska for the purpose of having the will drawn. He brought with him a former will and certain memoranda, which were used

in drawing the new will. He did not discuss with me the provision made for any of his relatives except the provision made for his wife—and that was not a discussion, but merely a statement upon his part that he had left her sufficient to cover all possible needs.

He did not consult me as a lawyer, but came to me because he desired to leave some money to me, and desired me to distribute an additional sum for him. I had never been his attorney and never discussed any legal question with him, but I stated in the probate court that I was perfectly willing to have any presumption weighed against me that could be invoked against me had I been his attorney and had I drawn the will for him as his attorney. After making such provision for his family and relatives as he desired to make, he wanted to use certain other sums for the advancement of his political views and for educational and charitable purposes. These purposes were set forth in the will and the sealed letter and they were the only purposes about which he consulted me. The first question is, therefore, should I have declined to assist in drawing the will? Should I have sent him back to New York to have the will drawn by someone else? Was the drawing of the will by me immoral, or did it in any way manifest a “commercial spirit?”

The will was not executed in Nebraska. It was carried back to New York and executed there ten days later. Mr. Bennett was fifteen hundred miles away from me when he summoned the witnesses and executed the will, wrote the sealed letter, and put both away in a safe deposit vault of his own selection where they remained under his control until his death, more than three years afterwards.

The probate judge, a republican, after hearing the testimony, declared that the circumstances of the case fully and completely rebutted any presumption arising from the fact that I am by profession a lawyer.

As to the second question. The sealed letter was excluded by the probate court not because of any undue influence in the making of the will, but on the legal ground that it was not sufficiently identified by the will to be made a part of it. It is

my fault that the bequest was not made direct, and I explained in court the reason for suggesting the indirect form. I did not care to accept the gift unconditionally. I preferred to leave the matter to be decided at the time of his death. The will was made just before the opening of the campaign of 1900, and at a time when my renomination was certain. I told him that I did not care to accept the money unless I needed it, and that I would not need it if, as then seemed probable, I should be elected. I did not care to have my name appear in the will if I did not accept the money, and at my suggestion it was made to the wife in trust, and the terms of the trust were set forth in the sealed letter.

Was it immoral to accept the bequest conditionally instead of unconditionally? Did it betray a "commercial spirit" to put the matter in the hands of the wife, instead of making it direct, as in the other cases? Can either Mr. Bennett or I be accused of unfairness to the wife in making the bequest in the form in which it was made? When I objected to receiving it as a direct and unconditional bequest, he stated how he desired it disposed of in case I refused to receive it. The alternative plan was that it should be distributed by me among educational and charitable institutions, and this alternative provision was clearly set forth in the sealed letter, (written with his pen) which was left with the will.

The third question relates to the appeal. The will and the sealed letter taken together set forth the testator's purpose clearly and unequivocally, and no one who knows the facts in the case can doubt for a moment that I am endeavoring to carry out the will of the testator. I stated both in the probate court and in the circuit court that not a dollar of this money will be used by myself or by my family without the consent of the widow. The case can be disposed of any moment if the widow and heirs will agree that the \$50,000 shall be distributed among educational and charitable institutions. I know, and everybody knows who understands the facts in the case, that Mr. Bennett wanted this money distributed in this way if I did not receive it for myself and family. The trial judge excluded the sealed letter and all testimony in re-

gard to the testator's purpose in making the will. If I were considering merely my own convenience I would not contest the case at all, for in contesting it I am spending time and money without any probability of pecuniary return to myself. I am doing it because I could not do less and be true to the trust imposed upon me by a friend. The question is not a settled one in Connecticut, and there is no way to settle it except to obtain an adjudication of the point by the supreme court.

Is there anything immoral in leaving the question to the supreme court? Do I show a commercial spirit in refusing to consult my own convenience in this matter?

But the *Record-Herald* overlooks the questions which are really of greatest importance. The question of the making of the will, since it involved no undue influence, was at most a matter of propriety and not a matter of morals, and the same is true of the form of the bequest if—as it was, in fact—the desire of the testator to make the bequest. Likewise in regard to the appeal. It cannot be said to be immoral for a contestant to take a question upon appeal to the highest court, especially when, as in this case, I have tried in vain to consolidate the cases so as to occupy as little time and incur as little expense as possible. There are two questions, however, which involve moral principles, and if these could be decided against me my conduct would be subject to just criticism. First, did the testator with my consent do injustice to his wife? It is not sufficient to say that he was the person to decide that question. If, as a matter of fact, he did not make suitable provision for her, I could not throw the blame upon him if I should seek to carry out an unfair provision. But the facts in the case show that the provisions not only express his own wishes, but that in making the disposition he did, he was within his moral as well as his legal rights. In the sealed letter he told his wife that he estimated her bequest at \$100,000, and this, he said, would give her an income larger than she could spend, and enable her to make provision for those whom she desired to remember. The amount left to his wife will enable her to live in the same style as during his life without exhausting her annual income. The income from \$100,000 at 3 per

cent will give her more than half the salary paid to senators, members of congress and many other public officials. She has no children to provide for, and the sum left to her will enable her to leave to each of her brothers \$50,000, which is more than Mr. Bennett thought it necessary or wise to leave either to his sister or to his half-brother. He gave to his sister about \$30,000 and to his half-brother (including his half-brother's family) about \$28,000, besides remembering other relatives. If it is true, as stated by him in the sealed letter, that her income will be more than sufficient for her needs, then any additional sum left to her would have been left not to her, but to her relatives, unless she should dispose of it by will. Is there any reason why her relatives should receive more? Or has she any better right to dispose of it by will than he had?

The amount left to me conditionally would not have gone to his wife or to his relatives had I refused it at the time. It would have been distributed among educational and charitable institutions, but even this fact would not excuse me if I had accepted, even conditionally, money which in morals belonged to some one else.

Can it be said, after full consideration of the circumstances in this case, that I was culpable from a moral standpoint in not insisting when the will was made that the amount proposed for me or to be distributed by me should have been given to his wife or to his or her relatives?

But the questions which I have considered before have not, altogether, given me as much concern as the last, and to my mind the most vital of all the questions in this case, namely, Should I have consented to this bequest under any consideration, not as a matter of expediency, but as a matter of morals? That "it is more blessed to give than to receive" is recognized by all who have tried both. Instead of refusing the bequest absolutely it was at my request put in a form where the decision could be postponed until the time of his death. In thus postponing to a future time the decision of the question I acted upon what I believed to be satisfactory reasons. The campaign of 1896 had given me a prominence which, while it greatly increased my earning power, imposed upon me a large

additional expense. For years I had been interested in matters of government, and the campaign of 1896 placed me in a position where I could not lay down the work without what seemed to me a betrayal of trust. I could not return to the practice of the law without abandoning political work and ignoring a large correspondence. The field that seemed most suitable for the work I wanted to do was the lecture field, because in it I could earn what I needed and still have a large part of my time for public work. I found, however, that the fact that I received pay for lectures was misrepresented and distorted, and I not only reached a smaller number through my lectures than I could reach through public addresses, but the fact that I received money for lectures was made the basis of the accusation (entirely false) that I received pay for political speeches.

Mr. Bennett's purpose, as he expressed it in the sealed letter, was to make such a provision for me that I could more freely devote myself to public work—so that I could do without compensation work for which I was then compelled to charge.

During the period between 1896 and the making of the will, I devoted more time to work which brought no remuneration than I did to remunerative work. There was not a year between the two campaigns that I could not have made \$50,000 had I devoted myself entirely to money making. As it was I had up to May, 1900, saved only about \$25,000 or \$30,000 and of this about \$6,000 was accumulated before the campaign of 1896 opened. If at that time my health had failed under the stress of my work, I would have had an income of less than a thousand dollars—a sum not half equal to the annual expense of my correspondence between 1896 and 1900.

When Mr. Bennett unexpectedly made this proposition I considered it carefully, and felt that under the circumstances I was justified in accepting it conditionally. I regarded it as an insurance against financial embarrassment, in case of a possible break-down in health, and as an after-thought we added it was to be payable to my heirs in case of my death, it being to that extent a life insurance policy and saved me the annual

premiums on that amount. Since the making of the will I have accumulated between twenty-five and thirty thousand dollars more, but so large a part of my accumulations is tied up in a home, in household goods and in lands that yield but a small return, that I am still almost entirely dependent upon my lectures and my paper for my income.

THE COMMONER is accomplishing the purpose for which it was established. Through it I reach a large constituency directly, and through about 3,500 exchanges a still larger constituency indirectly. I have drawn from THE COMMONER about \$5,000 a year, which is not a third as much as I would have received had I accepted offers that came from other newspapers. Aside from property, real and personal, which I call my own, and which I estimate at from fifty to fifty-five thousand dollars, I have a sum in THE COMMONER reserve fund sufficient to guarantee to the subscribers that they will receive the paper for the period covered by their subscription. As the subscriptions are paid in advance I have felt bound to keep this fund large enough to protect the subscribers.

Besides giving so large a share of my time to public work which brings no remuneration I have since 1896 contributed in money more than \$32,000 to political, educational, charitable and religious work.

This statement is made not because it is pleasant to discuss my personal affairs, but because I desire that the readers of THE COMMONER, and others who may be interested, shall be able to judge the Bennett case according to the facts. Mr. Bennett earned his money honestly, was thoroughly in sympathy with the work that I am trying to do, and he had confidence that the bequest which he endeavored to make would be used for the advancement of principles which he believed to be important. Whether his faith in me was well-founded; whether his friendship was deserved; whether I was worthy of the confidence that he expressed—these must be proved by my conduct in the past and by my conduct in the future. I am satisfied that I have acted as he would have had me act in regard to this transaction. Where I have deviated from the path marked out by him it has been against myself rather than

in favor of myself. He intended that I should decide whether I would use the money or distribute it. I have left that question to be decided by his widow. Whether at any point in this entire transaction my conduct has been open to criticism from a moral standpoint is a question which I willingly submit to political enemies as well as to political friends, for a moral question cannot be decided by political bias or upon political grounds. The only decision thus far rendered upon the moral points in the case was rendered by a republican judge, and that decision was emphatically in my favor. When the court rejected the sealed letter and refused the introduction of further testimony, that branch of the case was appealed to the supreme court, and I immediately asked for the trial of the case in which undue influence was charged. The attorney for the widow and heirs asked for a postponement of the case on the ground that that case might be affected by the supreme court decision on the legal point, and I consented to the postponement only on condition that the records should affirmatively show that I was ready and anxious to proceed with the trial. That case involves the \$30,000 to be distributed for educational purposes as well as the \$50,000.

There is still another question to be considered—a question raised by another suit—namely, whether as a matter of equity the sealed letter, taken in connection with the will, should be construed as establishing a trust. This question remains to be tried.

And now, if the readers of THE COMMONER will forgive this reference to personal matters, I shall spare them any further mention of the Bennett will case until there is a decision to report.

“COMMERCIALISM AND MR. BRYAN ”

In the current issue of THE COMMONER, William Jennings Bryan publishes a diatribe against the trusts, which are, he argues, undermining the very government itself to satisfy their greed. “The public conscience,” he says, “has been stupified by commercialism until the grossest offenses against liberty

and good government do not awaken the protest that ought to be made against even trivial departures from the path of rectitude."

It is not defending the trusts to point out that Mr. Bryan's words come with poor grace from his mouth, when he puts the emphasis on avarice and greed and "trivial departures from the path of rectitude." He is even now engaged in an enterprise which other people are tempted to characterize in language akin to his own.

Here are the facts as they appear from court proceedings: Philo S. Bennett, a friend of Mr. Bryan's and an enthusiast for free silver, decided to leave Mr. Bryan \$50,000 by will to promote the work for the cause. Mr. Bryan, although a beneficiary, drew up the will himself. Had he phrased the bequest in direct terms all might have been smooth sailing. Instead he chose the indirect form of a secret letter, not formally part of the will, which specified what use was to be made of the money, and from the text of this letter it now appears the money was to go to Mr. Bryan's heirs in the event of his own death. Mr. Bryan eagerly pushes his claim in the courts, and now that the letter has been held to be no legal part of the will he is carrying an appeal to the higher courts.

Mr. Bryan's right to seek for the payment of the bequest will not be questioned by anyone—not even by those who most clearly feel the indelicacy of his drawing such a will himself, and of his drawing it in the evasive way he chose. But neither can, in most instances, the "legal rights" of the trust builders, whose greed Mr. Bryan so loudly denounces, be called in question.

The public conscience "stupified by commercialism" may need awakening, but Mr. Bryan would do well to strip off his own garment of commercialism before he poses again as a wakener.—*Chicago Record-Herald*.

THE NEW YORK PLATFORM

As it is somewhat unusual for a political speech to be made as this one is tonight, let me preface my remarks with an ex-

planation. I have hired this hall and I introduce myself because I do not care to speak under the auspices of any club or organization which is committed to any particular aspirant for office. My concern is not about the name or the personality of the nominee, but about the principles for which the democratic party is to stand. While many of the papers seem to assume that the contest for the democratic nomination is necessarily between Judge Parker and Mr. Hearst, and that every democrat must either be for one or the other, such a position is illogical and without foundation. Those who are classed as reorganizers—and by that I mean those who would carry the party back to the position that it occupied under Mr. Cleveland's administration—are not entirely agreed among themselves as to the proper candidate upon whom to concentrate their votes, and so those who are in sympathy with the spirit of our recent platforms may differ as to the relative availability of those who represent the progressive element of the party. My own position is one of neutrality. I regard as available all candidates who are in favor of making the democratic party an honest, earnest and courageous exponent of the rights and interests of the masses and I regard as unavailable all who are in sympathy with, or obligated to, the great corporations that today dominate the policy of the republican party and seek, through the reorganizers, to dominate the policy of the democratic party. I have no favorites among those on our side and no special antagonism to those who represent the reorganizers. I believe that the line should be drawn between principles, not between men, and that men should only be considered as they may be able to advance or retard the progress of democracy.

I have come to Chicago because from this point I can reach a large number of voters in the Mississippi Valley, and I have expressed a desire to have the ministers attend because they can and should exert an influence in behalf of honesty and fairness in politics. When some two years ago I became satisfied that ex-Senator David B. Hill was planning to be a candidate I pointed out the objections to his candidacy. When the Cleveland boom was launched, I pointed out the objections

to his candidacy, and now that Mr. Parker seems to be the leading candidate (though not the only candidate) among the reorganizers, I desire to present some reasons why he cannot be considered as an available candidate for a democratic nomination, and I find these reasons not in his personality, but in his position upon public questions. For a year he has been urged to speak out and declare himself upon the important issues of the coming campaign, but he has remained silent. If this silence meant that nobody knew his views, those who have been loyal to the party in recent years would stand upon an equal footing with those who deserted, but it is evident now that while to the public generally his views are unknown, they are well known to those who are urging his nomination. Whatever doubt may have existed on this subject heretofore, has been dispelled by the platform adopted by the New York state convention, and taking this platform as a text I am sanguine enough to believe that I can prove to every unbiased mind that Judge Parker is not a fit man to be nominated either by the democratic party or by any other party that stands for honesty or fair dealing in politics. I cannot hope to convince those who favor deception and fraud in politics, but I am satisfied that we now have evidence sufficient to convict Judge Parker of absolute unfitness for the nomination. If he did not know of the platform in advance, if he did not himself dictate it or agree to it, he has allowed it to go out as his utterance, for the convention was dominated by his friends and adopted a resolution presenting him as the candidate of the party of the state. This platform, then, can fairly be regarded as his declaration upon public questions and what does the platform say? The first plank reads:

“This is a government of laws, not of men; one law for presidents, cabinets and people; no usurpation; no executive encroachment upon the legislative or judicial department.”

This is a general plank that says nothing definitely. It is probably intended as a condemnation of the president's pension order, but the idea is so vaguely expressed that those who support the platform can deny that any criticism was intended, if they find that such criticism is unpopular.

The second plank reads :

“We must keep inviolate the pledges of our treaties ; we must renew and reinvigorate within ourselves that respect for law and that love of liberty and of peace which the spirit of military domination tends inevitably to weaken and destroy.”

This is probably intended as a rebuke to the president for his action in the Panama matter, but this, too, is so indefinite that the supporters of the platform can repudiate any such intention if it ever becomes convenient to do so.

The third plank reads :

“Unsteady national policies and a restless spirit of adventure engender alarms that check our commercial growth ; let us have peace, to the end that business confidence may be restored, and that our people may again in tranquility enjoy the gains of their toil.”

This, possibly, is intended as a criticism of the rashness of the president and of his emotional temperament, and yet it is so impersonal that those who support the platform can very plausibly insist that it has no particular reference to any person, but is intended as a very broad statement of a very general principle.

The fourth plank reads :

“Corporations chartered by the state must be subject to just regulation by the state in the interest of the people ; taxation for public purposes only ; no government partnership with protected monopolies.”

This plank might find a welcome place in any platform. It would be difficult to conceive of a party that would object to “just regulations by the state in the interest of the people,” nor is there any party that is likely to defend taxation for any other than a public purpose. Even the republican party has never declared itself in favor of “government partnership with protected monopolies.” The plank, therefore, has no meaning at all as it stands, unless there is a secret suggestion that the regulation of corporations must be left entirely to the states. This is the position that is taken by the trust magnates. Whenever congress attempts to interfere with a trust the friends of the trust at once insist that the state must do the regulating—that is the position taken by the dissenting members of the

supreme court in the merger case, and if this plank means anything it is an indorsement of the minority members of the court rather than an indorsement of the decision of the majority. The fact that the platform is silent about the merger decision lends color to this construction.

The fifth plank reads:

“Opposition to trusts and combinations that oppress the people and stifle healthy industrial competition.”

This is the anti-trust plank of the platform! At least it is the only plank in which the trust is mentioned by name. The plank contains fourteen words, and it will be noted that the opposition is not to all monopolies, or even to all trusts, but simply to those that “oppress the people and stifle healthy industrial competition.” That is the position taken by Judge Brewer in his separate opinion. He contends that the Sherman law was not intended to prevent all restraint of trade, but only “unreasonable restraint,” and so Mr. Hill and the other New York friends of Judge Parker have worded their trust plank so as to make their meaning uncertain. They have so worded the plank as to present the trust view of the question, rather than the view entertained by the people at large. In order to excite the opposition of the friends of Judge Parker the trust must be shown to be “oppressive.” It must be shown that it is not only stifling industrial competition, but that it is stifling a “healthy industrial competition.” The trust magnates claim that the object of the trust is to stifle unhealthy industrial competition and to promote a “healthy industrial competition.” The qualifying words used in this very brief and ambiguous plank destroy whatever vitality it might have had without them. The Kansas City platform declared a private monopoly to be indefensible and intolerable. It not only arraigned private monopoly as an unmitigated evil, but it pointed out specific remedies for the destruction of this evil. Compare the Kansas City platform with the cowardly and straddling anti-trust—or rather trust—plank of the New York platform, and you will understand why Mr. Hill and Judge Parker are so afraid of the Kansas City platform.

The sixth plank reads:

"A check upon extravagance in public expenditures; that the burden of the people's taxes may be lightened."

There is another plank that is as meaningless as those that have preceded it. Who advocates extravagance? Even when the republican party is guilty of the largest appropriations it insists that it is not extravagant, but that it is simply legislating for a large country.

The seventh plank reads:

"Reasonable revision of the tariff; needless duties upon imported raw material weigh upon the manufacturer, are a menace to the American wage-earner, and by increasing the cost of production shut out our products from foreign markets."

This plank is also evasive. The tariff revision must be "reasonable." What party ever advocated what it believed to be unreasonable on any subject? The duties upon raw material must not be "needless" duties. What party ever admitted that it put needless duties on anything? This plank justifies the criticism of one of the leading republican papers of the west which says that the platform "does not even dare to recommend the abandonment of the republican doctrine of protection of home industries, which had been fondly supposed by the old-fashioned Jeffersonian fellows to be about the only thing the party dared to cheep about at St. Louis."

The eighth plank is as follows:

"The maintenance of state rights and home rule; no centralization."

Now here is a plank that is a model of obscurity and brevity. Only ten words in the plank. To what issue is it to be applied? How is it to be construed?

The ninth plank reads:

"Honesty in public service; vigilance in the prevention of fraud; firmness in the punishment of guilt when detected."

As President Roosevelt prides himself upon his enthusiastic advocacy of honesty in the public service, and as his friends boast of his vigilance in the prevention of fraud and his firmness in the punishment of guilt, that plank might be regarded as an indorsement of him but for the fact that it is contained in a platform that suggests a candidate to oppose him.

The tenth plank reads:

“The impartial maintenance of the rights of labor and of capital; no unequal discrimination; no abuse of the powers of law for favoritism or oppression.”

Senator Allison has a reputation of being able to walk on eggs without breaking them, and this plank, if it appeared anywhere else than in a democratic platform, might be attributed to him for it is about as nice a piece of balancing as has appeared in many a day. The party stands “impartially” between labor and capital. If any discrimination is made, it must not be an “unequal” discrimination. That is, if the party discriminates in favor of one side, it must offset it by an equal discrimination in favor of the other side. There must be no abuse of the powers of the law, either for favoritism or oppression. Why this prodigality in the use of type? If the convention had said that it was in favor of doing right as between capital and labor, the plank would have been just as clear and just as useful as a guide to the party. In fact, the whole platform is so noncommittal, so absolutely colorless and so capable of being construed in any way that “we will do right” would have answered as well for the whole platform. A republican could run on that platform and after the election construe it as an indorsement of every policy for which the republican party stands, or at least he could find nothing in that platform that would rebuke him for doing anything that a republican might want to do.

What are the issues before the country? The trust question is certainly an issue, and yet there is nothing in that platform that gives any encouragement to the opponents of the trusts. There is not a word or syllable that binds a person elected on such a platform to do anything that the trusts are unwilling to have done. The Kansas City platform stated the party's position on the trust question, but the New York platform not only fails to indorse the last national platform, but also fails to propose any definite or positive plan of relief.

Imperialism is an issue. Our government is now administering a colonial policy according to the political principles employed by George III. a century and a quarter ago, and yet

there is not in this platform a single word relating to the question of imperialism, not a plank that defines the party's position on that subject, not a protest against the surrender of the doctrines of self-government. The Kansas City platform stated the party's opposition to a colonial policy, but the New York platform not only fails to indorse the Kansas City platform, but fails to take any position at all on this important question.

The labor question is an issue. The laboring men have been before the committees of congress endeavoring to secure three important measures. One, the arbitration of differences between corporations engaged in interstate commerce and their employes. Both the Chicago and Kansas City platforms declared in favor of arbitration, but the New York platform not only fails to refer to the arbitration plank of these platforms, but it fails to write a new plank covering this subject.

The laboring men are also trying to secure an eight-hour day, but the New York platform is silent on this subject.

The laboring men are trying to secure the abolition of government by injunction. Both the Chicago and Kansas City platforms contained planks on this subject, but the New York platform dodges this as it does all other vital questions. As the capitalists now have what they want and are in the position of defendants in a suit, while the laboring men are in the attitude of plaintiffs seeking relief, the failure of the New York platform to advocate what the laboring men desire is really a declaration against them.

On the tariff question no issue is joined. It was reasonable to suppose that on this question, at least, something would be said, but Mr. Hill and Judge Parker seem to be as much afraid of the tariff question as of other issues.

The money question is ignored entirely. No reference is made to bimetallism at any ratio—not even to international bimetallism to which Mr. Hill seemed to be so attached in the Chicago convention. No reference is made to the measure now before congress to melt up nearly six hundred million legal tender silver dollars into subsidiary coin that is only a limited legal tender. Nothing is said about the asset

currency which is a part of the scheme of the financiers. Nothing is said about the Aldrich bill which proposes to subsidize the banks into opposition to tax reduction by loaning them the surplus money in the treasury. There is no condemnation of the corruption that such a system would lead to. The platform does not antagonize the proposition now before congress to give the national banks unlimited control over the volume of paper money. In other words, there is not a line in the platform that is written in behalf of the people; not a line that will excite criticism in Wall street.

The platform ignores the income tax; it fails to indorse the election of senators by direct vote and also omits the plank of the Kansas City platform denouncing corporate domination in politics.

The New York platform is a dishonest platform, fit only for a dishonest party. No one but an artful dodger would stand upon it. The submission of such a platform to the voters of a state is an insult to their intelligence, for it is intended to deceive them, and a deliberate attempt to deceive—especially so clumsy an attempt as this platform is—is a reflection upon the brains of those to whom it is submitted.

This platform proves that the opposition to the Kansas City platform is not opposition to silver, but opposition to every needed reform and opposition to all that the masses desire.

I had expected that a platform prepared by Mr. Hill for Judge Parker would be evasive and lacking in frankness, but I did not conceive that any body of men calling themselves democrats would present such a platform as a recommendation of a candidate. If we are to take the New York platform as an indication of what the next democratic platform is to be, in case the reorganizers control the convention, then who will be able to deny the secret purpose of the reorganizers to turn the party over to predatory wealth? It is to this danger that I desire to call your attention tonight. With such a platform and a candidate who would be willing to run upon it, the party could secure as large a campaign fund as the republican party has ever secured, but in securing it it would, like the republican party, secretly pledge the administration to a construction

of the platform satisfactory to the corporations and the combinations. If you would know why the corporations contribute to campaign funds, read the testimony given by Mr. H. O. Havemeyer before the senate committee in the spring of 1894. The answers made by Mr. Havemeyer to Senator Allen's questions are conclusive as to the purpose of the campaign contributions made by the great corporations:

Senator Allen: "Therefore, you feel at liberty to contribute to both parties?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "It depends. In the state of New York, where the democratic majority is between 40,000 and 50,000, we throw it their way. In the state of Massachusetts, where the republican party is doubtful, they probably have the call."

Senator Allen: "In the state of Massachusetts do you contribute anything?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "Very likely."

Senator Allen: "What is your best recollection as to contributions made by your company in the state of Massachusetts?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "I could not name the amount."

Senator Allen: "However, in the state of New York you contribute to the democratic party, and in the commonwealth of Massachusetts you contribute to the republican party?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "It is my impression that wherever there is a dominant party, wherever the majority is very large, that is the party that gets the contribution, because that is the party which controls the local matters."

Senator Allen: "Then, the sugar trust is a democrat in a democratic state, and a republican in a republican state?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "As far as local matters are concerned, I think that is about it."

Senator Allen: "In the state of your nativity, or the nativity of your corporation, New Jersey, where do your contributions go?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "I will have to look that up."

Senator Allen: "I understand New Jersey is invariably a democratic state. It would naturally go to the democratic party?"

Mr. Havemeyer: "Under the theory I have suggested if they were there it would naturally go to them."

Here we have the head of the sugar trust admitting that his corporation contributes to campaign funds and that its contribution is determined, not by political convictions, but by its desire to stand in with the winning party. Senator Allen tried to ascertain the amounts contributed to the various campaign funds, but Mr. Havemeyer refused to answer.

The two republican members of the committee, Senator Davis and Senator Lodge, joined Senator Allen in calling the matter to the attention of the attorney general for the District of Columbia. Senator Allen individually reported a resolution in favor of calling the witness before the senate for contempt, but Senator Gray and Senator Lindsey, both gold democrats, presented a minority report in which they opposed taking any action in regard to the witness.

If you desire further testimony in regard to the purpose of corporations in contributing, you will find it in a letter sent by Mr. A. B. Hepburn of the National City Bank of New York to Lyman J. Gage, secretary of the treasury. The letter bears date of June 5, 1897, and is published in House Document 264 of the first session of the 56th congress. In closing the letter, after asking for deposits, Mr. Hepburn says: "Of course the bank is very strong, and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have great political claims in view of what was done in the campaign last year."

Here is the president of the most influential bank in the country calling attention to political service rendered by the directors of the bank as a reason why the bank should be remembered in the distribution of government money. Now, with the testimony of the head of one of the great trusts and the testimony of an official of one of the great banks, can any one doubt that contributions are made by the corporations for the purpose of controlling the policy of the party after the election? Can any one doubt that with such a platform as was adopted in New York, and with a candidate whose conscience would permit him to run upon such a platform—does any one

doubt that with such a platform and candidate the party would be mortgaged beforehand to the corporations that are now using the government as a private asset and plundering the people at will?

But there is another reason why the democratic party cannot afford to go before the country with an ambiguous platform and an uncertain candidate. No matter how people may differ as to the relative importance of issues, all must recognize that the trust question today presents an important phase of the great conflict between plutocracy and democracy. We have recently had a supreme court decision on the merger case. This decision was rendered by a bare majority of one, and that one (Judge Brewer) in a separate opinion has stated his position in such a way as to leave no doubt that in the first case involving a trust he may join the minority and defeat the Sherman law. Judge Brewer construes the anti-trust law to apply only to reasonable restraint of trade. He would have the court decide whether the restraint is reasonable or unreasonable. His decision, taken in connection with the dissenting opinions of Justices Fuller, Peckham, White and Holmes, shows that the appointment of a new judge might throw the decision to the one side or to the other. The judges of the supreme court are appointed by the president, and the president to be elected this fall will doubtless have the appointment of one or two, and possibly three, supreme court judges. If his sympathies are with the corporations he will doubtless appoint judges satisfactory to the corporations—especially if he is obligated to the corporations by large campaign contributions—and these judges can make it impossible to secure any remedial legislation for years to come. If, four years hence, the people should secure a president, a senate, and a house opposed to private monopolies, they may find themselves unable to get any remedial legislation past the supreme court for several years.

The opinion filed by Judge White and concurred in by the others denies the power of congress over monopolies organized in a state. These dissenting judges insist that congress has no power to regulate or restrain the creation of a monopoly within a state. It will be remembered that the decision in the Knight

case, known as the sugar trust case, turned upon that very question. It was admitted in that case that the sugar trust controlled the production of sugar, but the court held that the Sherman law did not prevent the buying up of the individual refineries even though the product of the refineries might ultimately enter into interstate commerce.

The division of the supreme court in the merger case shows the cleavage on the trust question. The dissenting judges would deny the power of congress to prevent a private monopoly and when the power of congress to destroy monopolies is denied the people are left helpless because some of the states, such as Delaware and New Jersey, find it profitable to permit the creation of these monopolies, and so long as they are created and can evade federal laws no separate state can fully protect itself against them.

The dissenting judges in the merger case refuse to draw a distinction between an individual and a corporation. Justice White says: "The principle that the ownership of property is embraced within the power of congress to regulate commerce, whenever that body deems that a particular character of ownership, if allowed to continue, may restrain commerce between the states or create a monopoly thereof, is in my opinion in conflict with the most elementary conceptions of rights of property," and Justice Fuller, Peckham, and Holmes concur.

"Rights of property" are, according to the dissenting judges, supreme and when congress tries to prevent a monopoly it is interfering with "the most elementary conception of the rights of property." The issue presented today in the trust question and in all the other questions with which we have to deal, is the question between human rights and so-called "property rights"—or, more properly speaking, between ordinary people and the great corporations. Those who believe that property rights are supreme take the side of the trusts. If we have a president who is in sympathy with this theory it means that the Dollar will be given consideration before the Man. It means that organized wealth can continue to trample upon the rights of the people; it means that the instrumentalities of gov-

ernment can be used for the protection of every scheme of exploitation that the capitalists can conceive.

I, for one, am not willing that the democratic party shall become the tool of the corporations; I am not willing that it shall be the champion of organized wealth. And it is because I believe that the party has a higher mission than to be the exponent of plutocracy that I am protesting against the schemes of those who would put it into competition with the republican party for the support of Wall street financiers. It is for this reason that I protest against mortgaging the party to the capitalists to secure an enormous corruption fund.

If any who are present tonight, or who read what I say, think that I am trying to interfere with democratic success, let me answer that no democrat is more anxious for the party to succeed than I am. No one has suffered more from dissensions and divisions in the party, and no one, I believe, is more eager for the country to enjoy the great benefits which a triumph of real democracy would bring. But I do not desire that the party shall win offices only. If that is the only purpose of the party, let its principles be abandoned and let its platform simply declare the party hungry for the patronage. The lesson of 1894 shows the folly of hoping to win by a surrender to the corporations, but even if success could be bought in such a way it would not be worth the price.

No one can defend the democratic party without defending its principles, and its principles ought to be so clearly set forth as to be easily understood. We ought to appeal to the conscience of the public and arraign republican policies as hostile both to the principles of free government and to the principles of morality. We have an opportunity to make the democratic party a power in this country; not only a power, but a power for good. Let us array the party against every abuse of government and against every policy that is hurtful to the people. Let us drive out of the party every democrat who betrays his trust, every official who would administer the office for his private advantage. Let us make democracy stand not only for good government—for honest government—but for a government “of the people, by the people, and for the people.” And

the first step in this direction is the adoption of a platform that recognizes the right of the people to decide public questions as well as their capacity for understanding public questions. To present a platform which is evasive and ambiguous shows that those who write the platform either distrust the people who are to act upon it or have purposes that they desire to conceal.

The New York platform is ambiguous, uncertain, evasive and dishonest. It would disgrace the democrats of the nation to adopt such a platform, and it ought to defeat as an aspirant for a democratic nomination any man who would be willing to have it go forth as a declaration of his views on public questions. In Illinois, in Wisconsin, in Michigan, in Minnesota, in Indiana, in Ohio, and in every other state that has not acted, it behooves the democrats to arouse themselves and organize to the end that they may prevent the consummation of the schemes of the organizers. Their scheme begins with the deception of the rank and file of the party. It is to be followed up by the debauching of the public with a campaign fund secured from the corporations, and it is to be consummated by the betrayal of the party organization and of the country into the hands of those who are today menacing the liberties of the country by their exploitation of the producers of wealth.

POLITICAL HONESTY

The necessity for honesty in financial transactions is understood by all, and the line between honesty and dishonesty is so clearly drawn that no one would attempt to confuse the two. For a man to be dishonest in a financial transaction brings upon him an odium from which he finds it difficult to relieve himself. Embezzlement is one form of pecuniary dishonesty. If a public official converts to his own use money entrusted to his care, he is convicted as an embezzler and summarily punished. The line between political honesty and political dishonesty ought to be as clearly marked, and political dishonesty

esty ought to meet with immediate and universal punishment. A public official has no more right to misuse the political power given him by the people than a treasurer has to misuse public money. Influence is bestowed upon a man, not as a personal compliment, but as a public trust, and when a party nominates a man for public office, it assumes responsibility for his faithful performance of duty, and it suffers if the confidence reposed in him is found to be misplaced. The object of a platform is to make known to the public the course which the official will follow, and it is promulgated in order that the people may know whether to confer authority upon him.

If a platform has any purpose at all, it is to inform the public as to the purpose, plan and methods of the candidate. If a platform commits a candidate to a certain course on any question, and the candidate after election follows a different and an opposite course, he is guilty of abusing public confidence and betraying those who trusted him. If, however, a platform is written in such ambiguous language that it can be construed in different ways, the action of those who wrote it can only be explained upon the theory that they either lacked the ability to state the party's position clearly or that they had a secret reason for using ambiguous language. The New York platform is one of the best illustrations of political dishonesty that has appeared in recent years. Take, for instance, the plank on the trust question. A president elected upon that platform could rigorously oppose every private monopoly and he could defend himself by saying that all private monopolies oppress the people and that all of them stifle "healthy industrial competition." Or a president elected on that platform could refuse to prosecute any trust, and explain by saying that no trust was guilty of oppressing the people, or of stifling healthy industrial competition. So far as that plank is concerned, it would leave any president elected upon it absolutely free to do anything or nothing, according to his pleasure.

And the objection that is made to the trust plank can be made to every other plank in the platform. Did the person or persons who wrote that platform understand the use of language? Could he or they have selected words that would con-

vey a clear understanding of the party's purpose? If not, it was a great misfortune that the convention placed the drawing of the platform in the hands of such ignorant men. If, however, the men who drew the platform were shrewd, intelligent and well informed men, then the purpose of the platform must have been to deceive. The platform, if intended as a model for the democratic national platform, is a cunning contrivance intended to be construed one way in one section of the country and another way in another section, and not intended to have any binding effect after the election. If the New York democrats have no objection to republican policies, why do they go to the trouble of proposing a candidate to run against Mr. Roosevelt? If they do object to republican policies, why do they hesitate to present those objections in clear and emphatic language? If they had views, but were afraid to express them, why did they not frankly say so? A simple resolution would have answered the purpose. They might have said:

“Resolved, That we do not desire to hamper our candidate with directions or instructions, and we therefore adopt no platform, and trust him to do what he thinks is right on all questions, and we agree in advance to indorse whatever he does.”

Such a resolution would have presented in an honest way what the platform presents in a dishonest way. The platform pretends to commit the candidate, but does not do so. Will the democrats of the United States, by approving of the New York platform, declare themselves in favor of deception and double dealing? If they insist upon an honest platform and nominate upon the platform a man whose opinions are known to be in harmony with the platform, they will relieve themselves of moral responsibility in case the candidate, after election, changes his position and misrepresents those who elected him. If, however, the democrats at large indorse a dishonest platform and nominate a man upon that platform whose opinions, although not known, are reasonably suspected of being with the corporations, they will become morally responsible for the betrayal of the party and the public.

If there is one principle more essentially democratic than another, it is that the people have a right to set in judgment upon every public question, and if this principle be correct, then it is the duty of parties to present the issues in such a way that the people can intelligently decide them. A dishonest platform not only betrays a lack of political honesty on the part of those who wrote it, but it denies the fundamental principle of democracy, namely, the right of the people to have what they want and to decide public questions for themselves.

We have reached a point where we condemn a man who embezzles public money. We shall not be able to boast that our government is thoroughly democratic until we reach a point where we are ready to visit the severest punishment upon those who embezzle public confidence and betray a public trust. The fact that political measures cannot be described and measured as accurately as sums of money, only makes it more important that those who deal with public questions shall be actuated by a sense of honor that will make them avoid the boundary line between that which is honest and that which is dishonest.

“SANITY”

Mr. Cleveland seems to have a special fondness for the word “sanity” when he speaks of the future action of the democratic party. At first the word might seem to be insulting, because it implies that those who have supported the ticket during the time of his desertion are insane. His friends might excuse the use of the word on the ground that he was trying to deal charitably with the loyal democrats and excuse their support of the party by assuming that they lacked the intelligence necessary to a proper understanding of the issues. He probably uses the word, however, for another reason. People who are insane are, of course, unable to manage their own affairs, and if a person is engaged in any important business and becomes insane it is necessary to have a guardian appointed to act for him. The most reasonable explanation, therefore, of Mr.

Cleveland's use of the word "insanity" when he describes the more than six millions who voted the ticket as insane, and the 132,000 who supported Palmer and Buckner as the only sane persons, is that he desires to have the latter appointed as guardians of the former. Those who supported the ticket outnumber the Palmer and Buckner men about fifty to one, and if Mr. Cleveland can have the insane put in charge of the sane, it will give each Palmer-and-Buckner man about fifty real democrats to take care of. Fifty to one is not exactly sixteen to one, but Mr. Cleveland never knew much about the ratio, anyhow.

While no suggestion of the kind has been made so far, yet it is possible that Mr. Cleveland intends to make an application to a federal judge for the appointment of these guardians. Or, possibly, as he favors government by injunction, he may attempt to have each Palmer-and-Buckner man apply for an injunction against fifty regular democrats restraining them from exercising their political privileges to the injury of the said Palmer-and-Buckner men. If Mr. Cleveland can show that the bolters are sane and that all the regular democrats are insane, he ought to have no trouble in securing the injunction. In view of these possibilities we who differ from him in political opinion ought, perhaps, to feel grateful that we enjoy as many privileges as we do, and are permitted to write, speak and vote just as if we were really sane.

LABOR BILLS POSTPONED

A week ago the house committee postponed consideration of the bill to abolish government by injunction and now another committee has postponed consideration of the eight-hour bill. Of course they were postponed and one of the corporation papers exultantly declares that postponement is equivalent to rejection.

The republican party is completely controlled by the corporations and labor can hope for nothing at its hands. The

reorganizers are even more hostile to labor's interests than the republican leaders. How long will it take the laboring men to learn to secure justice at the polls? In 1896 a great many laboring men were coerced into voting the republican ticket; in 1900 many were deceived by the full dinner pail argument, but they now find that the republican party, after using them to secure a victory, spurns their requests and disregards their interests.

The Chicago and Kansas City platforms pledged the democratic party to the measures then advocated by the laboring men. Had the laboring men supported those platforms with any degree of unanimity they would not now find their petitions rejected.

AFRAID OF THEIR RECORD

Referring to the resolution introduced by Congressman Cockran providing for an investigation of the charge that he was paid money for his services for the republican party in 1896, Walter Wellman, the Washington correspondent for the *Chicago Record-Herald*, republican, said: "No one imagines the republicans will permit an investigating committee to be appointed. They could hardly afford to go digging into the secrets of the first McKinley campaign. Tomorrow the speaker will probably hold that no question of personal privilege is presented and that will be the end of the matter."

Mr. Wellman sent this dispatch under date of April 26. On the following day, true to Mr. Wellman's prediction, the speaker held that no question of personal privilege was presented.

But it may develop that Mr. Wellman is not a thorough prophet in the claim that "that will be the end of the matter." The republicans have shown, in the language of Mr. Wellman, that "they could hardly afford to go digging into the secrets of the first McKinley campaign," and they are very likely to hear considerable of the Cockran resolution for several months to come.

THE MASSACHUSETTS PLATFORM

In last week's issue of *THE COMMONER*, the New York platform was discussed and the generalities, uncertainties, and evasions of that platform were pointed out.

Next comes the Massachusetts platform and this, too, was adopted by a convention which offered to the democracy a candidate for president. Of the two platforms, the Massachusetts platform was the more candid, because it did not attempt to say anything on the issues before the people. The New York platform was cunningly devised and intended to deceive; but the bay state convention practically said to the democrats of the country: "It is none of your business what our candidate thinks or what he will do."

The Massachusetts democrats declare that they have the ideal candidate for the presidential nomination and they ask the country to accept their assurance that he is all right in every particular. To prevent any disappointment before the convention, the Massachusetts democrats take the precaution to draw the veil over his views, a futile precaution, for in his New York speech, proposing Mr. Cleveland's renomination, Mr. Olney, the Massachusetts candidate, gave to the country a clear understanding as to the kind of president he himself would make.

There is only one political doctrine to which the Massachusetts platform distinctly refers, and that is no longer an issue. It commends Mr. Olney's position on the Venezuelan controversy with England. As this has been indorsed by all political parties, it can no more be made a campaign issue than could the nation's position in the war of 1812.

The New York convention presented no issue at all; the Massachusetts convention suggests an issue that was settled ten years ago; the next reorganizer convention might content itself with passing a resolution commending the discovery of America. What an animated campaign we shall have if the Wall street element writes the democratic platform! And to think that all this cowardice is displayed at a time when the republican party is unable to defend its position on a single

question; at a time when a bold, honest and consistent fight for genuine democracy would provide abundant hope for success.

THE GRESHAM LAW

The Gresham law, as it is called, was not a legislative enactment, but merely the statement of a principle by an Englishman by the name of Gresham when he was at the head of the treasury department. It was to the effect that the cheaper coin would drive out the more expensive coin, the reason being that the more expensive coin would be exported or melted for use in the arts, while the cheaper coin would be circulated among the people. This had reference to clipped coins, or coins that had been worn by use. To apply it to bimetallism the ratio must be taken into consideration. If the legal ratio in this country was less than the legal ratio in Europe the under-value coin would either remain here at a premium or would be exported, but as most of the coined silver of the world circulates at a ratio more favorable to silver than ours, bimetallists contend that silver would not drive gold out.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

The Philippine independence committee, of which Mr. E. W. Ordway, 150 Nassau street, New York city, is secretary, is sending out a petition, a copy of which is here given:

“We, the undersigned, members of all political parties, join with the above-named committee in urging upon the approaching national conventions the adoption of resolutions pledging to the people of the Philippine islands their ultimate national independence upon terms similar to those offered to Cuba.”

The petition will be laid before the various national conventions and they will be asked to adopt resolutions “pledging to the people of the Philippine islands their ultimate national independence upon terms similar to those offered to Cuba.”

Readers of THE COMMONER who are in sympathy with the movement, as all should be, are asked to cut out and sign the petition and mail to Mr. Ordway. There is no doubt that the democratic convention will adopt such resolutions, for they are exactly the same in substance as the platform adopted in 1900. If the republican convention would only adopt a similar plank, the Philippine question could be taken out of politics, but there is no likelihood of the adoption of such a resolution by a republican convention. However, the presentation of a large petition would greatly assist by showing public sentiment. In sending the petition it might be well for each one to state his politics, in order that public sentiment on the subject may be the better gauged.

A NARROW ESCAPE

A correspondent for the *New York Tribune* called upon Judge Parker April 24 and sought to obtain some statement from this presidential candidate concerning his views upon public questions. The *Tribune* correspondent reports Judge Parker as saying:

"I can't for the life of me understand why all these newspapers keep sending their representatives after me continually when they know I will have nothing to say to any of them upon any of these public questions. Personally, I want to treat them all courteously and in a friendly way, but they want something more which I cannot give. A reporter of a well known New York paper camped on my place nearly all day recently, and most every day for a time, and, of course, got nothing. But I was badly caught by a well known woman reporter the other day. She was waiting for me without my knowledge and I walked right in the hall where she was. I was a bit afraid of her, too, knowing her methods, fearing what she might say. But, of course, she got nothing of importance and I find no reason to complain of her report."

Judge Parker seems to be in the dark on a question wherein he could be enlightened immediately by any sixteen-year-old schoolboy.

A child in his 'teens could tell Judge Parker that when a man

is presented as a candidate for the presidential nomination at the hands of a great political party, the members of that party, as well as the people generally, are anxious to know the position he takes upon great public questions.

It is not a matter of mere curiosity, although in Judge Parker's case it may be said to be rapidly approaching that stage. But the members of a party having fixed principles have the right to know the opinion entertained by a man who aspires to the highest honor within their party's gift. It is the boast of Mr. Parker's friends that it has been his fixed policy to remain silent on public questions ever since he mounted the bench, and since he was suggested as a presidential candidate he has persistently refused to make his position known.

It is strange to hear a candidate for the presidency say that he "cannot" give his opinions upon "any of these public questions," and a touch of humor is added to this particular situation when this presidential candidate describes his narrow escape from being "badly caught by a well-known woman reporter the other day." According to this presidential candidate's statement, this woman reporter was waiting for him and he "walked right in the hall where she was." He declares that he was "a bit afraid of her, too, knowing her methods;" but, as Judge Parker explains, "This woman reporter got nothing of importance," and so Judge Parker was happy.

It was, indeed, a narrow escape. It is safe to say that never, in the history of politics, was there another instance where a man being formally and persistently offered for the presidential nomination at the hands of a great party, bent his energies, as Judge Parker has done, in the effort to avoid taking the public into his confidence and permitting the members of the party to which he is presumed to belong to learn his opinion upon the great questions of the day.

Under these circumstances, is it any wonder, then, that the Parker boom, in spite of all the bluff and bluster that has been made in its behalf seems incapable of real progress? Is it any wonder, then, that democrats who have faith in their principles and hope for their party decline to grow enthusiastic over the candidacy of a man who seems to imagine that the test of

an available candidate for the presidency is in his ability to keep the people in doubt as to his position on public questions and who acknowledges himself unable to understand why his opinions with respect to public questions are sought for by newspaper men?

JUDGE REAGAN'S LETTER AND THE ANSWER

Below will be found a letter written by Judge Reagan of Texas to Mr. Bryan and Mr. Bryan's reply. The letters explain themselves. Many loyal democrats have been deceived by the adroit appeals made for harmony by the reorganizers, and the editor of *THE COMMONER* regrets that these arguments have had an influence upon Judge Reagan. He is one of the noblest specimens of American democracy, and it is unfortunate that his influence should be thrown unwittingly upon the side of those who are seeking to deceive the voters of America.

THE COMMONER has more faith in Judge Reagan than have the reorganizers, who are making use of his letter. If the reorganizers will nominate Judge Reagan without any platform at all, Mr. Bryan and those who believe like him will enthusiastically support him, but that is not their purpose. Judge Reagan being an advocate of genuine democracy and a sincere friend of the people, his candidacy would be as objectionable to the reorganizers as was the candidate of 1896 and 1900. But to the letters:

JUDGE REAGAN'S LETTER

Palatine, Texas, April 25, 1904.

Hon. Wm. J. Bryan, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Dear Sir: Your letter of the 22nd instant is received. I send a postal money order for one dollar to renew my subscription to *THE COMMONER*. I generally read it before any other papers which come by the same mail. In your public converses, and through *THE COMMONER* you have done a great work in the interest of good government and of the American people; and I have often said that, while I might not approve your views in everything, I regarded you as one of the ablest

statesmen, and best democrats and as the truest man to the interests of the people among all our political men. And if I could name the president of the United States it would be Wm. J. Bryan.

I think you will know that I could not descend to unmerited flattery. And I make the above statement in order that you may not misunderstand what I am going to add.

If I were asked what I regard as the most serious menace to our constitutional system of government and to the rights and liberty of the American people I would say:

1. The disregard of President Roosevelt for the constitution and for political morality, his selfish and reckless partisanship, and his failure to enforce the criminal law against trusts and monopolies.

2. The policy of the republican party, in substituting the will of a popular majority of the people of the union for the provisions and limitations of the constitution of the United States, and its class and monopoly legislation, including a high protective tariff, the trusts and the monopolies fostered by it, and the notorious political corruption which has grown out of its policy.

If I were asked for a remedy for these dangers I would say the defeat of Roosevelt for the presidency, the reversal of republican policies, and the restoration of constitutional, honest and economic government.

If I am asked how this is to be done, I would say:

By the adoption by the national democratic convention when it meets of a platform covering the recognized cardinal principles of the party, and leaving questions of differences of opinions among democrats to be settled within the party after it shall have gotten the control of the government, uniting the whole strength of the party for this purpose, and offering this inducement to the floating vote of the country and to dissatisfied republicans. This plan would open the whole field for political discussion; and it seems to me offers the only possible chance for the success of the democratic party in the coming national election.

If we go into the contest with contesting factions in the party, defeat is inevitable; and the practices of Roosevelt, and the policies of the republican party will have four years more in which to become crystalized; and that would be the end of constitutional government, and the enthronement in its stead of a government of classes, money, corporations and trusts.

I believe as earnestly as you do in the great body of the doctrines you have been advocating, but I am not so afraid of the

limited number of democrats who oppose those policies as to be afraid to go into a convention with them. Surely six million democrats need not be afraid of three hundred thousand. While three hundred thousand may not be able to elect a president, they with the influences they can command can surely defeat the election of any one on a platform antagonizing their views.

With me it is not a question of whether we can defeat and punish any faction in the democratic party; but whether we shall, by uniting all democrats secure an election which will restore the constitution, good government, and the best interests of the people of this great republic.

You will understand that I do not write as an interested politician. My political race has been run. I am now eighty-five years of age. I have no political honors to expect or to desire. But I love my country and hope for a restoration of the constitution and for the peace, prosperity and equal rights of all.

Very respectfully,

JOHN H. REAGAN.

P. S.—As your letter to me is in part on political questions, I hope it will not be displeasing to you for me to give it to the *Houston Post*.

MR. BRYAN'S REPLY

Lincoln, Neb., May 5, 1904.

Hon. John H. Reagan, Palestine, Texas.

My Dear Mr. Reagan: I am just in receipt of your favor of April 25th and hasten to reply. Your well-earned prominence in public life, your conspicuous service to your party and to your country, and the cordial goodwill which you have manifested toward me, all combine to give me an interest in what you say, and it would be a genuine pleasure to me if I could adopt the conclusion which you have reached. The fact that I differ from one whose sincerity I can not doubt and whose ripened wisdom gives value to his words, makes it incumbent upon me to present for your consideration the reasons which lead me to take the position that I do.

I fully agree with you as to the dangerous tendency of republican policies as exemplified in both the legislative and executive departments of the government, and I may add, as exemplified in the judicial department as well. I also agree with you that President Roosevelt represents those policies in their most aggravated form. His imperialistic ideas and his

imperialistic methods, his refusal to enforce the law against men of great wealth who conspire against their country and its statutes, his subserviency to Wall street and his willingness to mortgage his administration to the great corporations in order to secure a second term—these ought to lead to his defeat in the coming election. I might add what you have omitted—namely, that to his other offenses he has added a grave one in that he has done more to stir up antagonism between the white and black races than any or even all of the other presidents since the civil war.

I am sure you do not regard with more apprehension than I do the continuation of republican rule, or look with more longing to the re-establishment of the government upon constitutional foundations. But how shall this be done? What course offers the most reasonable hope of success? If the party was harmonious and united in its general purpose, if those who call themselves democrats were one in aim and purpose, a general platform might be sufficient, providing of course the candidate was trustworthy. But we can not ignore existing conditions. In two national campaigns the party has tried to accomplish the very things that you commend, but its high purpose has been thwarted not so much by republicans as by men who have taken upon themselves the name of democracy without accepting its principles. The men who have twice defeated the democratic party by joining with the republicans are now seeking to demoralize the party from within. These are the men who threaten to continue their assaults upon the democratic party, and their support of the republican ticket, unless our party renounces its allegiance to the people and becomes the champion of organized wealth. The issue between democracy and plutocracy is clearly defined, and the democratic party must be on one side or the other—it can not occupy a neutral position or play fast and loose with the people.

You suggest that a platform be written covering the “recognized cardinal principles of the party and leaving questions of differences of opinion among democrats to be settled within the party after it shall have gotten control of the government.” The trouble is that it is impossible to secure a statement of principles that is satisfactory. Because I recognize the force of this appeal to party pride and loyalty I have from time to time endeavored to secure from the leaders of the reorganizing movement some suggestion as to what they regard as cardinal democratic principles. Mr. Cleveland, who talks in a ponderous way about the party’s return to “sanity,” carefully

avoids any statement of principles. The subsidized papers that have attempted to assassinate the political character of every loyal democrat, refuse to suggest a platform. We have had to wait for the conventions to be held, and these conventions when controlled by the reorganizers have thrown no more light upon the subject. You have read the New York platform and know that a republican could run upon it and after the election follow in the footsteps of President Roosevelt. In so far as it says anything at all, it defends rather than antagonizes the trusts. The platform adopted in Massachusetts is even less specific, and the New Jersey and Pennsylvania platforms are not much more clear. From the conduct of those who are in charge of the campaign of the reorganizers we must conclude that they either have no well defined political principles to present, or that they are afraid to let their views be known.

If we were sure of securing a candidate whose opinions were known to be right and whose record would be a guide to the voters, we might possibly get along without any platform at all—although that would be a confession of hopeless disagreement. But the most prominent candidate among the reorganizers is Judge Parker whose position on public questions is wholly unknown but whose attitude can be surmised from the company he keeps. Mr. Hill is the manager of the Parker boom, and August Belmont is its financial representative. When Mr. Hill was in the senate he opposed the income tax and went even farther in defending the insolent demands of Wall street than Mr. Cleveland did. Mr. Belmont is as noted for his apostasy from democratic principles as for his connection with the Rothschilds. The New York Parker club has published a list of the supporters of their candidate for the purpose of showing that he will be acceptable to the “conservatives,” and August Belmont’s name appears first in the list, with Mr. Hill’s second. Mr. Benedict, who exerted such a baleful influence on the Cleveland administration, is prominent in the Parker contingent in Connecticut, and you will find in your own state and throughout the country that his most enthusiastic champions are the men who openly opposed our ticket in 1896. The trust magnates, the great bankers and the railroad attorneys would not be so unanimous in his support if they did not have secret assurances in regard to his position. Those who, like you and I, believe that the best interests of the country require President Roosevelt’s defeat at the coming election must consider two questions—first, can a democratic victory be secured by an ambiguous platform and a tongue-

ted candidate? and second, would a victory under such conditions bring us the change desired? To answer the first question we have only to remember the party's experience in 1894. The men who seek to regain control of the party were then in absolute control. Mr. Cleveland was president, his cabinet was "pure gold," and the members of the national committee were in full sympathy with his administration, and yet our party was defeated in the congressional contest by 1,080,000 votes. Whether measured by the popular vote, by the number of states carried or by the number of congressmen elected, the defeat of '94 was more disastrous than the defeat in '96 or in 1900. If this defeat occurred before the open desertion of Mr. Cleveland and his political sympathizers, what would be the result if the party should now go into a campaign on a meaningless platform and under the leadership of one justly suspected of representing Mr. Cleveland's political views? You remember that Mr. Cleveland's administration lost us some of the southern states, and created a very active opposition to the democratic party in nearly all the others and this, too, notwithstanding the overshadowing influence exerted by the race question. Even from the standpoint of expediency it would, it seems to me, be criminal folly to throw away the chances of success by putting the party in a doubtful position on public questions or under doubtful leadership. The more anxious we are to defeat the republicans the more careful we ought to be to put the party in a position where it would deserve success, for it would be a reflection upon the patriotism and intelligence of the country to assume that there is any better way to insure success than to deserve it.

But even if it were possible to suppose that victory could be won by marshalling the six millions of voters under the three hundred thousand deserters (as you estimate them) what would the victory amount to? The men who deserted the party are really more antagonistic to democratic principles than the average republican. Many republicans oppose the democratic party simply because of their allegiance to the republican party, but those who left the democratic party in '96 showed that their hostility to democracy was strong enough to make them disregard political ties and political associations. Mr. Cleveland did the democratic party more harm than any republican president has been able to do it. He fastened upon the party responsibility for his betrayal of both the party and the people. I am sure you will agree with me when I say that in both campaigns (1896 and 1900) his administration, although our party attempted to repudiate it, did more to defeat

our party than the active opposition of himself and of such subordinates as he could coerce.

The trouble with President Roosevelt's administration is that it is on the side of plutocracy as against democracy, on the side of organized wealth as against the masses, and if by any possibility we should elect another democratic president controlled by the influences that controlled Mr. Cleveland, what assurance have we that he would attempt to undo what recent republican presidents have done? The reorganizers are as clearly and as completely controlled by the monopolists as are the republican leaders, and with one of their representatives in the White house we could confidently expect the appointment of supreme court judges who, like the three gold democrats now on the supreme bench, would decide against the power of congress to protect the public from industrial monopolies. These judges could block remedial legislation for years to come.

Instead of a plan of evasion and surrender, which would add disgrace to defeat in case of defeat, and would disappoint the people even if it won, the party should, I think, make an honest and democratic fight against all the republican policies. I can not believe that the democratic party will throw away the great opportunity it now has to make a successful attack on the strongholds of republicanism—not by trying to win back by fatal concessions corporation-controlled democrats, but by appealing to the conscience of the country and to the patriotism of the people. We can neither draw honest men to the party nor arouse enthusiasm among our own people by showing a greater desire for "winning" than for principles. If we refuse to declare a definite purpose before the election no one will expect us to do so after the election. If our policies are really wise, the more clearly they are stated the better, for truth like good seed will yield abundantly.

Most earnestly believing that the corporation element now seeking to regain control of the democratic party would lead the party not only to defeat but to disastrous defeat, and believing that a democratic administration controlled by these influences would disappoint the democrats of the country and delay the triumph of real democracy, I am doing all in my power to maintain the integrity of the democratic party, and prevent a surrender to the corporations. I can not claim to love my party better than you love it, nor can I ask you to substitute my judgment for your own, but during the last twelve years I have become intimately acquainted with the purpose, the plans, and the methods of those who are now

leading the reorganization movement, and believing them to be a serious menace to the party's welfare as well as to the country's good, I must continue to oppose them in season and out of season. It would be a source of great encouragement to me if in this struggle I felt that I had the active co-operation of all who, like yourself, have been loyal to the party in recent campaigns. But if I can not have it I shall console myself with the belief that events will vindicate my course and prove to those who have trusted me that in this contest I am only doing my duty as I have tried to do it in preceding contests.

In conclusion allow me to assure you of my high esteem and to express the hope that you may live to rejoice in the triumph of a real democracy and to see the country in the full enjoyment of its blessings.

As you gave your letter to the press, I am sure that you will not object to the publication of this.

Very truly yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

WILL SHAW EXPLAIN?

Secretary Shaw has talked enough to earn the distinction of being the mouthpiece of the Roosevelt administration but he now has ample reason to do some talking in his own behalf. He has become the central figure in an official scandal which, until it is cleared up, will monopolize his vocal powers. A Des Moines dispatch relates that there is "information on file in the governor's office" there showing that Secretary Shaw, when governor, paroled a desperate criminal at the request of political leaders and for political purposes—and the evidence further shows that the parole was granted in spite of the remonstrance of the trial judge and prosecuting attorney. Dave Mercer, a republican congressman, was a candidate for re-election in the Omaha district and wanted the aid of the gang to which the prisoner belonged. Mr. Hubbard, the political boss who found Governor Shaw and engineered his nomination, wrote a letter to the governor and called attention to the service which Mercer had rendered to "us" in

passing "the bill for the settlement of the Sioux City and Pacific indebtedness." Hubbard adds: "I suppose there is no doubt that he (the prisoner) is guilty of the crime charged but Dave says he has been punished pretty well now and that it will be worth 300 or 400 votes to him from relatives of Sheriff if he can be paroled." AND HE WAS PAROLED. Secretary Shaw has been quick to warn the people against tariff reform and against any interference with the plans of the money changers; he has even given the country an occasional defense of the trusts. The country would now appreciate a dissertation upon the political use of executive clemency. With an Indiana governor shielding a republican indicted for murder and an Iowa governor paroling a convicted thief to aid a republican congressman it would seem that the republican party would soon cease to boast of its reverence for law and order. If Secretary Shaw exhibits a disinclination to throw light upon the subject the president might illumine one of his addresses on civic righteousness with a discussion of the ethics of the Hubbard letter. The "grand old party" must be nearing the end of its usefulness of a criminal must be paroled to reward a republican congressman for supporting a railroad measure. And if Secretary Shaw thus abused his former executive authority is he not likely to abuse his present authority to reward the Wall street magnates who are expected to finance the republican campaign?

LABOR'S SPLENDID EXAMPLE

The press dispatches tell of the action of the Chicago Carriage Makers' Union in punishing a member who resorted to violence in dealing with a non-union man. John Bergquist was the offending member and his offense was an assault upon Harry T. Stevens, a fellow workman, who refused to join the union. Mr. Bergquist was fined twenty dollars by his association and then his union turned him over to the police court and fellow members furnished the evidence to convict him. The *Inter-Ocean* says that the action was taken in pur-

suance of the policy adopted by the union. The carriage makers are to be congratulated; they have done more to make friends for organized labor than they could have done in any other way. A large majority of the people sympathize with the laboring men and are anxious to see him improve his conditions. The acts of lawlessness charged to strikers—though generally unjustly so—are the things relied upon by capitalists to alienate public sympathy. A single use of force is reiterated over and over again by the capitalistic press, and the criminal acts of irresponsible thugs and desperadoes are charged up to labor organizations. While it is impossible for the unions to entirely avoid misrepresentation the summary punishment by the unions themselves of members who attempt to take the law into their own hands is the most effective means they can employ to prove their respect for law and order. And why not be the first to punish? The union man does his fellows a grievous wrong and retards the legitimate work of his organization when he brings upon his order the odium which attaches to a law breaker. If all the organizations of labor will follow the example of the Chicago carriage makers' union the plain people will soon be massed in solid phalanx behind the laboring men and the capitalists who as managers of the great corporations are now defying the law will have a monopoly of the defense of lawlessness. Labor's cause is just and an appeal to the innate and universal sense of justice will finally win—violence is the only thing that can check it.

GAGE'S DEFENSE OF WEALTH

Hon. Lyman J. Gage, formerly secretary of the treasury, but now enjoying a rich banking berth which he earned by turning the treasury department over to Wall street, has recently made a defense of the accumulation of wealth. The occasion was a session of the Bible class of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. He said: "The men who have accomplished great things are the most poorly paid, no matter how rich they may

be." Quoting a clergyman as saying that no man can acquire a million dollars in a lifetime without robbing some one, he said: "If the man who can make two blades of grass grow where one grew before takes to himself one-fourth of the increased product and lets three-fourths go to society, society gets a very good bargain." This is an unfortunate illustration because it does not state the situation which he is trying to defend. There is no criticism of those who really produce something. Society would not complain if the producer of an additional blade of grass kept it all. What society complains of—and justly, too—is that men who do not produce anything—men who add nothing to the world's wealth—saddle the masses and ride them with whip and spur. A great many of Mr. Gage's financial associates have grown rich by means of schemes of exploitation which do not differ in morals from the methods of the highwayman. Take, for instance, a trust that obtains a monopoly of a market. Its first act is usually to raise the price of the product, the second to reduce the price of the raw material and the third to impose harsher conditions upon employes. The managers of the trust do not increase the number of grass blades; they do not increase production. On the contrary they put into operation plans that must lead ultimately to an inferior product and decreased consumption. If a man learns that a traveler carrying a large sum of money is going to pass along a lonely road after dark and, taking advantage of the information, waylays and robs the traveler we do not say that he was exercising superior knowledge or skill; we punish him for taking that which did not belong to him. But when a private monopoly takes advantage of the necessities of the people and, suppressing competition, extorts from the public Mr. Gage regards them as benefactors. Instead of putting up a man of straw—or rather a man of grass—to attack, why did he not present the real issue and meet it fairly? No one obtains money honestly who does not give a fair equivalent for it, and the trust magnates not only do not confer a benefit upon society but they afflict society with increasing evils. Mr. Gage by his own official conduct has shown his sympathy with crooked methods of

accumulation. While acting as a representative of the government he conspired with the officials of the National City bank of New York to make the government pay rent on a building sold to the bank while the bank continued to have the use of the money paid for the building, and then he delayed the transfer of title so that the bank could escape taxes. If Mr. Gage had undertaken to justify his attempt to give the bank two incomes "where but one grew before" he would have felt more at home than he did in discussing the wealth producers in general and grass blades in particular.

TRUST DEFENDERS

The *Chicago Chronicle*, than which there is no more conscienceless supporter of organized greed, publishes the following defense of the trusts entitled "The Trust Bogy":

"From this time on the country will hear a great deal about the dangers and evils of the trust, especially from the democratic party. Political demagogues must have a slogan and there is nothing at present which they consider such an easy mark as the much-reviled, universally condemned and universally dreaded trust.

"If a person were to be governed by the platforms, the stump speeches and the newspaper interviews of the next six months he would form the opinion that the trust was something like the deadly upas tree, and it overshadowed and poisoned every human interest, that the chief end of man was to exterminate it and that the people should in the coming presidential election support with heart and soul the candidate most likely to deliver us from this gigantic evil.

"It is almost cruel to the cheap politicians to deprive them of the great advantage they derive from such a crusade as this, and yet the truth is that these politicians have no clear idea of what they mean by a trust, that there are few, if any, trusts in the United States, and that what are called trusts are simply ordinary business enterprises and lie at the foundation of all national prosperity and happiness.

"The last ten years have been noted as a period of unification and concentration in every branch of human activity. The object is to save waste, and it has been so successful in this

that one is amazed to think the world should have been so long in discovering it.

"It is not a trick of the capitalists nor the manufacturers, but a movement of the universal human mind. It has affected all business, whether done on a large scale or a small one, and not mercantile, manufacturing and financial business only, but the trades and professions. Even the churches have adopted it, and we read of five churches of five different creeds in one village being consolidated into one.

"As a result of this process of consolidation business has been done on a much larger scale than ever before and in some cases on a colossal scale, and these gigantic enterprises are now called trusts. They hurt nobody as a rule, they save expenses, reduce the cost of production and in most cases lower prices. They are subject to a competition among themselves which in many cases reduces them to bankruptcy, and as they kill each other off there is little need of a political party to kill them.

"It is safe to say that if any limit whatever were set to the scope of business enterprises or the size of private fortunes it would act on the life of society like a cord drawn around a man's neck. That is, it would result in social apoplexy and death and it would be the death, not of the capitalist and manufacturer only, but of the poor man and the laborer. It would be universal ruin.

"Does the democratic party believe that it can array itself against business enterprise and progress and endure?"

The *Chronicle* does not pretend that it favors "reasonable" restraint, as some republican papers do; it does not attempt to draw a distinction between good trusts and bad ones. It boldly announces its opposition to all anti-trust legislation and characterizes as demagogues those who criticise trust rapacity. The *Chronicle* is one of the foremost of the newspaper exponents of the reorganization movement and the above editorial, taken in connection with the New York platform, shows what is to be expected if the plutocratic element obtains control of the party machinery. It asks: "Does the democratic party believe that it can array itself against business enterprise and progress and endure?" That is the same question that is asked on the money question. Its owner, a republican banker, assumes that anything desired by Wall street is necessary to progress and prosperity, and that those who resist

the demands of Wall street are bent on the destruction of the country.

The *Chronicle* is evidently preparing to threaten a panic if trusts are disturbed just as it threatened a panic if the gold standard was disturbed. Those who believe in democratic principles and who desire remedial legislation might as well make up their minds to fight plutocracy all along the line, for the plutocrat appears as a defender no matter at what point entrenched privilege is attacked.

THE CLEVELAND BOND DEALS

Ex-President Cleveland, after a silence upon the subject for some ten years, feels called upon to give to the public through the *Saturday Evening Post* "a detailed history of the crimes charged against an administration that issued bonds of the government in time of peace." He proceeds at great length to describe the situation and the manner of issuing and selling the bonds. To those who investigated the matter at the time, his article presents nothing new, and it is only significant for two reasons—first, because there was no occasion for the making of such an explanation at this time, and, second, because the explanation conceals or misrepresents some of the most important parts of the transaction. The only plausible excuse that can be given for the preparation of the article at this time is that Mr. Cleveland desires a renomination and, keenly feeling the criticism directed against his administration on account of these bond deals, is trying to explain them in such a way as to satisfy the financial element to which he looks for the support of his candidacy. His political opponents in the democratic party ("may their tribe increase") are not alarmed by the article because if the people are "sane" they will think no more of Mr. Cleveland after reading the article, and still less of him if they will consider what he ought to have said, as well as what he did say.

He starts out with a misstatement of the law. He assumes that the greenbacks were redeemable in gold. This is a

groundless assumption. The greenbacks called for payment in dollars, and were payable in either gold or silver at the option of the government. The creation of a gold reserve did not obligate the government to redeem its paper in gold. The bonds which the secretary of the treasury was authorized to sell to provide a redemption fund, were coin bonds. Mr. Cleveland sent a message to congress complaining that he could only issue coin bonds, and asking for authority (which was denied) to issue gold bonds. Gold and silver were standard money and every national platform upon which Mr. Cleveland has run recognized gold and silver as the coinage of the constitution. His platform of 1884 so declared; his platform of 1888 reaffirmed the platform of 1884, and his platform of 1892 said: "We hold to the use of gold and silver as the standard money of the country," etc. Coin means silver as well as gold. He issued bonds because at the dictation of Wall street he refused to recognize silver as a standard money. He acted upon the assumption that gold alone was good money, and he permitted the financiers to raid the treasury and force an issue of bonds at the expense of the people. In his attempt to find an excuse, he has searched the law of 1890, and finding there an innocent clause, attempts to make that clause a scapegoat, and blames it with the bond issue. He says:

"It is hardly necessary to say that the assertion in the act of 1890 (the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals at a parity) had the effect of transferring the discretion of determining whether these treasury notes should be redeemed in gold or silver from the secretary of the treasury to the holder of the notes."

This is mere subterfuge. The clause referred to does not necessarily imply that gold could be rightfully demanded. That is a construction which Wall street has placed upon the section, and Mr. Cleveland simply accepted the Wall street construction. That this was not a necessary construction, or even a reasonable construction, is shown by a quotation from the testimony given by Secretary Carlisle on the 21st of January, 1895, before the house committee on appropriations. The following question and answer bring out the point:

Mr. Sibley: I would like to ask you (perhaps not entirely connected with the matter under discussion) what objections there could be to having the option of redeeming either in silver or gold lie with the treasury instead of the noteholder?

Secretary Carlisle: If that policy had been adopted at the beginning of the resumption—and I am not saying this for the purpose of criticising the action of any of my predecessors, or anybody else—but if the policy of reserving to the government at the beginning of resumption, the option of redeeming in gold or silver all its paper presented, I believe it would have worked beneficially, and there would have been no trouble growing out of it, but the secretaries of the treasury from the beginning of resumption have pursued a policy of redeeming in gold or silver, at the option of the holder of the paper, and if any secretary had afterwards attempted to change that policy and force silver upon a man who wanted gold, or gold upon a man who wanted silver, and especially if he had made that attempt at such a critical period as we have had in the last two years, my judgment is, it would have been very disastrous. There is a vast difference between establishing a policy at the beginning, and reversing a policy after it has been long established, and, especially, after the situation has been changed.

It will be seen that Secretary Carlisle blamed preceding secretaries of the treasury. He did not blame the law, and this, it must be remembered, was after Mr. Cleveland had issued his bonds—after Mr. Cleveland had made the deals with Morgan, Belmont and Rothschild. Carlisle, it seems, had never discovered the clause to which Mr. Cleveland refers, and upon which he relies. He blames preceding secretaries for establishing the precedent, and hides behind the excuse that the precedent having been established, he was not able to disregard it. He even went so far as to say that in his opinion it would have worked beneficially if the government had reserved the option of redeeming in either gold or silver.

This testimony of Mr. Carlisle's convicts Mr. Cleveland of having manufactured an excuse AFTER HE HAD DONE THE THING WHICH HE IS NOW TRYING TO EX-

CUSE. From the testimony of Mr. Carlisle it appears that previous administrations surrendered the option which the law gave to the government, and Mr. Cleveland's administration refused to resume the option and thus protect the public. From Mr. Carlisle's testimony it is also apparent that no distinction was made between the greenbacks and the Sherman notes. The distinction created by Cleveland's article is an afterthought, a distinction created for the purpose of unloading upon some one else the blame for his disgraceful bond transactions. Again Mr. Cleveland says:

"Manifestly, in the face of this assertion of the government's intention, a demand for gold redemption on the part of the holders of such notes could not be refused, and the acceptance of the silver dollars insisted upon, without either subjecting to doubt the good faith and honest intention of the government's professions, or creating a suspicion of our country's solvency. The parity between the two metals could not be maintained, but, on the contrary, would be distinctly denied, if the secretary of the treasury persisted in redeeming these notes, against the will of the holders, in dollars of silver instead of gold."

Here, too, Mr. Cleveland is assuming a fact that he cannot prove. In France gold and silver are maintained at a parity at the ratio of $15\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, and the Bank of France exercises the option, and pays in whatever coin it desires. If the bank officials think that an attempt is being made to secure too much gold for export, they refuse to pay in gold, or offer to pay part in gold and part in silver. By thus exercising the option they are able to protect their gold reserve, and they do not raise a doubt as to the good faith and honest intention of the government, nor do they create a suspicion of the solvency of either the country or the bank. Instead of strengthening silver by using it as full legal tender standard money, Mr. Cleveland constantly discredited it and discriminated against it.

Mr. Cleveland does not think for himself on the money question. He accepts the ready-made opinion of the money changers and permits them to do his thinking for him. Whatever they want done is, in his opinion, "manifestly" proper, and with him it is "hardly necessary to say" that what they want done should be done.

It has been currently reported that Mr. Cleveland's first secretary, Mr. Manning, prevented a raid upon the treasury gold by announcing that he would pay in silver if the financiers attempted to draw out gold. The threat was sufficient and it raised no doubt as to the government's intentions, and it created no suspicion of insolvency.

Mr. Cleveland describes with some minuteness his struggles to keep gold in the treasury, and there is a refreshing innocence in his narration of the way in which the purchasers of bonds drew from the treasury the gold with which to pay for the bonds. It is difficult to understand how any one with sense enough to save him from incarceration in an institution for imbeciles would permit the withdrawal of gold for the express purpose of purchasing bonds that were issued to obtain gold. And yet Mr. Cleveland, in a really serious vein, explains that the treasury was depleted by the purchasers of bonds, and that it was for this reason that he stipulated in the Rothschild-Morgan contract (the contract was drawn by his former law partner, Mr. Stetson, and gave a large profit to Morgan, Belmont and Rothschild) that at least half of the gold purchased with the bonds should be imported. This, however, was no real protection, because it simply enlarged the circle without at all breaking that circle. The papers at the time reported some amusing instances. In one case a bond buyer presented some greenbacks and Sherman notes and called for the gold with which to pay for his bonds. They told him at the sub-treasury office in New York that he could not make the exchange in the building, so he had to cart the gold across the street to his office, and then cart it back again, and he complained that he was thus put to the expense of carting both ways. His protest was a reasonable one, for if the government would let him draw out gold and take it across the street to his office, and bring it back and deposit it in payment for bonds issued for the sole purpose of securing gold, why would not the government let him make the exchange in the room?

In explaining the Morgan-Belmont-Rothschild contract, Mr. Cleveland says that he could have sold gold bonds on terms

that would have netted the government \$18,000,000 more than the coin bonds did, and yet in spite of the fact that the purchasers of the bonds charged \$18,000,000 difference between coin and gold bonds, Mr. Cleveland has always insisted that the bonds should be paid in gold. In other words, after the bond-holders had charged for the risk, they were to be saved the risk and given the amount charged as a gratuity.

Mr. Cleveland says that while the bonds sold under the contract were sold at a lower rate than bonds sold at auction, he believes that the government got an advantage equal in value to the difference paid, in that Morgan and Belmont were able to regulate the rate of foreign exchange and lessen the depletion of the treasury. In other words, he charges that the government was in a helpless condition and had to hire two financiers, at a high price, to take care of its interests, and he admits that he preferred to hire Morgan and Belmont rather than exercise the rights conferred upon the administration by law, namely, the right to redeem coin obligations in silver.

In addition to misrepresenting the law and the consequences of silver redemption, in addition to defending the Morgan-Belmont-Rothschild contract, he deliberately covers up one of the most reprehensible acts of the administration in connection with the bond sales. In describing the issue of the last \$100,000,000 of bonds, Mr. Cleveland conceals a part of the transaction, and that, too, the part which aroused the fiercest criticism. It will be remembered that he had first entered into negotiations with Mr. Morgan, and made a tentative agreement with him, by the terms of which Mr. Morgan was to take the bonds at about \$1.05. Mr. Morgan started out to place the bonds, and the terms of the agreement leaked out. Such an uproar followed that Mr. Cleveland was finally coerced by public opinion into calling for bids for the bonds. Just before the bids were opened Mr. Morgan put in a bid for \$1.10 and a fraction—\$5,000,000 above the price that he was to have paid for them had he taken them at private sale. Here was a difference of \$5,000,000 in his bid, and it could only be explained in one of two ways—either he knew the bonds were worth \$1.10, but used his influence with the administration to get

them at \$1.05 (a thing neither creditable to him nor to the intelligence of the president), or he was mistaken as to the value of the bonds. Was he ignorant of the actual value of the bonds? Did he make a mistake of \$5,000,000 in his own favor, or, as is probable, did he know the value of the bonds, and try to make \$5,000,000 out of his influence with the president? Mr. Cleveland not only passes over in silence his negotiations with Mr. Morgan, but he gives himself full credit for the public sale of the bonds. He says:

“Though our resort to the expediency of purchasing gold with bonds under contract had been productive of very satisfactory results, it by no means indicated our abandonment of the policy of inviting offerings of gold by public advertisement.”

And again:

“We had not lost our faith in the loyalty and patriotism of the people, nor did we doubt their willingness to respond to an appeal from their government in any emergency.”

As the denunciations which he received and merited for his attempt to make private negotiations with the Morgan syndicate drove him from his purpose, it is scarcely possible that he could have forgotten it, and his failure to make any reference to it shows that he is not attempting to give a history of the transaction, but is advancing a purely personal and partisan defense, in order to relieve himself of the blame that has justly been placed upon him. What must we say of the ethics of such an attempt? To what an extremity is he driven when he resorts to so one-sided, so incomplete, and so unfair a statement of his infamous part in the notorious bond deals?

If it is necessary to redeem greenbacks and Sherman notes in gold in order to maintain the credit of the country, then it is equally necessary to redeem silver dollars in gold for the same purpose, and if silver dollars are redeemed and then re-issued, we have an endless chain longer than the endless chain on account of which he issued bonds. If we are to have bi-metallism, the debtor must have the option whether the debtor be an individual or the government. On no other basis is bi-metallism possible. Any departure from this doctrine involves the government in endless difficulty. If the holder of

an obligation has a right to dictate the coin of payment, the silver dollar can be used as effectively as the greenbacks and the Sherman notes were to force an issue of bonds. In other words, the nation's debt will not be determined by the will of the people, or even by the will of those in authority, but by the will of the financiers, who are permitted to dictate terms to the government.

Mr. Cleveland does not mention the fact that a part of the money received for the bonds was used to pay current expenses, and that some bonds might have been necessary even if the financiers had not attempted to raid the treasury. When Mr. Harrison went out of office the treasury was practically empty, and the decision of the supreme court holding the income tax unconstitutional, left a deficit in the revenues of the government, but this omission on the part of Mr. Cleveland is not material. With the present manner of running the treasury department the financiers can increase the bonded debt at any time by drawing upon the gold reserve, and then demanding bonds. And if the Aldrich bill is passed authorizing the deposit of all the government surplus in the banks, we need not be surprised to see the banks forcing new issues of bonds from time to time and then borrowing back at a low rate of interest (or without interest) the surplus thus accumulated by the government.

Mr. Cleveland was the willing tool of the financiers. Elected by the people, he became the servant of Wall street. The treasury was made an asset in the hands of private individuals, and while the people at large bore the burden of his maladministration of the treasury, his party bore the odium of his conduct. And now, without showing any regret or repentance, he emerges from the obscurity to which his administrative acts consigned him, to defend his indefensible record and to excuse his inexcusable course. Not satisfied with defeating his party in two campaigns, he seeks to bind the party again to the policy of his malodorous administration.

And while he is posing as the party's "guide, philosopher and friend," he continues to assail with insult and inuendo the majority of the party that cast him out in order to save the

party's integrity. In this article he quotes from his message, and then remarks: "Perhaps it should not have been expected that members of congress would permit troublesome thoughts of the government's financial difficulties to disturb the pleasant anticipation of their recess." And in another part of his article he says: "Quite in keeping with the congressional habit prevailing at that time, the needed legislation was refused, and this money was not saved."

It must be remembered that the democratic party was in power in both the senate and the house, and this reflection upon the "habit" of congress is a reflection upon a democratic congress whose greatest sin, in his eye, was its refusal to follow him blindly in the carrying out of republican financial schemes.

It is fortunate for the loyal democracy that Mr. Cleveland has written his article, for it shows to what pettifogging the chief of the reorganizers can resort when he tries to cleanse his hands of the spot made by the handling of the finances of the government. He concludes his article by saying:

"I have attempted to give a detailed history of the crime charged against my administration which issued bonds of the government in time of peace. Without shame, and without repentance, I confess my share of the guilt; and I refuse to shield my accomplices in this crime who, with me, held high places in that administration. And though Mr. Morgan and Mr. Belmont and scores of other bankers and financiers who were accessories in those transactions may be steeped in destructive propensities, and may be constantly busy in sinful schemes, I shall always recall with satisfaction and self-congratulation my collusion with them at a time when our country sorely needed their aid."

There are two degrees of vice. Those take the first degree who yield to temptation, but retain enough conscience to be ashamed of their sins. The second degree is conferred upon those who are proud of their viciousness. Mr. Cleveland seems to be aspiring to the highest honors of the second degree. He is proud of his part in the bond transactions which were so largely instrumental in driving his party out of power, dividing its councils, and turning the government over to a

republican administration—and that, too, to a republican administration that has indorsed all that he did that was bad and carried the policies of plutocracy to still greater extremes.

TARIFF QUESTION IN 1896 AND 1900

Replying to Mr. Bryan's criticism of the New York platform, the *New York World* maintains that the platforms upon which Mr. Bryan was a candidate were evasive on the tariff question. The *World* explains:

"Mr. Bryan's own Kansas City platform said on this point: 'We condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust-breeding measure, skilfully devised to give the few favors they do not deserve and to place upon the many burdens which they should not bear.' Not a word, it will be observed, to show what sort of tariff the Kansas City democracy wanted. Merely a condemnation of the Dingley law—the McKinley tariff might have been restored in entire consistency with this declaration.

"Mr. Bryan's explanation of his failure to be any more explicit at this time was that the party needed the votes of protectionist silver republicans. Yet he talks about 'bunco games' and 'a dishonest platform fit only for a dishonest party.'"

The *World* failed to quote two very important paragraphs in the Kansas City platform.

Not only did that platform "condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust-breeding measure, skilfully devised to give the few favors which they do not deserve and to place upon the many burdens which they should not bear," but it also declared that "tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free lists to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection."

The Kansas City platform further said: "We reaffirm and indorse the principles of the national democratic platform, adopted at Chicago in 1896."

The Chicago platform said: "We hold that tariff duties should be levied for the purposes of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country, and not discriminate between classes or sections, and that taxation

should be limited by the needs of the government, honestly and economically administered." The Chicago platform denounced the proposition of the republicans to restore the McKinley law, and declared that that law "enacted under the false plea of protection to home industry, proved a prolific breeder of trusts and monopolies, enriched the few at the expense of the many, restricted trade and deprived the producers of the great American staples, of access to their natural markets."

While it is true that in 1896, as in 1900, the tariff question was not a conspicuous issue, and while the Chicago platform objected to "any agitation for further changes in our tariff laws, except such as are necessary to meet the deficit in the revenue caused by the adverse decision of the supreme court on the income tax," the party did not abandon its time-honored position on the tariff question in either 1896 or in 1900. Nor were these platforms evasive upon the tariff question. It is absurd to say that the democratic position was evasive in 1900 with a platform that denounced the Dingley law, promised the amendment of the tariff laws by putting the products of trusts upon the free list to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection and reaffirmed the platform of 1896 in which platform it was plainly said: "We hold that tariff duties should be levied for the purposes of revenue."

TRY IT

In an editorial entitled "The Coal Companies and the Law," the *Wall Street Journal* seems to undertake to make it appear that it is impossible for the people to obtain relief from the exactions of this trust through the enforcement of law. The *Journal* says:

"There is no law in the world that can prevent individuals from refusing to fight with each other. No law could make Mr. Morgan, at the head of the Northern Pacific, fight with Mr. Hill, at the head of the Great Northern, if neither wanted a quarrel. We do not believe that any law can force the presi-

dents of the coal-carrying companies to inaugurate a policy of sharp competition, if they do not want to do so. What has really occurred in the coal industry is a thorough realization of the various interests of the profitable possibilities that lay in common action and avoidance of competition. We doubt that the law can reach the so-called 'coal trust,' although as far as the average man is concerned, it is in effect at least as much of a 'trust' as any combination existing today."

There is one statute that, when vigorously enforced, has sufficient power to bring the most arrogant monopolist to his knees. That is the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law.

The exactions of a trust are the work of individuals and just so long as men love personal liberty, just so long as men fear prison bars, the criminal indictment will be a potent weapon in a campaign seriously waged against these powerful law breakers.

Mr. Morgan and Mr. Hill may not want to quarrel with one another; but if they knew that when they conspired against the lives of the people they would be held strictly to account, even as is the case with the humblest law-breaker, they would be very slow in inviting a quarrel with the people. The presidents of the coal carrying companies may not take kindly to "a policy of sharp competition," but if they knew that a conspiracy on their part against competition would take them to a prison cell, they would be very likely to look at the matter in an altogether different light.

The men in authority might, at least, undertake the experiment of enforcing the law. Until the experiment has been made vigorously and sincerely, until these influential law-breakers are made to understand that they cannot trifle with the people, no one is justified in expressing doubt as to the possibility of the law reaching the coal trust.

EQUIPPING A COUNTRY HOME

Mr. Bryan receives frequent inquiries in regard to the best manner of providing heat, light and water for a home in the country or in a city where modern conveniences are not at

hand. The following suggestions are given as a result of his own experience.

Heating.—In his first house Mr. Bryan tried the base-burner, and found it an improvement over the open fireplace or the wood or soft coal stove, although somewhat more expensive. In his second house he tried a hot air furnace—this gave one stove to look after instead of a number, and was more economical than it would have been to keep fires in enough base-burners or other stoves to heat the same number of rooms. In his third, his present house, he uses a hot water system which he finds superior to either the base-burner or the hot air furnace. The heat is uniform and the temperature can be easily controlled.

Lighting.—His first house was at Jacksonville, Ill., and his second in the city of Lincoln. In both of these he used ordinary city gas. In his present home he uses acetylene, and finds that the light is better and the discoloration from smoke less. In fact, he has had no smoking whatever from the acetylene. As a matter of precaution the acetylene plant is kept in a cave about a hundred feet from the house. It is operated with very little trouble. The magazine holds one hundred pounds of carbide, and that lasts for two or three weeks. He uses a hundred-light plant, but acetylene plants are made of varying capacity. He has seen a three-light plant, and they are made all the way from that size up to a size sufficient to light a village.

Water System.—He uses the compressed air water tank. The tank is in the ground below the frost line, and the water is thus kept cool in the summer and does not freeze in the winter. As the water is pumped into the tank the air is compressed, forcing the water through the house. A windmill pumps water into the tank, and is so geared as to work automatically. The pressure is kept at about forty-five, and with a hose on each floor, the protection against fire is ample.

While the underground tank is usually satisfactory, it has one disadvantage—in case of a leak it is more difficult to examine and repair. Sometimes the tank is put in the base-

ment, sometimes in a cave large enough to permit an examination of the tank.

Neither the lighting plant nor the water system is very expensive, and it is possible for the farmer to have them. The water system especially ought to be introduced, because of the great convenience to the housewife where she does her own work; and it makes it much easier to secure hired help where help is desired.

DEMOCRATIC SUCCESS

The following extract from a speech recently delivered by Governor Garvin of Rhode Island is along the right line, and shows that the governor desires a real victory, not merely a chance for the party to distribute a few offices:

“What are the elements essential to democratic success? In seeking to answer this question, it should be understood that by success I mean not merely victory in the coming presidential election, but that highest success which is lasting.

“It is quite possible that we might win this election by making a bid for monopolistic support, but to defeat Mr. Roosevelt by such means would give only a temporary success, the offices gained by democrats would prove to be an injury rather than a benefit to the American people, and eventually to the party itself. It is worse than useless to have two parties resting upon the same foundation—that of special privilege. Happily the democratic party has not enough cunning to serve a monied aristocracy and at the same time lead the people to believe that it is serving them.

“In other words, the democratic party cannot succeed permanently upon dishonesty. This does not seem to be true of the republican party. In Rhode Island the republican state boss sold out the people to the principal street railway of the state, of which Senator Aldrich was president, granting all that the corporation asked in the form of irrevocable laws, fixing the state tax forever at one per cent of the gross receipts, and the fares forever at 5 cents, and yet against this

recreancy there has been no popular revolt. A similar union between the republican party and the monopolistic corporations has long existed in the nation, and the people so far have done nothing more than grumble."

DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM

Papers like the *Chicago Chronicle*, the *Nashville American*, the *St. Paul Globe*, and others which, like these papers, are owned and run in the interests of some corporation, are constantly accusing the democratic party as at present organized of being socialistic. The platforms of 1896 and 1900 have been criticised as socialistic, and those who adhere to those platforms when not described by these papers as populists, have by these papers been classed as socialists. The fact is that the socialist movement is receiving its greatest support from the greedy trusts and corporations, and from those who yield willing and unthinking obedience to the large corporations. The socialist may be defined as one who believes in the ownership and operation by the government of all the means of production and distribution. Sometimes the thing advocated is called the cooperative commonwealth. The ultimate purpose of the socialists is to so enlarge the sphere of the government as to eliminate competition, and provide for the joint production and distribution of all the products of labor through the instrumentalities of the state. It is a common error to obscure the line between the individualist and the socialist. One test is whether the person believes that competition is a helpful or a destructive force. It is also a common error to confuse the arguments in favor of municipal ownership with the arguments that favor real socialism.

If the term socialist was broad enough to include all cooperative effort in which the government engages, then the government would today be socialistic to a considerable degree. But there is a well defined line between government ownership when competition is impossible, and government

ownership for the express purpose of destroying competition. Take the case of a city water plant. The argument in favor of the municipal ownership of such a plant is not that all competition between water companies is necessarily bad, but that competition is practically impossible. A city could not afford to allow its streets to be torn up for the putting in and repair of a half dozen different water systems. And if it were willing to submit to the inconvenience, the cost of a number of systems would be a heavy tax upon the consumers, for each system would have to make a dividend upon all of its plant, including the mains that parallel other systems of mains.

Where there is private ownership of a water plant, it has been customary to secure a franchise reserving the right to impose conditions, but the tendency of a private monopoly to increase its profits both by an increase in its rates and by a cheapening of the service usually manifests itself, and the effort to correct abuses and to control franchise holding companies has resulted in most of the municipal corruption, of which there is such an abundant evidence throughout the country. There has been great growth in public sentiment in the direction of municipal ownership, and in most of the large cities the question has been so thoroughly investigated that on a popular vote a proposition in favor of a municipal water plant, a municipal gas plant, or a municipal electric plant would in all probability carry.

Following close behind the water and the lighting comes the street car service, and the same arguments that apply to water and lighting apply with almost as much force to the street car system. The streets are limited in width and it is impossible to have a number of car lines with separate tracks. The public recognizes the advantage of having a unified street car system run from some central point into various directions, with a single fare and transfers, but when this system is in the hands of a private corporation it soon exhibits all of the evils of any other private monopoly, and the tendency to have the government take charge of the street car systems is an inevitable one.

If central heating plants grow in favor, as they seem likely to, the same principle will apply, and the city will finally be constrained to take hold of it for the same reason that the city is taking hold of water and lighting, and to a less degree, of the street car lines. In doing this the city is no more guilty of embarking upon what can be properly called socialism than is the national government when it operates the postal service. At first the government established an office at which people could call for their mail, then a system of carriers was established in the cities, and the mail was taken to the door, it being found more economical for one person to deliver mail to a large number than for the people thus accommodated to go to the office for their mail. Now the same system has been applied to the country, and there is a great deal of saving of time to the farmers.

If we are to shun as socialistic every co-operative effort of the government, we must abandon our public schools, for they are distinctly co-operative. Instead of leaving education to private schools, the people of the country acting together, establish the school house and employ the teacher.

In paving streets the city indulges in co-operative effort, and in providing police protection the city engages in a co-operative work. Instead of imposing upon each person the necessity of protecting himself or of hiring a watchman, the people of the town acting through their city organization, employ their police force, as they also do their fire department.

All government is co-operative in the sense that it is an economical method employed by the people to do for themselves by joint action what it would be more expensive for each one to do for himself.

During the last few years the federal government has been conducting a series of experiments in agriculture. It tests the soil of different sections, transfers seeds and plants from one latitude to another or from one point to another in the same latitude for the purpose of ascertaining what can be cultivated to advantage. In doing this it is acting for all the people, and is doing that which could only be done at much greater expense by individual effort.

There has been considerable discussion in regard to the purchase of the telegraph lines by the government. Some years ago under President Harrison the postmaster general recommended the operation of the telegraph lines in connection with the postal system, and this can be defended by the same arguments that are employed to defend the carrying of the mails by the government.

A considerable number of people favor the ownership and operation of the railroads by the government. They argue that competition is only possible to a limited extent even where there is no consolidation of lines, for the reason that most of the towns have but one railroad, and the people adjacent to such towns are, by their very location, compelled to patronize that one road. The position of the people so situated would be tolerable if the government would prevent, as it might, the watering of stock, extortionate rates and discriminations. But instead of the government controlling the railroad corporations in the interest of the people, the corporations have too often controlled the government in the interest of the railroad stockholders and managers. The consolidation of the great lines of railroads has lessened the competition and at the same time increased the influence of the corporations over the government authorities, and these consolidations have brought many to a point where they look upon government ownership as the only relief.

Whether the government will embark upon the ownership and operation of railroads will depend not so much upon what is said about the theoretical advantage of co-operation, as upon the necessities that may arise.

The democratic party during the campaigns of 1896 and 1900 was an earnest advocate not of the government ownership of railroads, but of the strict regulation of the roads in the interest of the public.

Papers like those above mentioned, which have been active in opposing railroad regulation, are much more responsible than the democratic party for any growth that has taken place in the sentiment in favor of the government ownership of railroads, just as the financiers who defeat legislation intended to

increase the security of banks are responsible for growth of the sentiment in favor of government savings banks.

The question, however, which is doing most to make socialists is the trust question. There is no economic reason why all woolen goods should be manufactured by one firm, and all cotton goods by another and all iron goods by another, and all sugar by another, and all crackers by another. There is no reason why all the meat should be packed by one firm, and all the whisky made by another, and all the tobacco supplied by another. The trusts are organized not because of any economic necessity, but for the purpose of destroying competition and of putting the consumer at the mercy of the producer.

The democratic party attacks the principle involved, and declares that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. It favors legislation that will lay the axe at the root of the tree, and by making a private monopoly impossible, restore industrial independence, and by a revival of competition give protection to the consumer, and stimulus to the producer.

The papers which defend the trust as an economic development are the best friends of socialism. If they can make the people believe that all competition is harmful, that the trust is a natural growth and "has come to stay"—if they can make the people believe that a better article can be furnished for a less price when one producer supplies it all, and if they can further convince the public that there are no moral or sociological objections to the trust, they will have wonderfully aided the socialists, because the socialist then taking for granted what he is not able to prove—namely, the advantage of the trust—can insist that the advantage must accrue to the whole people and not to a few individuals.

In the campaign of 1896 the leading anarchists of the country supported the republican party, although the republican papers were in the habit of speaking of Chicago platform democrats as anarchists. Why did the anarchists support the republican party? Because the anarchists believed that the democratic party, by applying remedial legislation, would relieve conditions and lessen discontent, while they believed that

the republican party would aggravate conditions and increase discontent.

In 1900 the ultra socialists were more friendly to the republican party than to the democratic party, and they are today. Why? Because they believe that the republican party is friendly to the trusts, and that the trust, when firmly established, will be so intolerable as to make the people welcome government monopoly as a relief from private monopoly. For the same reason the ultra socialists sympathize with the reorganizers, who are as friendly to the trusts as the republicans are, if not more so.

Whether papers like the *Chronicle*, the *Globe*, and the *American* denounce democrats as socialists with intention to deceive, or because they are ignorant of the tendency of their own arguments, or because they have perfect confidence in the power of organized wealth to control the people under any and all circumstances, may be a matter of conjecture, but that they are helping the socialists there can be no doubt.

In advocating individualism the democratic party can consistently favor legislation putting competitors upon an approximately equal footing. Legislation limiting the rate of interest is legislation of this kind. Such legislation does not deny the right of contract, but it recognizes that in most cases the borrower and the lender are not upon an equal footing—they recognize that but for legislative protection the borrower may become the servant of the lender. So with legislation limiting the hours of labor, abolishing the sweat shop and prohibiting the employment of children.

Just as we recognize that air, which is essential to our existence, may become disastrous when it takes the form of a tornado; that water, although necessary to life, may destroy life when it becomes a flood, and that fire, which saves us from the cold may, if unchecked, consume us, so we recognize that competition, a vital principle and essential for the development of the race, may under some conditions defeat the ends of justice and humanity. But there is as much difference between an honest effort to regulate competition and make it

productive of good, and an effort to exterminate it, as there is between the labors of a physician and a hangman.

Other phases of this subject will be discussed in a subsequent issue of *THE COMMONER*. It is sufficient for the present to point out that the democrats, instead of being properly described as socialists, are in fact the truest friends of individualism. The corporation papers and the reorganizers who delight in applying the name "socialism" to Kansas City platform democracy, are in reality the ones who are advancing the cause of socialism by their servile defense of organized wealth.

PRAISE FROM THE CHRONICLE

Those who read the *Chicago Chronicle* today and who remember how much like its present editorials were its editorials of 1896, will turn with pleasure to the following editorial which appeared on Friday morning, July 6, 1900. To some this may seem an oasis in the desert of abuse, but to those who are well informed it will only show that what the *Chronicle* says is governed by the interests that it has to serve, and not by any principles or convictions. In 1900 it was trying to get back the subscribers lost in 1896 and it regarded Mr. Bryan as a "sincere" man and as an "honest" man. Now, although Mr. Bryan is defending the same platform upon which he ran in 1900, he is, according to the *Chicago Chronicle*, anything but honest and sincere. It thought that the party would go forth "with steadfast loyalty to the leader thus chosen;" it declared that "the reunited democracy should go forth to a certain and merited triumph." Now the very suggestion of that same platform, according to the *Chronicle*, rends the party in twain and insures certain and deserved defeat.

The editorial reads as follows:

NOMINATION OF MR. BRYAN

"In obedience to the practically unanimous voice of a reunited party the democratic national convention has again

placed William J. Bryan in nomination for the presidency.

"The honor is a distinguished one from whatever point of view it may be regarded.

"Four years ago Mr. Bryan, who was not then an avowed candidate, was called to party leadership in a moment of great excitement, not to say of passion, on the part of the convention. This year he is summoned with deliberation and with unanimity to the same high place.

"In 1896 his unexpected elevation, for which neither the party nor the country was fully prepared, caused dissensions among democrats which soon led to open and apparently hopeless rupture.

"Today Mr. Bryan reappears as the democratic candidate with no evidence anywhere in the organization of protest or opposition. It is true that here and there democrats may be found who would have preferred another nominee, but it may be stated with emphasis that never in the history of the party has a presidential candidate been placed in the field with greater unanimity or with more genuine cordiality on the part of his supporters.

"It is plain, therefore, that during these four years Mr. Bryan has been a growing man. He has impressed himself upon his party and upon the country. His energy, his zeal, his sincerity, have not been and cannot be questioned, even by his most implacable foes. An honest man, whose honesty is recognized and admitted, is a power in himself, and Mr. Bryan is an honest man.

"The campaign which is about to open promises to be one of the most momentous in the history of the republic. It is a good omen that the democracy is able to enter upon the contest with harmony and enthusiasm and with a leader whose ability, courage and candor are admitted by all.

"There is not much doubt that democrats constitute a majority of the electorate today. To harmonize, to inspire and to urge that majority to the polls and make it effective in the election of Mr. Bryan is now the duty of all democrats who have contributed to his splendid indorsement by the Kansas City convention.

"With this end in view, with toleration for honest differences of opinion on non-essentials, with kindly oblivion for past quarrels and with steadfast loyalty to the leader thus chosen, the reunited democracy should go forth to a certain and a merited triumph."

JUDGES ARE HUMAN

Collier's Weekly takes exception to Mr. Bryan's statement at Chicago to the effect that "it is as important to have judges who sympathize with the people as to have judges learned in the law." It says:

"When sympathy takes the place of fidelity to the law, the basis of our civilization will be endangered. The 'people' in this country are supposed to be all the people, and it is not for judges to make class discriminations. There are wrongs to be remedied—some by legislation, some by the executive departments, but the courts are to have an eye singly to what is law, if we are to succeed in government as England has succeeded."

If the editor of *Collier's Weekly* knows so little about human nature as to believe that the elevation of a man to the bench makes him wholly impartial on questions that involve great interests, his criticism of Mr. Bryan's statement can be attributed to his lack of information. If, however, as is very probable, he understands the influence that sympathy exerts upon the courts, his criticism merely proves that his own sympathies are with the corporations that are today controlling some of our judges, as well as the executive, the senate and congress.

It is a beautiful theory that the judge, when he takes his place upon the bench, purges himself of all previously formed opinions and impressions, but the decision of the Hayes-Tilden electoral commission showed that judges are as liable to bias as senators and congressmen. Will the editor of *Collier's Weekly* argue that the five judges on that commission who divided on political lines each had an "eye singly to what is law?" Will he say that the nine judges who divided five to four on the income tax each had "an eye singly to what is law?" Will he say that the nine judges who divided five to four on the question of imperialism each had "an eye singly to what is law?" Will he say that the nine judges who divided five to four on the merger case each had "an eye singly to what is law?"

There is no known way in which judicial sympathy can be entirely extracted, and as some will necessarily remain, it is important that the judge shall sympathize with the masses of the people who ask only equal rights, and not with the few who are always claiming special privileges. If the trusts make a man rich with big fees and then make him a supreme judge by the aid of a president elected by trust funds, may he not lean toward the trusts? What does *Collier's Weekly* say?

AS TO BOLTING

The men who bolted in 1896 are very solicitous just now lest some who were loyal in 1896 intend to bolt in 1904 if the party is made to represent Wall street ideas. Several statements have been made in regard to Mr. Bryan's purpose. A statement has been going the rounds to the effect that Mr. Bryan asked a citizen of Lincoln if he (the citizen) would bolt with him (Mr. Bryan) in case the Kansas City platform was not reaffirmed. The dispatch further said that the said citizen declined to make a promise to bolt, and that Mr. Bryan then had him defeated for delegate to the national convention. The story is entirely without foundation. No such conversation ever occurred, and Mr. Bryan took no part in the selection of the delegate from his home county.

This false report is only referred to to show the extremity to which the reorganizers are driven. Not being able to make their fight on honest grounds, they are constantly resorting to misrepresentation.

Mr. Bryan has refused to discuss the subject of bolting, because he believes that each individual must decide his political duty for himself, according to his conscience and his judgment, and that this decision cannot be intelligently made until the issues and candidates are presented and the citizen is able to judge the purposes and plans of the various parties.

Mr. Bryan received a letter recently from a citizen of a western state asking him to state whether he proposed to bolt

or would vote the ticket "no matter what platform was adopted and no matter who was nominated." His answer will be found below, and it states his views upon the subject. Whenever a reader of THE COMMONER sees a statement at variance with these views he may know that it is without foundation.

"My Dear Sir: Your favor at hand. While a democrat presumes that his convention will write a platform and nominate a ticket that he can conscientiously support, it is not a conclusive presumption and I do not believe that any one ought to be asked or expected to say that no matter what a convention does, he will support the ticket. For that reason I defer until the convention has acted a decision upon the course that I will pursue.

"If the rule suggested by you were the correct one—namely, that whatever the platform and whoever the candidate, the ticket should be supported at the polls, then there would be no need of a campaign, because no rule is a sound one that does not answer as well for republicans as for democrats. There is no more reason why every democrat should pledge himself in advance than there is that every republican should, and if all did, campaigns would not change a vote. If that is a correct rule, then when a party is once in power it is useless to attempt to dislodge it, because it can only be dislodged by a change in political affiliations. And then, too, you will notice that the eastern democrats never pledge themselves to support the ticket, and there is no reason why western democrats should hold at a lower value their duty to give to their country their best conscience and their best judgment at the time when action is required.

"Because eastern democrats refuse to make promises and assert their right to independent action after the convention, their opinions are now being consulted, while it is not thought necessary to consult the opinions of those who vociferously announce that neither their convictions nor their interests need be considered, but that they can be counted upon to hurrah for anything in the platform and to change their own opinions whenever the eastern democrats decide that the time has come to change. Yours truly,

"W. J. BRYAN."

DEMOCRATIC OPPORTUNITY IN WISCONSIN

The split in the republican party in Wisconsin gives the democratic party its opportunity. Governor La Follette is

making a courageous fight for two state reforms—primaries and more equitable taxation—but he is indorsing republican national policies that are just as bad as the local republican policies which he attacks. The democrats sympathize with La Follette in his state fight, but they know that it must ultimately fail because national policies will control and the policy of the party in the state must in the long run be in harmony with the policy of the party in the nation.

In 1902 the democratic party in Wisconsin attempted to defeat La Follette by consorting with the corporation republicans and the attempt failed miserably, as it ought to have failed. Now let the democrats adopt a truly democratic platform and nominate a truly democratic ticket and go out and make a democratic appeal. Let them show the people that the democratic party is opposed to corporation rule, both state and national. By so doing they will lay the foundation for a victory that will be of permanent value to the state and to the party.

MONEY IN POLITICS

The *New York World*, which is one of the strenuous advocates of Judge Parker, seems to be getting more Parkerism than it wants. It is now objecting to James T. Woodward, one of the New York electors. What is the matter with Mr. Woodward? He really represents in an open way what the reorganizers want secretly, but dare not admit. What does the *World* think of Cord Meyer for chairman of the democratic state committee of New York? Besides representing the trusts he is said to have opposed the democratic party in both 1896 and 1900. The *World* says that we have had abundant evidence of the power of money in public affairs, and it was advocating the nomination of Cleveland, who gave us a splendid illustration of the power of money in public affairs, and whose nomination today would be more pleasing to Wall street than the nomination of any republican. The following

editorial in a recent issue of the *World*, entitled "Money in Politics," shows how Mr. Pulitzer's breast is agitated with fear that the democratic party may become commercialized:

"I hope,' wrote Thomas Jefferson to George Logan, 'we shall crush in its birth the aristocracy of our moneyed corporations, which dare already to challenge our government to a trial of strength and bid defiance to the laws of our country.'

"Jefferson would have been surprised to hear that the time would come when his own party in the greatest state of the Union would put forward as its chief representative a man with no other claim to preferment than his connection with those moneyed corporations which, even in their mewling infancy, had seemed so alarming.

"The selection of James T. Woodward as head of the democratic electoral ticket is dismissed by some as unimportant, on the ground that an elector is only a figurehead. But that is precisely where its ominous significance lies. In the decay of politics appearances are the last things to be sacrificed. A commercialized party may have a popular figurehead, but a popular party will not tolerate a commercial figurehead.

"We have had abundant evidence of the power of money in public affairs. Last winter it was proposed to authorize the construction of pipe galleries in the new subways. The Rapid Transit commission, while admitting that this would be a most desirable improvement, refused to ask for it on the ground that it would be impossible to get anything through the legislature against the wishes of the Consolidated Gas company. This same Consolidated Gas company found no trouble in getting the legislature to pass a bill giving it a perpetual monopoly in the streets of New York, and in inducing a democratic mayor to sign it.

"Money has debauched Pennsylvania. It has qualified a good part of the legislature of Missouri and of the city council of St. Louis for the penitentiary. It has bought up the republican party of Delaware. It has reduced politics in Montana to a contest between copper mining companies. It threatens to rob New York and the world of Niagara.

"Yet the democratic party of New York asks a popular vote of confidence in a ticket headed by a man who represents nothing whatever but money—who never took any interest in public affairs, never came into touch with the government except to see what he could make out of it, never made a political speech or had a recorded political idea.

"Is it strange that Mr. Bryan should have a hearing when he talks about the 'money power?' Is there not a good deal

of truth in his criticisms of the men who have undertaken to reform the democracy by transferring it from his hands to those of the corporations and syndicates?"

Since the above editorial appeared in the *World*, Mr. Woodward's name was withdrawn from the ticket on account of ineligibility.

BURGLARIOUS METHODS

It is quite the fashion for the reorganizers to talk of "harmony between the factions," and about "standing shoulder to shoulder," but the insincerity of such talk becomes apparent when the methods and purposes of the reorganizers are understood. Where the reorganizers can by force or fraud secure control of the organization they proceed to disregard every rule of honesty, democracy or decency. What loyalty to democratic principles can be expected from those who deny the right of the majority to rule? What harmony can there be between those who believe in an honest fight for honest government and those whose only desire is to distribute patronage and who trample on the rights of their political associates. If the reorganizers really wanted harmony they would say: "We have been opposed to recent platforms and are still opposed to some planks in them, but we believe that republican rule is bad and we desire to join the regular democrats in defeating the republican party. We will state our views when they differ from the Kansas City platform so that the voters at the primaries can act intelligently in choosing delegates. If a majority indorse our views we shall be glad to go as delegates and will carry out the instructions given. If the majority favor a new platform, in harmony with the Kansas City platform, it is only fair that the delegates shall be personally favorable to such a policy."

If the reorganizers had made some such an announcement they would have shown some respect for democratic methods as well as a desire for democratic success, but instead of that they proceeded by stealth, by deception, by unfair rulings and by the impudent disregard of the rights of majorities to select

delegates secretly pledged to Wall street, but whose views are unknown to the public. Wherever the reorganizers control an ambiguous platform, or no platform at all is adopted, and the candidates are cautioned not to allow their opinions to be known on any subject. It would be a reflection upon the democrats who at great sacrifice, but with great devotion supported the ticket in recent years to say that they could work harmoniously with the men who, openly boasting of their desertion in 1896, employ burglarious methods to secure control of the party organization and who hope in the same way to secure the offices.

SOCIETY'S PRODIGAL SON

We all know the story of the prodigal son—of his high-spirited departure from his father's house and of his disappointing career. We know how, after wasting his substance in riotous living, after being brought by hunger to a sense of his sin, he turned back and in repentance sought his father's house. We know how the father had yearned for him in his absence and how he welcomed him on his approach, forgave him his waywardness and rejoiced in his reinstatement. But this story tells of the case of a son of the blood, who first wandered away and then came back to the sire from whom he sprung. But has not this lesson a wider meaning? Society has its prodigal sons—sons who wander away, yield to temptation, sin grievously, break the laws, and finally after punishment desire to lead an upright life. What are we to do with these? Any one who has conversed with ex-convicts knows that the critical time in the reformation of the criminal is the time when he issues from the prison door and comes into contact with a cold and unsympathetic world.

Great improvement has been made in the method of treating criminals and there is still room for further improvement. There has been improvement also in the methods of employment. Instead of bringing the prisoner into competition with free labor, an effort is being made to find employment which

will make the labor of the prisoner productive and yet not cause an injury to those who must by their manual labor provide support for their families.

The employment of prisoners in agriculture has been found to be productive of good, because the employment is a wholesome one and those employed in the tilling of the soil help to produce food for themselves and others. The Good Roads movement suggests a new use for prison labor. The employment of convicts in the building of roads reduces the expenses of such an improvement to a minimum and brings the convict to the attention of the public. A man employed at this work feels that he is really conferring a benefit upon society, and at the same time feels assured that his work is not lowering the standard of living of any of his fellows.

Those who deal with the criminal should deal with him recognizing that there is in his body an immortal soul, a spark of spiritual life, a moral sense that can be quickened into a controlling influence, and the cultivation and development of the good in the prisoner ought to be the constant aim of those who are in charge of reformatory institutions. But even this is not sufficient, for the courage and hope inspired within the walls of the prison may be chilled by the distrust and suspicion met with outside. The great difficulty is that the individual to whom the ex-convict applies fears to trust him until he has given proof of his reformation. Only those who are deeply alive to the obligations of brotherhood and Christian love are willing to risk the employment of one who has been convicted of a crime. Cannot organized society give to the ex-convict an opportunity to demonstrate a change in his purpose and plan of life? Cannot the state with propriety and with benefit to itself offer an opportunity for voluntary employment for a period that will convince the world that the man is again worthy of confidence? As it is today the ex-convict is tempted to hide from his employer his previous record, and if by any means it is discovered, both employer and the associates of the employe feel that they have been imposed upon. If a man could go from the walls of the penitentiary into employment furnished by the state, he could in a

few months of voluntary labor and exemplary life make a record to which he could point as an assurance of his worthiness. He would not then be tempted to conceal his former delinquencies. He could apply for work and point to the experience that had taught wisdom and ask to be trusted, and such an appeal would find a quick response.

What is the value of a human life? Who will measure its possibilities for good? A fault however grievous, a sin however black, ought not to consign its perpetrator to hopeless despair. Sin is all too common to permit even the most virtuous to look with unfeeling contempt upon those who have most erred. While the safety of society requires the imprisonment of the offender, the welfare of society also requires that he shall be reformed and made to feel that the past, when purged by sincere repentance, is no bar to future effort. A consciousness of his wrong-doing may even spur the ex-convict to more earnest effort in the hope that he may confer upon his fellowmen a benefit that will offset the injury done by him.

In his poem, "The Man With the Hoe," Markham asks:

"How will you ever straighten up this shape;
Touch it again with immortality;
Give back the upward looking and the light;
Rebuild it in the music and the dream?"

And these questions may be asked concerning the criminal. The citizen, the patriot, the Christian, may well consider society's duty to society's prodigal son.

PLEGGED TO WALL STREET

The *St. Louis Chronicle* of last Wednesday interviewed some of the prominent bankers in attendance upon the Missouri Bankers' association. The interview will be found on another page. Attention is called to it because one of the bankers, Mr. J. M. Donald, vice president of the Hanover Bank of New York, declared that "President Roosevelt has pledged himself to the bankers of the country to accept any money standard

they may decide is the best." He also said: "President Roosevelt realizes that the standing of the country depends upon the standing of the banking interests. The banks are the safety valves of the country. He realizes that upon them and their success depends the wealth and prosperity of the United States."

Mr. L. F. Potter, president of the First National Bank of Harlin, Ia., was quoted as saying: "The financial interests are strongly for Roosevelt." However, he is willing to add: "Parker is all right and would be given the full democratic vote."

Mr. J. R. Dominick of the Traders' Bank of Kansas City, whom the *Chronicle* describes as "the only democrat among the six approached," said: "Roosevelt is a good man. He has gone along cautiously and is now considered all right by the money interests. They do not fear him." He said that as a democrat he would select Parker, but significantly added: "But we really do not want a change of administration at present. And without doubt there will be none. Roosevelt will be nominated and elected. Though many of us may be democrats and vote for a democratic nominee, still we want Roosevelt to win."

These interviews present the political situation in a nutshell. Mr. Roosevelt is satisfactory to the moneyed interests, he has secretly pledged his administration to do what the financiers (and they are the trust magnates also) want done. The financiers and trust magnates, therefore, want Roosevelt to win. However, to remove any uneasiness they would like to nominate Parker in the democratic party and then the financiers and trust magnates could divide up and feel that Wall street interests would be secure no matter which candidate was elected. Can any democrat who has the interests of his party and his country at heart favor the nomination of a candidate who, like Judge Parker, attempts to deceive the public and at the same time gives secret pledges to plutocracy?

The reorganizers are not seeking success; they are attempting to secure control of the democratic party in order to prevent any interference with republican policies.

WAITING UNTIL ELECTION IS OVER

Recently THE COMMONER printed in full the Hill bill reported to the house of representatives by the republican committee on banking and currency, and now awaiting the action of the house. It was reprinted in order that the readers of THE COMMONER may know what to expect at the short session which follows the election. The bill provides, first, that customs receipts as well as internal revenue receipts may be deposited in national banks. The purpose of this provision is to enlarge the government deposits in the national banks, and is an indirect attempt to pass the Aldrich bill. The measure would lay the foundation for a still larger corruption fund than is now obtainable.

The second provision of the bill removes the limit upon the withdrawal of national bank circulation. The purpose of this provision is to place the control of the paper money of the country more completely in the hands of the national banks and enable them to enlarge or decrease the bank circulation at will.

The third section removes the limit on subsidiary coin and authorizes the recoinage of silver dollars into subsidiary coins—half dollars, quarters and dimes. The purpose of this is to enable the secretary of the treasury to reduce the standard money of the country by converting standard silver dollars into fractional currency, which is only a limited legal tender.

Section four provides for the issuance of gold certificates in denominations of ten dollars and upwards—heretofore twenty dollars was the lowest gold certificate issued.

Section five removes the limitation upon the bank notes of the denomination of \$5. It will be seen that sections one, two, and three will have a very serious effect upon the financial system of the country, while sections four and five are intended to provide means of substituting bank notes and gold certificates for silver certificates, as the silver certificates are retired.

If the advocates of the gold standard had the courage to present their measures and submit their case to the judgment

of the public they could at least claim credit for honesty of purpose, but now as heretofore they steadfastly refuse to take the people into their confidence or to outline in advance what they intend to do. The republican leaders are afraid to pass the Hill bill before the election, but they will not hesitate to pass it after the election if the vote in November indicates that the people will tolerate any further steps toward the gold standard.

A BILL TO IMPROVE CURRENCY CONDITIONS

Reported to the House by Mr. Hill of Committee on Banking and Currency.

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section fifty-one hundred and fifty-three of the Revised Statutes be, and is hereby, amended by striking out from the first clause of said section the words "except receipts from customs," so that said clause shall read as follows:

"All national banking associations designated for that purpose by the secretary of the treasury shall be depositories of public moneys, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the secretary; and they may also be employed as financial agents of the government; and they shall perform all such reasonable duties as depositories of public moneys and financial agents of the government as may be required of them."

Sec. 2. That so much of an act entitled "An Act to enable national banking associations to extend their corporate existence, and for other purposes," approved July twelfth, eighteen hundred and eighty-two, as prohibits the deposit of more than three million dollars of lawful money during any calendar month for the purpose of withdrawing circulating notes is hereby repealed, and all other acts or parts of act inconsistent with the provisions of this section are hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. That the secretary of the treasury is hereby author-

ized, without regard to any heretofore prescribed limit of amount of subsidiary silver coinage, and as public necessities may demand from time to time, to recoin standard silver dollars from cash in the general fund in the treasury into such authorized denominations of subsidiary silver coin as he may deem necessary to meet public requirements.

Sec. 4. That section six on an act approved March fourteenth, nineteen hundred, entitled "An Act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public lebt, and for other purposes," be, and is hereby, amended by striking out the word "twenty" in the first clause of said section and inserting in lieu thereof the word "ten," so that said first clause of said section shall read as follows:

"That the secretary of the treasury is hereby authorized and directed to receive deposits of gold coin with the treasurer or any assistant treasurer of the United States, in sums of not less than ten dollars, and to issue gold certificates therefor in denominations of not less than ten dollars, and the coin so deposited shall be retained in the treasury and held for the payment of such certificates on demand, and used for no other purpose."

Sec. 5. That section twelve of an act approved March fourteenth, nineteen hundred, entitled "An Act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," be, and is hereby, amended by striking out from the second proviso in said section the following words: "except that no national banking association shall, after the passage of this act, be entitled to receive from the comptroller of the currency, or to issue or reissue or place in circulation, more than one-third in amount of its circulating notes of the denomination of five dollars," so that said proviso of said section shall read as follows: "And provided further, That the circulating notes furnished to national banking associations under the provisions of this act shall be of the denominations prescribed by law."

SUBSIDIARY COINAGE

A reader calls attention to the discussion over the purchase of silver for subsidiary coinage, and asks whether it has anything to do with the silver question. The secretary of the treasury has asked for authority to coin more half-dollars, quarters and dimes. A difference has arisen as to whether the silver for this purpose shall be purchased in the market, or secured by the melting of silver dollars. Representative Hill of Connecticut insists that the silver dollars should be re-coined, while Senator Aldrich favors the purchase of silver. The papers report that the matter was discussed at a cabinet meeting and that fear was expressed that the silver question would be opened up if any attempt was made either to recoin the silver dollars or to purchase new silver. The more outspoken advocates of the gold standard favor the recoinage of silver dollars for the purpose of getting them out of the way, subsidiary coinage being only a limited legal tender. The republicans seem to be as much afraid of the silver question as the reorganizers are. It may be set down as a certainty that the recoinage of the silver dollar is a part of the gold standard scheme and that it will be undertaken whenever the financiers feel that it is safe to undertake it.

LAWLESSNESS

The press dispatches report that some Colorado strikers have been guilty of acts of lawlessness, and the same papers report that the governor of Colorado and the military commander who is acting under him refuse to obey the courts of that state. Here are two instances of lawlessness—one by workingmen and another by officials. The governor has called out the militia ostensibly for the purpose of preserving law and order, but the evidence seems to convict him of using the military rather to advance the interests of employers in their conflict with their employes.

Lawlessness is indefensible anywhere, whether committed by poor men on a strike or by high officials in the interest of corporations. The law must be obeyed, and those who refuse to obey it ought to be taught that they are not only guilty of disrespect toward their government and toward the whole people who stand behind the law, but that they are injuring those in whose supposed interest they act. A laboring man who attempts to use force in the settlement of a strike injures himself and his fellow laborers more than any one else. Nothing so surely turns public sentiment against a strike as the employment of violence by the strikers. And so Governor Peabody, and his military subordinates, in resisting the law and disregarding the orders of the court, will injure those in whose interest they are acting.

The American people are law-abiding; they will not tolerate disregard of the law on the part of any one, high or low. And the higher the law-breaker, the greater the offense, for if those entrusted with great authority and great responsibility are indifferent to the claims of the government which they help to administer, how can individuals in the humbler walks of life be expected to show due respect for the government and its laws?

NEBRASKA'S VOTE IN 1892

THE COMMONER published a letter written by James E. Boyd (then governor of Nebraska), informing the democrats of Nebraska that Mr. Cleveland's national committee desired the democrats of Nebraska to vote for the Weaver electors, as the only means of defeating the republican electors—the object being to throw the election into the house in case no other candidate had a majority in the electoral college. As further proof that such instructions were given, the following letter is published:

North Platte, Neb., April 2, 1904:—Hon. W. J. Bryan, Lincoln, Neb.—Dear Sir: From time to time I observe that the *Chicago Chronicle* charges that you and other democrats of Ne-

braska who voted for J. B. Weaver for president were "bolt-ers." Now I was one of those, but before doing so I wrote Mr. Harrity of Philadelphia, chairman of the national committee, and asked him if Nebraska democrats should vote the Weaver ticket, and his answer was that while no resolution of that kind had been formed by the committee, yet they had talked the Nebraska situation over, and were practically of the opinion that it would be the very best kind of politics for Nebraska democrats to cast their votes for the Weaver electors. Very truly yours,

WALTER B. McNEEL.

Mr. McNeel, the writer of this letter, is the chairman of the democratic congressional committee in the Sixth district of Nebraska. His testimony corroborates the Boyd letter, although no corroborative testimony is necessary. In fact, without any instructions at all the democrats of Nebraska should have reached that conclusion, because it was impossible to defeat the republican electors with the democratic electors, and as the democrats had a majority at that time, the election of a democratic president was assured if the election should be thrown into the house, and the democrats of Nebraska would have been guilty of criminal folly if they had failed to take advantage of the only means in their power of contributing to democratic success. By following these instructions they came nearer defeating the republican electors, and the democrats of Kansas and Colorado, who received the same instructions, did succeed in defeating the republican ticket.

"RUNNING AMUCK"

Recently the *New York Times* in an editorial demanded to know why the Roosevelt administration refused to follow up its victory in the merger case. The *Times* asked: "Why does the government now falter and draw back?" and it added: "Scores, hundreds and perhaps thousands of corporations in this country are today doing business in open and flagrant violation of the law of congress just applied in all its rigor by the supreme court."

The *Times* specified:

“The railroad systems controlled by the Rock Island, the Pennsylvania, the New York Central and the New York, New Haven & Hartford companies are operated under agreements and consolidations which constitute in the several cases a ‘contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several states,’ in defiance of the anti-trust act. The violations of the law in these cases are as unmistakable as was the violation in the case of the Northern Securities company.”

Commenting upon the *Times* statement, the *Wall Street Journal* says that if the *Times* is honest in its position, it will present to the attorney general the evidence in support of this statement. The *Journal* adds:

“Will the *Times* move in this matter? Will it lay before Attorney General Knox the materials for a bill of complaint in a suit against the New York Central, for example? We do not think it will. And yet, if it is honest in its statement of the case, if it honestly believes that the law is being violated, and if it is honestly desirous that the law shall be enforced, this is an easy way of proving it.”

This is all very well, but the editor of the *Times* might reply that it is not necessarily an editor's duty to present to the law officers evidence which the officers may themselves readily obtain.

The *Wall Street Journal* maintains that the Roosevelt administration is sincere in its alleged campaign against the trusts. Why then need the attorney general wait for the editor of the *Times* to present evidence on this point? The attorney general has the facilities to investigate and congress has appropriated half a million dollars to aid him in his investigations.

If, however, the attorney general does not find it convenient to delve into the mysteries of this particular railroad organization, he might turn to the court records in the civil proceedings against the beef trust. In those proceedings the attorney general charged that a conspiracy within the meaning of the Sherman anti-trust law existed between the great packers of the country; and he presented ample evidence to support the charge.

It is admitted that the injunction proceedings have provided the people with no relief. Since those proceedings were commenced the beef trust has on the one hand decreased the prices it pays to the cattle raiser and on the other hand has increased the prices it demands from the beef consumer. The criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law remains on the statute books utterly ignored by Mr. Roosevelt's law officers.

If the *Wall Street Journal* is anxious that Attorney General Knox be presented with evidence showing the existence of criminal conspiracy, let it call upon Mr. Knox to look at the affidavits filed by his own department in the civil proceedings against the beef trust.

It is not at all likely, however, that the attorney general will give consideration to this point; and even though the *Journal* could summon sufficient courage to address the attorney general on this line, it is not likely that he would pay any attention to it. As Mr. Knox himself has said the administration does not propose to "run amuck," which, being interpreted, means that the trust magnates have nothing to fear at the hands of the Roosevelt administration.

PLATFORM OF THE NEBRASKA DEMOCRACY

Reported to the democratic state convention, held at Omaha, June 1, by Mr. Bryan, chairman of the committee on resolutions, and unanimously adopted:

We, the democrats of the state of Nebraska, in convention assembled, reaffirm our faith in democratic principles as those principles were set forth in the last national platform of the party, adopted at Kansas City in 1900.

Democracy means the rule of the people—a government resting upon the consent of the governed and administered according to the will, and in the interest of the people.

With an increasing love for the principles of democracy and an increasing confidence in their final triumph, we look upon the present time as opportune for their earnest and courageous

promulgation. With a chief executive who has disregarded constitutional limitations, stirred up antagonism between the races, employed all the powers of his office to secure a renomination and purchased political support by turning the treasury department over to the financiers and putting the law department in the hands of the trusts—with such a chief executive and with republican leaders openly and arrogantly in alliance with organized wealth, the country imperatively needs a return of the government to positive and clearly defined democratic principles. Democracy as taught by Jefferson and exemplified by Jackson is the hope of the republic and offers the only relief from the plutocracy which now dominates the republican party, and through that party, the country.

Democracy would oppose as inimical to the welfare of the people all private monopolies, and would exterminate them by the enforcement of the remedies suggested in the Kansas City platform. The failure of the present administration to enforce the existing laws or to suggest more effective laws, is conclusive proof that it lacks the desire, the intelligence or the moral courage to attack the conscienceless combinations of capital that have flourished during recent years.

Democracy would relieve the country of the menace of militarism and imperialism by following the example set by this country in its dealings with Cuba, and giving the Filipinos an immediate promise of ultimate independence. The administration of a colonial system according to monarchical principles is repugnant to our theory of government and cannot be defended without the assertion of doctrines which, if carried out, will undermine free government in the United States.

Democracy would restore the tariff to a revenue basis and administer it for revenue only, thus demolishing the legal bulwark behind which the predatory trusts have found refuge. Protection for protection's sake is an ingenious device for the exploitation of the masses by the privileged classes; it has brought great injustice to the consumers and has been the fruitful source of widespread political corruption.

Democracy would administer the treasury department in behalf of the public, not, as now, in the interest of Wall street.

It would prevent the recoinage of legal tender silver dollars into limited legal tender subsidiary coin; it would secure to the people a volume of standard money sufficient to keep pace with the demand for money; it would favor paper money issued by the government without the intervention of national banks; it would resist the attempt to establish an asset currency and branch banks, and it would oppose the loaning of government money to favorite banks—a scheme by which the people's money is employed to lay a foundation for a campaign fund and to bribe the financial interests to oppose any reduction of taxation. The present administration of the treasury department is progressively beneficial to the capitalistic class and progressively harmful to the producers of wealth.

Democracy would make taxation more equitable by collecting a part of the revenues from an income tax, secured by a constitutional amendment, and would bring the government nearer to the people by the popular election of United States senators and by direct legislation.

Democracy would strictly regulate the railroads, thus protecting farmers and merchants from excessive rates and discriminations.

Democracy would safeguard the interests of the wage-earner and the artisan by providing for an eight-hour day, by substituting arbitration for strikes and lockouts and by restoring the right of trial by jury, now suspended through government by injunction.

Democracy would secure to the surviving soldiers and sailors and their dependents generous pensions, not by an arbitrary executive order, but by legislation which a grateful people stand ready to enact.

Democracy would construct an isthmian canal without a violation of treaty obligations and without exciting suspicion among our sister republics of Central and South America.

Democracy would regard public office as a public trust, provide for an honest and economical administration of the government, and punish with severity any betrayal of official duty.

Democracy has nothing to gain from ambiguity and nothing

to fear from the light. Democratic platforms should, therefore, set forth democratic principles, policies and purposes with frankness clearness and definiteness. Those who champion the principles embodied in a truly democratic creed can appeal to the moral sense of the country, and trust for vindication to the awakened conscience of an intelligent and patriotic citizenship.

The delegates chosen by this convention to the democratic national convention are hereby instructed to vote as a unit on all questions, provided that the unit rule may be suspended by a majority vote of the delegation.

Separate resolution introduced by Hon. Edgar Howard and also unanimously adopted:

“The democracy of Nebraska heralds to the democracy of the nation its steadfast respect for, confidence in, and loyalty to Nebraska’s great champion of pure democratic principles, and bids him God-speed in his splendid efforts to prevent the national organization from falling under the baneful control of the enemies of the real democracy.”

“WOODMAN, SPARE THAT TREE”

In presenting the platform as chairman of the resolutions committee, Mr. Bryan said:

I respond to the call for a speech, not because it is necessary to say anything in defense of this platform, but because I am always glad to speak to the democrats of Nebraska.

This platform, unanimously reported by your committee and so cordially received by the convention, is a democratic platform. It is brief and concise, but so clear and easily understood that “he who runs may read.” Your committee recognizes, as you recognize, that the supreme issue running through the minor questions is the issue between democracy and plutocracy, the issue between a government “of the people, by the people, and for the people,” and a government such as we have

now under a republican administration—a government of the corporations, by the corporations and for the corporations. No matter to what subject we address ourselves we find the same struggle between organized wealth and the masses. In 1892 the paramount issue was the tariff question. There the issue was between the consumers, who constitute the bulk of the population, and the producers of protected articles who profit by high tariff. In 1896 the money question was paramount and there, too, the issue was between the masses of the people who desire a stable currency, and the money changers, who are interested in manipulating the finances of the government for their own profit.

In 1900 the paramount issue was imperialism, and in this the same contest between plutocracy and democracy was apparent. Imperialism disregards the right of the Filipinos to self-government and it also disregards the right of the people of this country to a government administered in behalf of the people at large, for the expenditure of enormous sums on the army and on the navy, and for carpet-bag government in the Philippines, is not in the interest of the voters of America, but in the interest of the syndicates that exploit the islands and in the interest of the few who will find official position there.

So with the trust question, which is growing into greater and greater importance, the issue is between corporate wealth, organized in the form of monopoly, and the people who are the victims of extortion and whose sons are denied the hope of independence in the industrial world. The controversy between labor and capital distinctly involves this issue. In fact, you may turn in any direction, you may consider any subject you like, and you cannot avoid this issue between the man and the dollar. The democratic party takes the side of the man.

Those who have faith in the righteousness of democratic principles and faith in the intelligence and patriotism of the people, are glad to make their principles known, because they believe that the better the principles are known the stronger they will become with the people. The Nebraska platform

speaks the honest convictions of democrats who have faith in the persuasive power of the democratic principles to which they adhere.

The platform presented to you reaffirms faith in the fundamental principles of democracy, and those principles are dear to the hearts of Nebraska democrats. If I were an artist I would draw a picture which would represent the present situation. It would be a picture of a tree; upon its trunk I would inscribe "Democracy." Upon the various branches of the tree I would inscribe "Anti-Monopoly," "Anti-Imperialism," "Tariff Reform," "Bimetallism," "Labor Legislation," "An Income Tax," "Popular Election of Senators," "Direct Legislation," etc. I would represent Wall street in the act of cutting the tree down, using reorganization as the ax. The Kansas City platform democrats, nurtured in the democratic faith, revering the democratic creed as the gospel of free government, and strong in their confidence in its ultimate triumph—these I would represent as a man ready to protect the tree, and I would have this representative of militant democracy entering his protest in the words of the poet—

"Woodman, spare that tree,
Touch not a single bough;
In youth it sheltered me,
And I'll protect it now."

There never was a time when democratic principles were more necessary or when the defenders of the faith had more reason for earnestness and courage. The democrats of Nebraska who for so many years adhered to their principles in the face of overwhelming defeat, are not disposed to surrender now no matter what others may do. They believe that both principle and expediency demand progress rather than retrogression.

When Mr. Bryan was elected by acclamation as a delegate to the national convention, he was called out again, and in thanking the convention for honoring him, said:

"I felt complimented when my precinct selected me as a delegate to the county convention; I felt complimented again

when my county sent me a delegate to the state convention, and I appreciate the honor you do me in making me a delegate to the national convention. I shall endeavor to carry out the wishes that you have expressed, and I have such confidence in the intelligence and patriotism of the voters of the party that I believe that when their representatives meet at St. Louis they will be able to write a platform and select a ticket which will command the support of those who believe in democratic principles as you understand them."

A POPULAR PLATFORM

Do the leaders of the New York democracy know what is popular in New York? The *La Crosse* (Wis.) *Leader-Press* directs attention to the democratic vote cast in New York for 1892 and for every state election thereafter until 1902, as follows:

| Year. Democratic candidate. | Total Dem. vote. |
|------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1892—Cleveland, president..... | 654,868 |
| 1894—Hill, governor | 517,710 |
| 1896—Bryan, president | 551,369 |
| 1897—Parker, court of appeals..... | 554,680 |
| 1898—Van Wyck, governor..... | 643,921 |
| 1900—Bryan, president | 678,386 |
| 1902—Coler, governor | 655,398 |

The *Leader-Press* says that at only two of these elections—1892 and 1897—were the democratic candidates successful and that in 1900 the democratic nominee for president received the largest vote cast during a decade for any candidate. In other words, in 1900 the democratic national ticket received 23,518 votes more than Mr. Cleveland received in 1892; 160,000 more than Mr. Hill received in 1894 and 123,000 more than Mr. Parker received when he was elected to the bench in 1897.

Do these figures indicate that the Kansas City platform is unpopular?

Can New York democrats improve the chances of success by repudiating that platform?

SIX-YEAR TERM

An organization known as the National Business League, with headquarters at Chicago, is attempting to secure a change in the constitution that will, first, extend the president's term to six years, and, second, make the president ineligible to re-election. The resolutions adopted by the executive committee place the emphasis upon the extension of the term, rather than upon the making of the president ineligible to re-election.

The editor of *THE COMMONER* has for a number of years urged a constitutional amendment which would make the president ineligible to re-election. He introduced a resolution when a member of congress proposing such an amendment, and in both of his campaigns announced his fixed purpose, if elected, not to be a candidate for re-election.

The arguments against the ineligibility of a president are numerous and strong, and there is no very weighty reason in favor of eligibility. The country is well supplied with men entirely competent, and it can never be said that the country depends so completely upon one person that his failure to be re-elected would materially endanger the country. On the other hand, we have time and again seen a presidential administration devoted largely, if not entirely, to the securing of a renomination and election. The present administration is an excellent illustration of this. From the time of the president's entry upon his official duties, as a result of the deplorable death of President McKinley, he has been planning his nomination to the detriment of the public service. Surely one entrusted with the great responsibilities of chief executive ought to find honor enough in one term and be willing to devote himself exclusively to the discharge of the duties of his office.

Self-interest is so disturbing a factor that we are careful to exclude it in trials by challenging any judge or juror who has an interest in the result. The same principle would lead us to free from selfish bias the chief executive who must decide upon so many grave questions.

But why should the term be lengthened? Four years are enough for a good president to accomplish a great deal, and six years would enable a bad president to do much harm. Counting thirty-three years as a generation, a four-year term would only permit the honoring of eight men in one generation, while with the six-year term six presidents would more than cover a generation.

The argument that a presidential election interferes with business is the same argument that is advanced in behalf of a monarchy—namely, that as there is no change in administration business is less disturbed by election than in republics. There is a plain and obvious answer to the arguments based upon the disturbance of business. Business is only disturbed by presidential elections because the government has been used to help certain branches of business at the expense of other branches of business. It is perfectly natural that industries dependent upon legislation should be disturbed by the prospect of a withdrawal of special privileges, but the remedy is not to be found in lengthening the presidential term (to elect a president for life would cause less disturbance of business than to elect him for six years), but to keep the government out of class legislation and make it a government “of the people, by the people, and for the people.”

It will be noticed that the Business League emphasizes the influence of elections upon tariff and finance. The manufacturers and the financiers are the ones who have been riding the government to death and who resent any interference with the favoritism which they have engrafted upon the government. It is true that elections will disturb business as long as the government is used as a private asset in business affairs, but with the government confined to its legitimate functions and legislating for the public at large rather than for special interests, there would be no reason for the disturbance of business by a presidential campaign. *Public Opinion* is quoted as citing the decline in the sales on the stock exchange during presidential elections as evidence of the disturbance of business. If gambling was eliminated from the stock exchange and legislative aid withdrawn from the great corporations that

have been thriving upon favoritism, the business of the stock exchange would be reduced to a legitimate basis and a presidential contest would not disturb quotations.

But speaking of changing the presidential term, why not change the date of inauguration? It occurs at the worst season of the year, when the weather is nearly always bad. If the presidential term began in May instead of March, the weather would be better and the president would have two months more time to prepare himself for his official work. Then, too, the sessions of congress should be changed so that the new member of congress would begin his duties with the inauguration of the president and not, as now, wait thirteen months. The second session could be made to commence in time to complete its work before the fall election. It is a great mistake to have a session of congress after a congressional election, for a great many members of congress go out at the end of each term, and some of the retiring congressmen are not as careful about their votes as they are when they are being watched by their constituents. Then, too, if anything bad is done at a session just following the election, the resentment is sometimes softened by time, and experience has shown that many measures are rushed through at the short session which would not be undertaken at a session held prior to the election. An amendment making the president ineligible to reelection, fixing his inauguration for May 4th, providing that the first regular session of congress shall be held on the 4th of May and the second on the 1st of January, would produce good results and give added protection to the public.

PREPARING FOR HARD TIMES

The locomotive firemen of the New York, New Haven & Hartford railroad recently invited the officers of the road to dinner. Percy R. Todd, one of the vice presidents of the road, is reported to have said during the course of his remarks:

“I want to say that there are many indications now that for the next few years hard times are ahead. Business is falling

off everywhere. It would be well for your committee to remember that and to reckon with it in asking consideration of claims from the company."

If, as Mr. Todd says, the indications point to hard times, what is going to become of the prosperity argument which the republican party has been employing so diligently? If business is falling off everywhere, how are they going to whoop it up for the full dinner pail? It will be noticed that he does not say that the hard times will last a few months (during the campaign), but he predicts hard times for the next few years.

The press dispatches report a large number of men discharged during the last few months, and we are told that clerks are being discharged in New York because business is dull. What can all this mean? Did not the people buy prosperity at an enormous price? Did they not elect a republican administration for the express purpose of getting prosperity? Did they not turn down free silver, reject tariff reform, swallow imperialism and risk private monopolies just for prosperity? When a man sells his birthright for a mess of pottage he ought to be careful that the pottage does not get away. It looks as if the republican leaders were unable to deliver the goods sold. How can men out of employment be expected to wear yellow hats and march in sound money parades? How can they be expected to hurrah for the republican party with the trusts raising prices and discharging men? Verily, the republican party will have a rocky road if "for the next few years hard times are ahead."

BREAD-LABOR

Count Tolstoy, the great Russian philosopher, in an essay entitled "Industry and Idleness," indorses the theory of "Bread-Labor" presented some years ago by a Russian named Bondaref. "The Agriculturist's Triumph," is the name of Bondaref's work and he declares: "It is physically impossible that true religious knowledge, or pure morality, should exist

among any classes of a nation who do not work with their hands for their bread." Tolstoy declares that this is an absolute law, "the infringement of which involves ills and sufferings and the observance of which is demanded of us by God, or by Reason, as Bondaref expresses it." Tolstoy explains that Bondaref's rule does not demand "that every man should absolutely put on peasant's shoes and follow the plow, though he says that would be desirable and would liberate people sunk in luxury from the delusions that torment them," but he represents Bondaref as saying that every man should consider "the duty of physical labor—of direct participation in those labors of which he enjoys the fruits—as his first, chief and indubitably sacred obligation, and that people should be brought up to recognize that duty."

So strong an impression has Bondaref made upon the mind of Tolstoy that the latter declares that Bondaref's work "will survive all other works described in this dictionary (a dictionary of Russian authors), and have more effect on the people than all the other books mentioned in it put together." He gives the reason for this as follows:

"And the reason for my conviction is, that just as there are an innumerable quantity of false paths that lead nowhere and are therefore unnecessary, but only one true path that leads us to our aim and is therefore necessary, so also there are an innumerable quantity of false, unnecessary thoughts, but only one true and needful thought, or, rather, direction of thought, and that true and needful direction of thought in our time has been expressed by Bondaref in his book, with a force, clearness and conviction with which no one else had expressed it. Therefore the many works that now seem so important and necessary may vanish completely and be forgotten; but what Bondaref has said, and that to which he has called men, will not be forgotten—for life itself will bring men more and more to see the force of his statements."

In this essay ("Idleness and Industry"), one of his greatest, Tolstoy elaborates and defends this theory. Among the reasons given by him in this essay and elsewhere attention is called to three. First, that if one throws upon others the drudgery of life, the production of food and clothing, while he does some more pleasant labor, he never can be quite sure that

he is supporting himself. Tolstoy argues that human nature is so constituted that each one is apt to place a high estimate upon his own work, and the more so if this is an easy and pleasant work. In deciding, therefore, what compensation is to be exacted, one is biased in his own favor, and is apt to measure his contribution at a high price while measuring at a low price the coarser work done by others.

The second reason is that bread-labor equalizes all "and clips the wings of luxury and lust." "One cannot plough," says Tolstoy, "or dig wells dressed in fine clothes with clean hands. Work at one sacred occupation common to all would draw men together." He adds that bread-labor "will restore reason to those who have lost it by standing aside from the life natural to man and will give happiness and content to those engaged in work undoubtedly useful and appointed by God himself, and by the laws of nature."

Luxury destroys the body, weakens the mind, and undermines the morals. If bread-labor—a constant participation in the primary struggle with nature—will rid the world of luxury, then assuredly Bondaref deserves the eulogy pronounced upon him by Tolstoy.

The third reason given in support of the theory of bread-labor is that it closes the gulf between the various classes of society and brings people into sympathy with each other. Tolstoy declares (and can the truth of the declaration be doubted?) that lack of sympathy between man and man is the tap root of most, if not all, of our social troubles. If there existed everywhere fellowship, friendly interest and a genuine brotherly love, men would not cheat each other, they would not steal from each other, they would not oppress each other, they would not do injustice to each other. Neither would they be indifferent to each other's welfare, or to the welfare of each other's children. It is not sufficient that one's ancestors should have toiled; it is not even sufficient that one should have himself toiled at some time in his life. Some of the worst taskmasters have been men with a recollection of former servitude. It is necessary that there shall be such a constant and permanent acquaintanceship with labor that one may be able to

understand its fatigues and thus appreciate the necessity for rest and recreation.

Tolstoy regards love as the great instructor. He insists that love will guide the mind aright. He criticises those who devote themselves to entertaining the rich while the poor die of hunger, and in the presentation of this criticism uses language which shows his aptness in the use of illustrations. He says:

“As the spring cannot question where its waters are to flow—upwards, splashing the grass and the leaves of the trees, or downwards to the roots of the grass and trees—so a believer in the teaching of truth cannot ask what he must do first—whether to teach people, defend them, amuse them, supply them with the pleasures of life, or save them from perishing of want. And just as water from a spring flows along the surface and fills ponds and gives drink to animals and men, only after it has soaked the ground, so a believer in the teaching of truth can serve less urgent human demands only after he has satisfied the primary demand; has helped to feed men, and to save them from perishing in their struggle against want. A man following the teaching of truth and love not in words, but in deeds, cannot mistake where first to direct his efforts. A man who sees the meaning of his life in service to others can never make such a blunder as to begin to serve hungry and naked humanity by forging cannon, manufacturing elegant ornaments, or playing the violin or the piano.”

He concludes his essay with an eloquent appeal for human brotherhood. No one can read this appeal without catching a glimpse of the spirit of Tolstoy, and when this spirit is understood it is easy to understand how Tolstoy has touched the heart of the world. He says:

“Go to the bottom—to what seems to you the bottom, but is really the top—take your place beside those who produce food for the hungry and clothes for the naked, and do not be afraid; it will not be worse, but better in all respects. Take your place in the ranks, set to work with your weak, unskilled hands at the primary work which feeds the hungry and clothes the naked; at bread-labor, the struggle with nature; and you will feel, for the first time, firm ground beneath your feet, will feel that you are at home, that you are free and stand firmly, and have reached the end of your journey. And you will feel those complete, unpoisoned joys which can be found nowhere else—not secured by any doors nor screened by any curtains.

"You will know joys you have never known before; you will for the first time know those strong, plain men, your brothers, who from a distance have fed you until now; and to your surprise you will find in them such qualities as you have never known; such modesty, such kindness to yourself as you will feel you have not deserved.

"Instead of the contempt or scorn you expected, you will meet with such kindness, such gratitude and respect for having—after living on them and despising them all your life—at last recollected yourself, and with unskilled hands tried to help them.

"You will see what seemed to you like an island on which you were saved from the sea that threatened to engulf you, was a marsh in which you were sinking; and that the sea you feared, was dry land on which you will walk firmly, quietly and happily; as must be the case, for from a deception (into which you did not enter of your own wish, but into which you were led) you will escape to the truth, and from the evasion of God's purpose you will pass to its performance."

GOVERNMENT PAPER VS. NOTES

Some of the gold bug papers are disturbed because the Nebraska platform, recently adopted at Omaha, favors government paper "issued without the intervention of national banks." These papers declare that this is more populist than the Chicago platform. The Nebraska plank on the money question is in line with the historic policy of the party. The Chicago platform said:

"We therefore denounce the issuance of notes intended to circulate as money by national banks as in derogation of the constitution, and we demand that all paper which is made a legal tender for public and private debts, or which is receivable for dues to the United States, shall be issued by the government of the United States, and shall be redeemable in coin."

The Nebraska platform indorses the Kansas City platform and the Kansas City platform indorses the Chicago platform. The Nebraska platform on the question of paper money is therefore entirely in harmony with the Kansas City and Chicago platforms, and is also in harmony with earlier platforms of the party. The democratic platform of 1840 said:

“Resolved, That congress has no power to charter a United States bank; that we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions, and the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and above the laws and the will of the people.”

This platform was reaffirmed in 1844, 1848, 1852, and 1856. A great many democrats have been deceived by the reorganizers into believing that the opposition to the Kansas City platform was merely an opposition to the silver plank. The fact is that the silver plank, while it presented the paramount issue in 1896, was only a part of a larger issue, namely, the money question. If you ask a gold bug what objection he has to the Kansas City platform, he tells you that the increased production of gold has made the free coinage of silver unnecessary, and yet while giving this excuse he is just as much against the greenback as he is against free silver. Now, the issue between government paper and bank notes is not affected by the increased production of gold. If the gold bug insisted that the increased production of gold made the greenback unnecessary, his argument would at least be consistent with his argument against silver, but the volume of national bank notes has increased since 1896 so that while he is objecting to the issue of government paper he is willing to have more bank notes issued.

At St. Louis the gold bugs will oppose the Kansas City platform on the ground that it brings up the silver question, but they will be unwilling to state the party's position on the question of greenbacks versus bank notes for the reason that they are in favor of a bank currency issued by the banks and controlled by the banks, while the democratic voters prefer the greenback to the bank note. If the national bank note is issued we must either have a perpetual debt for it to rest upon, or we must have some other basis, and the other basis is the asset basis. No one who is acquainted with the situation doubts for a moment that the asset currency is sure to come if the national bank note is continued. The democratic party, therefore, must take a position upon this subject or stand convicted

of secretly participating in the scheme of the financiers to turn the note issuing function of the government over to the banks. Jefferson declared that banks of issue were more dangerous than standing armies, and Jackson, according to Thomas Benton, saved the country when he destroyed the bank conspiracy.

The responsibility of framing the next national platform for the democratic party rests upon the delegates appointed to the St. Louis convention, and they must either meet this question boldly or dodge it, and dodging would be virtually taking the side of the banks, for they work by stealth and never submit to the people any question in which their interests are involved.

The fight at St. Louis will expose the hollow pretense put forward by the opponents of the Kansas City platform. When the resolution committee meets, the representatives from the various states will find that the reorganizers are against the spirit of the Kansas City platform and against every needed reform. The issue is not so much between silver and gold as between honesty and dishonesty—between square dealing and deception.

CONSCIENCE AS A PROSECUTOR

After all, the conscience is the prosecutor from whom the criminal cannot escape. This truth has been verified over and over again. The most recent case is that of Tascott. He died recently in the Klondike country and a person present at his death makes public his last words. A prospector found him alone in a mining shack. He was safe from the officers of the law, but his conscience had kept him company for fifteen years and had been persistent in its punishment. Recognizing that death was at hand, he said to the visitor:

“I am leaving a world that I did not appreciate. I am going to ——, where I belong.”

A few moments later he summoned up strength to continue the conversation.

“I am Tascott that they have been hunting like a wolf for

years. I cannot run any more. I am getting paid for what I did. I know I am dying, and I know where I am going."

The murder of Millionaire Snell created a great sensation at the time, and as much as \$20,000 was offered as a reward, but all to no effect. Tascott was successful in eluding the public prosecutor and the detectives, but his life was a life of misery.

The relentlessness of the conscience is not often considered by those who are about to commit a crime. They see an opportunity to do a wrong which they think will result in advantage to themselves. They hope to escape the vigilance of the officers of the law, but when the act is once done the memory of it haunts them and they learn that the avenger is with them day and night. If in a moment of temptation a man falls, the best plan is to acknowledge his fault, take his punishment and then enter upon a new life.

The life of the fugitive, starting at the slightest sound and fleeing from a shadow, is less inviting than any punishment, short of death, that the state inflicts.

HILL'S SUMMERSAULT

A reader of THE COMMONER sends a quotation from a speech delivered by Senator David B. Hill and reported in the *New York Tribune* of December 5, 1891. According to THE COMMONER's informant, Mr. Hill said:

"It is politics for babies and sucklings to preach that the gold and silver question should be kept out of the presidential election. It is politics for cowards and straddlers to advise and contrive that the democratic national convention's trumpet next summer shall blow some uncertain sound."

It will be remembered that Mr. Hill was at that time a candidate for the presidency. The speech above mentioned was made only a few months before the "snap convention" which elected Hill delegates to the national convention of 1892. Mr. Hill was then advocating a bold and straightforward platform. He declared that "cowards and straddlers" only favored uncertainty. He wanted the democratic national convention's

trumpet to sound forth clear and strong. Alas, what a change! He now stands sponsor for the New York platform which did exactly what he objected to having done in 1892. His recent convention trumpet not only "blew some uncertain sound," but it blew all uncertain sound. Mr. Hill has evidently taken a summersault. The advice which he gave in 1891 is a great deal better than the advice that he is giving now. His opponents in the democratic party are today insisting just as he insisted thirteen years ago that the "democratic national convention's trumpet" shall not this year "blow some uncertain sound."

"BY THEIR WORK"

And now comes the *Long Island Farmer* and complains that Mr. Hill has placed Cord Meyer at the head of the democratic state committee, and deponent further says that the said Cord Meyer is "a representative of the mother of trusts, the iniquitous, grinding and corrupt sugar trust." And the *Farmer* further objects because Hugh J. Grant "who is a bigger trust manipulator than even Meyer, being a representative of no less than nine of them," is put on the executive committee to help run the Parker campaign. The *Farmer* suggests that Hill is out for campaign funds. It is certainly loading Mr. Parker's candidacy down to put him in the hands of conspicuous trust representatives after giving him a platform that says nothing clearly, but squints at a trust defense. The *New York Press* is another paper that calls attention to Meyer's connection with the sugar trust. The *Press* also alleges that Senator McCarren, the chairman of the executive committee of the democratic state committee, is the champion defender of the sugar trust in public life. It calls attention to the investigation which was conducted by the Lexow committee. Senator McCarren was the democratic member of the committee, and presented a minority report in which he defended the sugar trust. His report concludes: "In my opinion the presence of the American Sugar Refining company and location of its plant in the state of New York has resulted in developing our

commerce, increasing our taxable property, and benefiting our people." What kind of a fight will the democratic party be able to make against the trusts if the organization is officered and engineered by men who are closely connected with the trusts?

THE COLORADO SITUATION

The industrial situation in Colorado is unfortunate in the extreme. The conflict between the miners and the mine owners has terminated in violence on one side and military despotism on the other. On the merits of the strike, justice is with the strikers, but the lawlessness charged to them will probably destroy their hope of success. They are seeking an eight-hour day and the sentiment in Colorado is so largely on their side that a law was passed establishing the eight-hour day in mines. The supreme court declared the law unconstitutional. A constitutional amendment was then submitted authorizing an eight-hour law. This amendment was indorsed by the republican party as well as the democratic party and was carried by a large majority. But the legislature yielded to the influence employed by the corporations and failed to pass a law carrying out the constitutional amendment. What shall we say of legislators who would thus refuse to obey the constitution? What shall we say of mine owners who would secure a nullification of a constitutional provision? Here is lawlessness of the most dangerous kind, and it has been followed by a military despotism which is as harsh as the rule of the czar. The explosion which killed sixteen non-union miners was a dastardly and diabolical act. Every person in any way connected with it as participant or advisor should be given the full penalty of the law, but the crime of one, or, at most, a few men, cannot justify the deportation of nearly a hundred men against whom no criminal charge could be brought. If the men deported were guilty of violating the law they ought to have been tried and punished. If they were not guilty, it was an outrage against our form of government to carry them to the border of the state and leave them without food. Even in

Siberia the exiles have food. But in this, as in all disputes between labor and capital, the lawlessness charged to labor is denounced by all, as it should be, but the lawlessness of capital is less heard of. For this reason the laboring man who resorts to violence does his fellows an inexcusable wrong. The officers of the Federation of Miners declare that the miners are not responsible for the explosion and offer their services to help find and prosecute the guilty, but military rule continues and the corporation papers continue to place the blame on the unions.

CHURCH SETS EXAMPLE

According to the press dispatches, the Southern Methodist church of Hobart, Okla., has set a good example in returning an excess of fire insurance. The insurance company allowed the church \$1,300 for repairs, but the church found that the repairs cost only \$1,000, and returned the remaining \$300. And why not? That the incident should excite attention shows the low state of the public conscience. "The principles of right and wrong are easily discerned," says Jefferson, "and require not the aid of many counsellors." That is true. It is not lack of intelligence, but lack of conscience that causes the most alarm today. Cheating in business, cheating in politics, and corruption of government—all spring from the same source, namely: indifference to moral obligations. The Hobart church has done well, but as "darkness brings out the stars," so this incident is made conspicuous only by the fact that scrupulous integrity is not as common as it ought to be.

SHALL THE PEOPLE BE ALLOWED TO RULE?

The action of the Illinois democratic convention, recently held at Springfield, raised a question which dwarfs into insignificance the issues which have during recent years caused dissensions in the democratic party. The question raised by

the arbitrary, unfair and unprincipled action of Hopkins and his satellites is: Shall the people rule? Mr. Hopkins as chairman of the state committee and with a majority of the committee to support him selected a temporary chairman who would do his bidding and, refusing to allow a minority report to be submitted to the convention, declared his man temporary chairman. He then had a sub-committee of his central committee throw out the regular delegations and seat some two hundred delegates who had no semblance of right to sit in the convention. His chairman refused to allow a minority report to be considered, saying that it was merely advisory and would be filed for record. The chairman refused to allow a roll call on the motion to adopt the report of the credential committee. But notwithstanding the illegal seating of delegates not entitled to seats the convention was still about three to one against Hopkins as shown by the only roll call, namely, the one on the Hearst instructions, and the chairman continued to run the convention surrounded by a lot of policemen and a body guard imported from Chicago for the purpose. In the various districts enough delegates were thrown out or ignored to give Hopkins a majority of the state committee and a majority of the delegates to the national convention and on the endorsement of these delegates and committeemen by the state convention no roll call was permitted. So unjust, so bold and so outrageous was the conduct of Hopkins and his chairman that Judge Prentiss of Chicago and Mayor Crolins of Joliet declined to be candidates before the convention. It was not a convention, it was a usurpation of power by a conscienceless gang of political pirates. If the democrats of Illinois after making a successful fight at the primaries can thus be robbed of their victory what incentive is there to Illinois democrats to study public question and work for reform? The Hopkins crowd has destroyed all hope of success in Illinois this fall, but there is still a chance of appeal to the national convention and this appeal should be taken. A contest should be prepared and the voice of the democracy of Illinois should be given a chance for its life. Democracy is a mockery with a man like Hopkins in control. If he can stifle the voice of the

people this year he can do so indefinitely, and the sooner he is repudiated the sooner the party will be put on sound ground. The national convention is an appellate court to which the democrats of Illinois ought to be able to look for justice. It is alleged that the same tactics were resorted to in Indiana; if so there ought to be contests from that state also. The right of the democratic voters to control their organization is one that can not be disturbed without the demoralization and ultimate destruction of the party. That the people shall rule is fundamental.

PREDATORY POLITICS

On another page will be found an interesting editorial which recently appeared in the *Chicago Tribune*. The editorial is entitled "John R. Walsh," and more than a column in the *Tribune* is devoted to an expose of Mr. Walsh's prominence in predatory politics. It calls attention to the alliance between Walsh and the *Chronicle* on one side, and the worst elements of the republican party on the other, and shows how these mercenary democrats and mercenary republicans use both parties to increase their financial gains.

The readers of THE COMMONER know something of the *Chronicle*, and the *Tribune* editorial will enable them to better understand its purposes in making its attacks upon all that is democratic. A democracy that interferes with the plans of the Walsh combination has elements of promise in it. A democracy that is eulogized and supported by the *Chronicle* and Mr. Walsh is a democracy that does not deserve the confidence of the public generally.

THE VIRTUOUS TRUSTS

In delivering a commencement day address, William Crosswell Doane, bishop of the Episcopal diocese of Albany, said:

"I see no difference between the inhumanity of a corner in wheat or a corner in quinine and the inhumanity of freezing

the entire population of a country by a coal strike in midwinter, or of dishonoring the bodies of the dead by making their burial impossible."

Commenting upon Bishop Doane's statement, the *New York Commercial* says:

"A mighty difference that Bishop Doane might have pointed out is this: The 'trusts' and the market-corners are never found arrogating to themselves rights and privileges that do not belong to them; they never say to other 'trusts' or to other traders, 'You shall do this, you shall not do that!'; nor do they resort to physical force to compel acquiescence in their policies. The labor 'trusts,' on the other hand, are not content to keep within the law; they deny to non-union labor the right to work, to sell itself; and, when it assumes to exercise that right, they too often start in forthwith to crush or to kill it; their 'inhumanity' goes to the length of embracing riot and murder."

Is it not strange that the newspapers that orate so profoundly against the "encroachments of trades unionism" have nothing but praise for the trust system? It may be true that these trust magnates and market-cornerers never say to other trust magnates or other traders: "You shall do this; you shall not do that." It is not true, however, that these men are "never found arrogating to themselves rights and privileges that do not belong to them." If they do not resort to physical force to compel acquiescence in their policies it is because they have the people so completely at their mercy that there is no necessity for a resort to physical force.

When the coal baron and the beef trust magnate and the managers of other concerns obtain monopoly upon the necessities of life and force the people to pay for these necessities exorbitant prices in preference to freezing or starving, then these men do arrogate to themselves rights and privileges that do not belong to them. They are guilty, also, of everything which the *New York Commercial* charges against the so-called labor trust. They do not keep within the law of the land; they violate that law with impunity; they invade congress; they control political conventions; they dominate public policies; and through the power thus obtained they secure special privileges and with all of this power they crush out their feeble

competitors on the one hand and bear oppressively upon the consumers of their products.

It is strange that a publication claiming to circulate among intelligent men would have the hardihood to make the defense of trusts which the *New York Commercial* has offered to its readers.

FAITH WITH WORKS

Rev. Allan Hoben, of Waupun, Wis., who recently took the degree of doctor of philosophy at the University of Chicago, has written for the *Biblican World* a revised version of the Fourth Psalm. He has made it apply to the present time, and has written it as he thinks the inspired author would have done if he had been living today. It reads:

“Oh, God, hear me, for my faith in man is broken. The unfairness and the cruelty of trade are too much for me. My soul is stained with it, my protest is raised in vain, my nerves are shattered, and I am filled with fear. Let me away from it all—away from the strife and greed to some lone nook in the strong and kindly hills, beside the still sympathetic waters.

“Wipe out these liars of the city—this restless cesspool of sin, breeding only the soul parching fever of gain. There is no honor on the board of trade—none. Had an enemy sold me out and exulted, I could have borne it and asked no pity; but that my best friend, he to whom I uncovered my heart, a brother in the church—that he should have betrayed me!

“They are all alike. May death smite them, may the grave swallow them up, for they are only husks filled with evil. Now I have nothing left but Thee, O God, and unto Thee do I turn for my only and continual joy.

“The trust crushed me, but now that the struggle is over Thou givest blessed peace. As sure as Thou art just their day is coming. How long can a man stab his friend with impunity, break his word and cover unsparing greed with oily speech? As for me, my lesson is learned. I will cast my burden on Thee, O God; Thou wilt sustain me, and in the end I know Thou wilt establish the good and utterly overthrow the wicked. So out of the wreck of fortune I come to Thee, my Lord and my God.”

The only trouble about the Psalm is that the Rev. Mr. Hoben casts the burden on the Lord. He ought to write another psalm in which he will undertake to do his part in the work of overthrowing trusts and the combinations of which he complains. It is all very well to believe that God will establish the good and overthrow the wicked, but it is not fair for citizens to throw upon the Lord the work which they can do themselves. The trusts are creatures of law; they have grown up out of the corporations that have been organized, and it is possible for people who make the laws to destroy the trusts. A great many who ought to roll up their sleeves and go to work are relying upon the providential working out of the problems with which they have to deal.

The Bible nowhere gives assurance that people can be saved from the results of their own folly or rescued from the natural consequences of their political apathy and indifference. The people can kill the trusts whenever they get ready. If the Rev. Mr. Hoben wants something to do, he might commence at once upon the trust magnate who puts up the money for the Chicago university.

EQUALITY

In a speech delivered in the house of commons recently Mr. Balfour said: "Unfortunately, the theories of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, that all men were born equal, have been refuted in this, as in many other instances, by advanced science. Men are not born equal. They cannot be made equal by education extending over generation after generation within the ordinary historical limit."

Addressing the graduating class of Armour Institute at Chicago, Rev. Frank Gunsaulus declared: "There never was a more interesting falsehood than 'all men are created equal.' The Declaration of Independence was the work of an hour of intense excitement, and on every national anniversary this phrase is misquoted, because when it is taken from its context it is false."

It is not at all difficult for one to believe that the British premier and the Chicago clergyman are both wrong if the expression "all men are created equal" is accepted as it was used by the American fathers.

If the "theory" has been "refuted," as the British premier says it has, and if the statement is a "falsehood," as the Chicago clergyman says it is, then republican form of government is a failure; then the men who builded this nation were mere theorists and liberty is a thing to be reserved for a few men ordained of God to enjoy the best of life.

The statement, "all men are created equal," was well described by Mr. Lincoln in his speech delivered at Alton, in which he said: "I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men, but they did not mean to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say that all men were equal in color, size, intellect, moral development or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what they did consider all men created equal—equal in certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This they said and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth, that all were then actually enjoying that equality, or yet, that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact, they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit. They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society which should be familiar to all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even, though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors, everywhere."

In his speech delivered at Springfield, Mr. Lincoln said: "The assertion that 'all men are created equal' was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain; and it was placed in the Declaration, not for that, but for future use. Its authors meant it to be—as, thank God, it is now proving itself, a stumbling-block to those who in after times might

seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants and they meant, when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation, they should find left for them, at least, one hard nut to crack."

"THERE ARE OTHERS"

Referring to the selection by H. C. Frick, the steel trust magnate, of Mr. Knox to be United States senator, the *New York World* says: "Is it not a colossal outrage that three or four men who are republicans in republican states, democrats in democratic states and corporation men always and everywhere, should have the power to select in the inner office of a railway company the man who in the name of a great historic party shall represent the second state of the Union as a member of the most august deliberate assembly on earth?"

It will be admitted that that is something of an "outrage."

There is just now an effort made to persuade the democratic convention to nominate for the presidency a man who is the pet candidate of corporation men.

August Belmont, the financier whose methods have been roundly denounced by the *New York World*, is the leader of the coterie of corporation men who have undertaken to push this particular candidacy to the front.

Is it any more offensive that the trust magnates should select the man who in the name of the republican party "shall represent the second state of the Union as a member of the most august deliberate assembly on earth," than that the same influences should select a man who in the name of the democratic party is to represent all of the states and all of the people in the highest political office in the world?

And yet, while the *New York World* condemns the selection of Knox by Frick, it gives it a cordial support to Parker, the protege of Belmont.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Some one has described the republican party as like the potato vine—"the best part of it being under ground." The platform adopted last week at Chicago by the republican national convention seems to justify this description. It is devoted to reminiscence and glows with funereal phrases. The eulogy pronounced in the platform would seem immodest if it described the work of those present in the convention and, as the republican leaders are nothing if not modest, their language must be construed as referring to the dead or the absent. The pledges for the future are so meager, as compared with the praise of past achievements, that the party's attitude resembles the attitude of a prisoner at the bar who refuses to testify and relies for acquittal upon the testimony of friends as to former good character.

The most emphatic part of the platform, so far as it deals with pending issues, is that devoted to the tariff question and the language on this subject seems intended as a rebuke to the tariff revisionists in the republican party.

Republican leaders seem to go on the theory that their platforms supply the only authentic history of the country and that instead of being under obligation to recite facts they can by their simple statement create facts. Witness the gross misrepresentation contained in one sentence. The platform says: "A democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity; a republican tariff by business prosperity." Now what are the facts? The democratic tariff of 1846 was followed by an era of prosperity so widespread that when the republican party wrote its first national platform in 1856 the platform did not mention a protective tariff. Here, then, is an historical fact which shows that adversity does not always follow a democratic tariff. How about the panics of 1873 and 1893? Did they follow democratic tariffs? When the panic of 1873 occurred the republican party was in power in all the branches of the federal government and the country was in the undisturbed possession of a republican high tariff law.

Not only that, but the panic came just after the overwhelm-

ing republican victory of 1872 that put the party in position to make the tariff still higher if that was deemed necessary. Did the republican leaders forget the panic of 1873, or were they simply indifferent to the truth?

Here, then, is an historical fact which proves conclusively that prosperity does not always follow a republican tariff. But what of the panic of 1893? It came while the McKinley tariff was still in force—a year before the Wilson law went into effect. They may reply that the panic was caused by the threat of the repeal of the McKinley law involved in the election of Mr. Cleveland, but there is no force in that argument, for if the people were pleased with the McKinley law why did the democrats win a sweeping victory in 1890 and two years later defeat by nearly 400,000 votes the republican candidate who as president signed the McKinley bill?

The republican platform claims too much. It boastfully asserts that the republican party has controlled the government during nearly all of the forty-four years since 1860. It declares that the democrats had undisputed control during but two years of the forty-four (and it might have added that the so-called democrat who occupied the White house during those two years helped to elect a republican successor). Why, then, does it try to escape responsibility for the two disastrous panics which have occurred since 1860?

The platform says: "When the only free trade country among the great nations agitates a return to protection the chief protection country should not falter in maintaining it." If the writers of that platform had been entirely frank they would have said that the policy of protection in the United States has raised tariff barriers against this country in most of the countries of Europe and that retaliation against the United States is the main argument of those who advocate protection in England. So much for the tariff plank of the platform.

In discussing the trust question also the platform appeals to memory rather than inspires hope. It claims credit for republican anti-trust laws "which the democratic party failed to enforce" and declares that they have been "fearlessly enforced by a republican president." Here again Mr. Cleveland is

charged up to the democratic party. The odious record of his plutocratic administration still hangs like a millstone about the democratic party's neck. It is base ingratitude on the part of the republican leaders to seize the White house through Mr. Cleveland's treachery to his party and then use his administration as a horrible example. Only by contrast can President Roosevelt's administration seem to be fearlessly anti-trust. Shown against a black background of Clevelandism almost any color looks bright, but standing alone and judged on its merits the Roosevelt administration is anything but an anti-monopoly administration. The existence of a multitude of trusts is well known; the extortion practiced by those trusts is enormous and everywhere apparent. What is the president doing to destroy them? His friends point to the decision in the merger case, but it has not been followed up by the enforcement of the principle established by it, and the temporary chairman of the convention is one of the most conspicuous corporation attorneys in the country. The platform not only fails to promise any specific remedy, not only declares the party content with the little done by the administration, but complacently classes the trusts with the labor organizations. It says: "Combinations of capital and of labor are the result of the economic movement of the age." This is a defense of the trusts—not a condemnation. Then the platform adds: "But neither must be permitted to infringe upon the rights and interests of the people." Here again the laboring man is used as a companion piece for the trust. "Such combinations," continues the platform, "when lawfully formed for lawful purposes are alike entitled to the protection of the laws, but both are subject to the laws, and neither can be permitted to break them." As the trusts are now breaking the laws with impunity, this must be intended as a warning to laboring men only. The trusts are holding the laboring man between themselves and the fire of public opinion. As a declaration against trusts the platform is a hollow mockery—one must be anxious to deceive himself if he accepts the republican platform as offering any hope of relief from trust exactions. There are no words of encouragement for the laboring man. He is prom-

ised punishment if he violates the law, but he is offered no relief from government by injunction. He is assured that the Dingley tariff has given him more employment and higher wages, but nothing is said about an eight-hour day.

The platform pledges the party to "the peaceful settlement of international differences by arbitration," but nothing is said about arbitration between American corporations and their employes. Why is the laboring man thus ignored? The answer is easy: It is because the republican party as now organized is a party of the corporations and it acts for the corporations.

In enumerating the deeds which they regard as meritorious the writers of the platform call attention to tariff legislation, the establishment of the gold standard, the reduction of taxes after the Spanish war, the restoration of public credit, the freeing of Cuba, the suppressing of insurrection in the Philippines, the preservation of the integrity of Cuba, the preservation of the integrity of China, the securing of a canal route, the encouragement of irrigation, the reorganization of the army, the improvement of the militia, and the increase in the navy, but there is in all the enumeration no act which is declared to be in the interest of labor, although without the labor vote the party would not have a majority in a half dozen states. Even in pointing with pride to President Roosevelt's action in settling the coal strike they did not dare to indorse arbitration as a permanent method for settling disputes between capital and labor.

On the great question of imperialism the republican party announces no policy and gives no pledge. It refers to the subject and declares that the republican party has established order in the Philippines, given security to life and property and "conferred upon the people of those islands the largest civil liberty they have ever enjoyed." What a proud boast! They were subjects of a king and were ruled by arbitrary authority and they are better off under our rule than under Spanish rule! Is this all they are to hope for? Then, too, "civil liberty" has been "conferred" upon them! What a departure from the doctrines of Jefferson and Lincoln! Instead

of being a great republic holding before the world the light of self-government, we have shrunk to the stature of a benevolent despot doling out liberty in broken doses to "inferior races," assuring them meanwhile that our medicine is more pleasant to take than the medicine which they formerly received at the hands of kings!

The platform contains a plank threatening reprisals on the south if black suffrage is interfered with, but contains not a word about the right of the brown men to suffrage and a voice in their own government.

Why does the republican party run from the issue of imperialism? It is conscious that its policy violates fundamental principles; and yet for commercial reasons it is unwilling to return to constitutional methods.

It is not a truthful platform—as has been shown—neither is it a courageous platform. The republicans assembled in national convention cast admiring glances at the past, but contemplated the future with doubt and misgiving. The republican party is afraid of the trust question; it is afraid of the question of imperialism, and it is afraid of the labor question. Even on the money question it dares not outline a policy: It commends the gold standard, but is silent on the melting of the silver dollar, the asset currency and the branch bank. Only on the tariff is it bold. On this question it goes farther than any other republican convention has ever gone. A former convention favored a tariff equal to the difference between the cost of production here and abroad, but this convention makes that the minimum, while no maximum is suggested.

Will the people indorse such a platform at the polls? Not if the democrats do their duty at St. Louis.

LA FOLLETTE'S FIGHT

The national committee rejected the credentials of the La Follette delegation from Wisconsin and admitted what is called the "stalwart" delegation, headed by Senators Spooner

and Quarrels, Congressman Babcock and Postmaster General Payne. The La Follette men refused to appear before the convention committee on credentials, saying that it was "packed" in favor of the "stalwarts." Governor La Follette has announced that he will appeal to the republicans of Wisconsin, and the candidate for lieutenant governor on his ticket explains the action of the national convention by saying that the result was brought about, first, by the railroad corporations of the country; second, by senatorial courtesy, inspiring the blind following of Senator Spooner by the twenty United States senators on the committee; third, by the threats of Congressman Babcock, who dispenses the congressional campaign funds; fourth, by the postoffice clique headed by Postmaster General Payne.

Well, the governor certainly had a hard combination to fight and it is no wonder that he lost out. He has doubtless found that the corporations run the national organization of the republican party, just as but for him they would run the Wisconsin republican organization. But what is he going to do about it? He cannot hope to maintain his place in the republican party in Wisconsin with the national administration against him, neither can he make much headway against the domination of his state by the corporations so long as he excuses and defends the corporate domination of the national organization and administration. He has a rocky road before him and as there is no hope of the national organization being freed from monopoly rule, Governor La Follette must, in the end, give up his fight or leave the republican party.

In the mean time he is doing a good deal of educational work.

THE DEMOCRATIC OPPORTUNITY

President Roosevelt has been nominated and his platform given to the world.

Senator Fairbanks, his running mate, represents the Hanna

element of the party, having been, as it is believed, slated by Hanna to succeed McKinley had the latter lived out his term.

The platform and all the circumstances attending the convention commit the ticket to the plutocratic element of the country. Not a word spoken or an act done gives promise of reform. As a matter of expediency, there is no advantage to be gained by trying to outbid the republican party for the support of the corporations.

If the democratic party is to have any standing in the campaign it must take a bold and aggressive position. Its platform utterances must be clear and definite and its indictment of the republican policies must be strong and emphatic. The presidential candidate must be a man with known opinions and a record that commits him to the people's side of public questions. The republicans have nominated a ticket that stands, and stands positively, for all that is bad; the democratic ticket must stand positively for all that is good. With Judge Parker running on a cowardly, straddling platform, there would be no enthusiasm and no hope of victory.

If the republican convention had been held two months ago, Mr. Parker's campaign of silence and evasion would have made but little progress; as it is the party's hope lies in the uninstructed delegates and in the delegates instructed against Parker. If the readers of *THE COMMONER* desire to prevent the nomination of Judge Parker they can assist in doing so by writing to the delegates. Let each reader address a postal card to each of the two delegates from his congressional district and to each of the four delegates at large. Let the letters be written *AT ONCE* and addressed to the delegates at the headquarters for their state at St. Louis. Ask each delegate to use his influence to prevent the nomination of Judge Parker and to secure the nomination of a democrat whose opinions are known to be democratic.

No matter if your delegates are instructed. Your protest may be useful in preventing an attempt to repeal the two-thirds rule. Every protest sent will lessen the enthusiasm and help to turn the tide in favor of a candidate who will make an honest fight against plutocracy.

MEASURING GOLD BY ITSELF

There are a few gold bugs so ignorant of the money question that they talk about the gold dollar being unchangeable in value. It must be apparent to any one that if we measure a dollar by itself it cannot change in value, and it must also be apparent to any one that the bullion value of a dollar must be the same as the coinage value so long as the bullion can be converted into coin without cost or loss of time. In no other way and in no other sense can the gold dollar be called an unfluctuating dollar. If there is a charge for the coinage of gold, this charge will necessarily make the coined dollar more valuable than an equal weight of gold, for no person would pay for converting bullion into coin if the coin was not worth enough more to pay for the conversion.

It is also obvious that the melting of a gold coin would bring a loss to the holder if he had to pay anything to have the melted bullion converted into coin again. Even with absolutely free coinage there might be a difference between the value of the bullion and the coin unless the bullion could instantly be converted into coin. Suppose, for instance, a man needed \$100 in money and had sufficient gold from which to coin the amount of money needed; if he could instantly convert his bullion into coin he would not sell it to any one for less than the coinage value. If, however, he had to have the money at once and could not have his gold coined for a week or a month, he might sell his gold for less than the coinage value in order to get the money at once.

The difficulty with the advocate of the gold standard is that he is constantly measuring an ounce of gold by an ounce of gold—or comparing one gold dollar with another gold dollar. As THE COMMONER has already pointed out, the melting pot test is a farce and a fraud, so far as it is resorted to to ascertain an honest dollar. The test of a dollar is in its purchasing power, and that dollar most nearly approaches honesty whose purchasing power most nearly approaches absolute stability. But stability in the purchasing power of the dollar is only possible when the supply of money and the demand for money

remain in exactly the same proportion to each other. An increase in the supply of money, the demand remaining the same, reduces the purchasing power of the dollar, while, on the other hand, an increase in the demand for money, the supply remaining the same, raises the purchasing power of the dollar. As both supply and demand are subject to constant variation, it is impossible—or at least has been in the past—to secure an absolutely stable dollar.

The effort of the sincere and intelligent students of the subject has been to secure as near an approach to absolute stability as human wisdom could devise, but the editors of the gold standard papers make no effort to secure stability in the purchasing power of the dollar, and many of them seem to have no comprehension of the principles which govern in the science of money.

There has been no change in the weight or fineness of the gold dollar since 1896, and yet the increase in the production of gold, supplemented by an increase in the volume of money from other sources, has reduced the purchasing power of the dollar in the United States and raised prices. To the extent that prices have been raised by the enlarged production of gold and by other increases in the currency, the affect upon business is exactly the same as if this increase had come wholly from the coinage of silver. The gold standard advocates, who until 1896 pointed with pride to a rising dollar and claimed that it brought blessings to the country, now point to the very reverse condition, namely, rising prices, and claim that their system has been vindicated. Insofar as prices have risen as a result of an increased quantity of money, bimetallists have been vindicated and their arguments verified. It must be remembered, however, that conditions have been abnormal for several years and that this country has been receiving more than its share of the world's metallic money. There is evidence that we have already reached the summit and are on the decline. The scarcity of money is such that our banking business is not done on a safe basis. The scarcity of money is also evidenced by the fact that the banks are clamoring for an asset currency which will increase the volume of money by

the issue of unsecured bank notes, and the financiers are also demanding the Aldrich bill, by means of which more government money is to be deposited in the banks. Secretary Shaw has deposited more government money with the banks than any previous secretary, and republicans attempt to defend it on the ground that business conditions require that the money held by the government should not be withdrawn from the channels of trade.

There is also a scarcity of money in the various money centers of the world, and in spite of this fact the great financiers are even now attempting to force India, China and Mexico to the gold standard. If this effort succeeds it means an increased demand for gold that is likely to outrun the increased supply, and bring us again face to face with the evils of an appreciating dollar.

The man who says that the money question is settled ignores facts that are patent to all. Any one who understands human nature or the financial history of this country, knows that the money question is not a contest between gold and silver, or between gold and silver on the one side and gold on the other. It is a contest between the money power and the rest of the people. If the money power is victorious any financial system that can be devised will be turned to the advantage of the money magnates, and against the interests of the people. Just as our form of government, the wisest ever devised, can be made oppressive, if conducted by a few in their own interests, so the best financial system ever conceived can be converted into an instrument of injustice if administered for the selfish interests of a particular class.

The gold standard is really beneficial to comparatively few, but these few have great prominence in the business world and their representatives in the press and on the platform are continually deceiving the public and leading them away from the real issue. No falsehood is more persistently relied upon than that which presents the melting pot test as the test of honesty in the dollar, and no fundamental principle is more studiously ignored by the advocates of the gold standard than that self-evident principle that the test of virtue in money is

its stability. When one understands—and who can deny it—that that is the best dollar which changes least in purchasing power, and that stability in purchasing power can only be secured by having a quantity of money that will keep in pace with the demand for money—when one understands these principles he is able to meet any arguments which the advocates of the gold standard can present.

The dollar is not to be measured by itself, but is to be measured by other property. The advocates of the gold standard insist upon measuring the gold dollar by itself.

THE DOCTRINE OF THRONES

The opponents of imperialism assert that “it is the doctrine of thrones that man is too ignorant to govern himself.” Today the republican party is thoroughly committed to this doctrine of thrones.

In a speech delivered in the house of representatives in 1818. Henry Clay pleaded for South American independence from Spanish rule.

“It is the doctrine of thrones,” said Mr. Clay, “that man is too ignorant to govern himself. Their partisans assert this incapacity in reference to all nations; if they cannot command universal assent to the proposition it is then demanded as to particular nations; and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us. I contend that it is to arraign the disposition of Providence himself to suppose that He created beings incapable of governing themselves and to be trampled on by kings. Self-government is the natural government of man, and for proof I refer to the aborigines of our own land. Were I to speculate in hypothesis unfavorable to human liberty, my speculations should be founded rather upon the vice, refinement or density of population. Crowded together in compact masses, even if they were philosophers, the contagion of the passions is communicated and caught, and the effect too often, I admit, is the overthrow of liberty. Dispersed over

such an immense space as that on which the people of Spanish-America are spread, their physical, and I believe their moral condition, both favor their liberty."

JUSTICE THE FIRST ESSENTIAL

Just now there is considerable discussion of civic conditions, civic improvements and civic righteousness. Newspapers are publishing civic sermons and the duty of the individual to society is being emphasized. These discussions cover the observance of law and order, cleanliness in the management of a city, virtue and beauty as factors in national, civic and individual life and the best means of bringing them about. The subject is a broad one and it is impossible to deal with it briefly. There is one principle, however, which is fundamental and without which there can be no civic improvement and, in fact, no substantial civic ties. That principle is justice. The government, if it would be secure, must rest upon justice and the dealings between man and man must be characterized by justice. No stable society can be built upon any other foundation. Intelligence ought to be the handmaiden of justice, but it cannot take the place of justice. A society composed of intellectual athletes would not hold together for a day without the cohesive power of justice. In fact, without justice as a controlling influence the contest only becomes the fiercer as intelligence is increased.

Those, therefore, who are contemplating government whether from the standpoint of the nation, the state, or the city, must devote themselves to the advancement of all that is just. Force can compel obedience to unjust laws, but force cannot excite love—and love is the basis of unity. Patriotism may be invoked to stimulate heroic conduct, but patriotism is only another expression of love of country, and love of country can only be inspired by a belief in the justice of the government. Those are the best citizens, therefore, who are endeavoring to make the government so good as to deserve the love of

its people. The cleanliness of a city's streets is necessary to health and comfort, and the beauty of a city's parks appeals to taste and is an education. The observance of law and the maintenance of order are requisite to progress, and the importance of individual virtue in the citizen cannot be overestimated. But all of these together do not make a state. People may be cleanly and yet have no higher thoughts than the welfare of their bodies. People may love beauty and yet fall far short of high ideals; the law may be obeyed and order preserved and yet the grossest wrongs may be perpetrated by the government. And even individuals, though exemplars of the personal virtues, may leave a community in chaos if they do not recognize the binding force of social ties.

Justice universally applied welds individuals and communities together and gives a foundation upon which may be builded all other civic virtues. Justice will remedy every evil and bring forth increasing good, and only those are in a position to judge justly and to act justly who recognize the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

TWO MEN I HONOR

While the result of the democratic national convention will probably be known to the public before this issue of THE COMMONER reaches the subscriber, the paper must go to press before the convening of the convention. As it is useless, therefore, to discuss questions upon which the convention must decide and impossible to predict the result of the convention, the editor of THE COMMONER invites the attention of the reader to an exceedingly strong passage from Teufelsdröckh which appears with the indorsement of Thomas Carlyle in "Sartor Resartus." Teufelsdröckh says:

"Two men I honor, and no third. First, the toil-worn craftsman that with earth-made implement laboriously conquers the earth, and makes her man's. Venerable to me is the hard hand; crooked, coarse; wherein notwithstanding lies a cunning virtue, indæfeably royal, as of the sceptre of this planet. Ven-

erable, too, is the rugged face, all weather-tanned, besoiled, with its rude intelligence; for it is the face of a man living manlike. O, but the more venerable for thy rudeness, and even because we must pity as well as love thee! Hardly-entreated brother! For us was thy back so bent, for us were thy straight limbs and fingers so deformed; thou wert our conscript, on whom the lot fell, and fighting our battles wert so marred. For in thee, too, lay a God-created form, but it was not to be unfolded; encrusted must it stand with the thick adhesions and defacements of labor; and thy body, like thy soul, was not to know freedom. Yet toil on, toil on; thou art in thy duty, be out of it who may; thou toilest for the altogether indispensable, for daily bread.

“A second man I honor, and still more highly: Him who is seen toiling for the spiritually indispensable; not daily bread, but the bread of life. Is not he, too, in his duty; endeavoring towards inward harmony; revealing this, by act or by word, through all his outward endeavors, be they high or low? Highest of all, when his outward and his inward endeavor are one; when we can name him artist; not earthly craftsman only, but inspired thinker, who with heaven-made implement conquers heaven for us! If the poor and humble toil that we have food, must not the high and glorious toil for him in return, that he have light, have guidance, freedom, immortality? These two, in all their degrees, I honor; all else is chaff and dust, which let the wind blow whither it listeth.

“Unspeakably touching is it, however, when I find both dignities united; and he that must toil outwardly for the lowest of man’s wants, is also toiling inwardly for the highest. Sublimier in this world know I nothing than a peasant saint, could such now anywhere be met with. Such a one will take thee back to Nazareth itself; thou wilt see the splendor of heaven spring forth from the humblest depths of earth, like a light shining in great darkness.”

We have here a beautifully presented philosophy that sounds discordant when uttered in the presence of the commercialism of the present day, but a philosophy that must commend itself to all who will for a moment reflect upon man’s mission and capabilities. The useful man—the man who does something, the man who creates, frames, fashions, feeds, shelters and clothes the world—who will withhold from him the reverence that he deserves? Compare him with the drone who lives fat upon what others produce, clothes himself ele-

gantly with the handiwork of others and spends his life in idleness, a burden upon better man. Is it not strange that the latter can be envied and petted, while the former is frequently forgotten and sometimes despised? Is it not time for the raising of higher, truer and nobler ideals?

And the second man—he who devoutly and with resistless earnestness seeks to bring his life into harmony with the divine plan, anxious to know his duty and to do it—what of his recompense today? While hundreds and thousands of these are engaged in toil, receiving from society a stipend scarcely sufficient for the needs of the body, many upon the avenues and in the byways, grow rich ministering to the vices and encouraging all that is evil in man.

But a few days ago my attention was called to two men in the city of New York. They labored not far apart, one a genius modeling in clay, putting his whole soul into his work and dreaming of a usefulness but scarcely begun. The other a bookmaker, gathering in sometimes a thousand dollars in a day, as a commission upon the wagers of those who put their money upon the races. How stingily society deals with one, and how prodigally society deals with the other! And yet in the years to come the bookmaker will be forgotten and the artist's handiwork will live to please and to inspire.

Is it strange that it is difficult to draw youth away from worldly temptations and turn its thoughts to higher things when the worshiper of Mammon seems to prosper while the idealist has such a constant struggle to maintain himself? And yet it is only an apparent advantage that the former have, for nothing that they can secure gives the peace and satisfaction that are earned and enjoyed by those who labor with a high purpose and a fixed resolve. The "peace that passeth understanding" and crowns life with continual happiness is not purchaseable with coin that is stained.

The two whom Carlyle and Teufelsdröckh honor are honored among those who know them and they not only make the world better, but are better themselves for the contributions that they make to the sum of human happiness.

INDEFENSIBLE AND INTOLERABLE

The Kansas City platform in attacking the trusts took the only position that is tenable, namely, that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. Upon no other ground can a fight be made against the trusts. To say that a private monopoly is a good thing if properly managed, or if conducted with due regard for the interests of the people, is like saying that a monarchy is good when the king is benevolent. No successful fight could be made for the establishment of free institutions if those in charge of the fight were opposed to the king personally rather than to the system which he represented. A private monopoly is indefensible because it puts the citizen at the mercy of the man in charge of the monopoly. If a large community obtained its water supply from a spring no member of the community would be willing to leave the spring in the undisputed control of a private individual. Where a city grants a franchise to a company to furnish water, there are always two safeguards; first, the right of the city to regulate the charges, and, second, the right of the city to undertake the work itself. Usually there is a third, namely, the right of the city to charter another company. But in the case of an industrial monopoly, the government has never undertaken to regulate prices, and the fact that there is a monopoly excludes the assumption that there are other sources of supply.

Until human nature has reached a stage far in advance of its personal development, it will not be safe to intrust the enormous powers of monopoly in the hands of frail human beings.

If the government were to attempt merely to regulate private monopoly, the condition would be found intolerable. If the regulation were by means of a tax, it would be an easy matter for the monopoly to transfer the burden of the tax to the consumer, and then, too, an attempt to control a monopoly would result in tremendous and widespread corruption. If, for instance, an attempt is made to lessen the advantages of a monopoly that counts its profits at a hundred millions, it could afford to spend five or ten or even twenty millions in prevent-

ing legislation and in electing officers who would favor it. We have seen city councils corrupted by franchise corporations; are we prepared to invite wholesale corruption by adopting this plan in national politics?

As the trusts develop and increase their exactions, the people will be driven to accept the democratic position on this question and then when the fight is made—not against a few monopolies, or against the worst monopolies, but against the principle of monopoly, relief can be expected.

LIBERTY A SUPREME GOOD

Buckle, whose "History of Civilization in England" has given him a permanent place in the literary world, was a passionate lover of liberty. In one of his productions, to be found in the "World's Best Essays," he expresses himself with so much clearness and emphasis that an extract is given below. It is worth while for the reader to compare the vigorous logic of the historian with the complacent philosophy of the present-day imperialists who assume that a desecrated monarch can bargain, sell and convey, for pecuniary consideration, the bodies, souls and inalienable rights of eight millions of Filipinos.

Buckle says: "Liberty is the one thing most essential to the right development of individuals, and to the real grandeur of nations. It is a product of knowledge when knowledge advances in a healthy and regular manner; but if under certain unhappy circumstances it is opposed by what seems to be knowledge, then, in God's name, let knowledge perish and liberty be preserved. Liberty is not a means to an end, it is an end itself. To secure it, to enlarge it, and to diffuse it, should be the main object of all social arrangements and of all political contrivances. None but a pedant or a tyrant can put science or literature in competition with it. Within certain limits, and very small limits, too, it is the inalienable prerogative of man of which no force of circumstances and no hope of

time can deprive him. He has no right to barter it away even from himself, still less from his children. It is the foundation of all respect, and without it the great doctrine of moral responsibility would degenerate into a lie and a juggle. It is a sacred deposit, and the love of it is a holy instinct engraven on our hearts."

THE DEMOCRATIC TICKET

I shall vote for Parker and Davis, the nominees of the democratic national convention, and shall do so for the following reasons:

First—Because the democratic ticket stands for opposition to imperialism, while the republican ticket stands for an imperialistic policy. On this question, which was the paramount issue in 1900, and which must remain an important issue so long as an attempt is made to hold colonies under the American flag—on this issue the convention was unanimous, the platform emphatic, and I have no doubt that the candidate will carry out the platform.

Second—Mr. Roosevelt is injecting the race issue into American politics, and this issue, if it becomes national, will make it impossible to consider economic questions that demand solution. The election of the democratic ticket will put a quietus upon this attempt and permit the race question to work itself out without the bitterness which Mr. Roosevelt's conduct has engendered.

Third—Mr. Roosevelt stands for the spirit of war. His friends present him as a man of blood and iron. He believes in strenuousness and inculcates a love for war-like things. The democratic ticket stands for peace, for reason and for arbitration rather than for force, conquest and bluster.

Fourth—The democratic platform declares in favor of the reduction of the standing army, and as this plank was unanimously adopted there is reason to believe that a democratic success on this subject would bring some advantage to the people.

For these four reasons I feel justified in supporting the ticket, but I shall not misrepresent the situation, or appeal for votes for the ticket upon false grounds. A democratic victory will mean very little, if any, progress on economic questions so long as the party is under the control of the Wall street element. On the money question Mr. Parker is as thoroughly committed to the side of the financiers as Mr. Roosevelt. If he does not go as far as the republicans would in retiring silver dollars, in establishing branch banks, in enlarging the powers of the national banks, and in the substitution of an asset currency for the present currency, it will be because he is restrained by the democrats in the house and senate. Nothing good can be expected of him on the money question.

On the trust question the democratic platform is very much better than the republican platform, but the nomination of Judge Parker virtually nullifies the anti-trust plank. Unless in his letter of acceptance he commits himself to attempt anti-trust legislation we need not expect him to pursue a different course from that pursued by President Roosevelt.

So far as the labor questions are concerned we must await Judge Parker's letter before we shall know whether the laboring man has anything to expect from his election. The labor plank as prepared by Judge Parker's friends on the sub-committee was a straddling, meaningless plank. In the full committee planks were adopted in favor of arbitration, the eight-hour day, and against government by injunction; also a plank on the Colorado situation. If Judge Parker is silent or ambiguous on these subjects it will mean that the financial influence back of him will not permit him to take the labor side on these disputed questions.

On the tariff question some little progress may be hoped for, but the Parker men on the committee were nearly all in favor of a very conservative tariff plank, and it remains to be seen whether Judge Parker will carry out the positive and definite plank which was submitted by the full committee. This is the situation.

Judge Parker stands for enough things that are good to justify me in giving him my vote, but as I have tried to point

out for several months, the triumph of the Wall street element of the party denies to the country any hope of relief on economic questions. I have nothing to take back, I have nothing to withdraw of the things that I have said against the methods pursued to advance his candidacy. It was a plain and deliberate attempt to deceive the party. The New York platform was vague and meaningless and purposely so, because the advocates of Judge Parker were trying to secure votes from among the people who would have opposed his views had they known them. If he had sent to the Albany convention the telegram that he sent to the St. Louis convention he would have had very few instructed delegates from the south, and no possible chance for the nomination. But he and his managers adroitly and purposely concealed his position until the delegates had been corraled and the nomination assured. Then his friends attempted to secure a gold plank, which was overwhelmingly defeated in the committee. After the party had rejoiced over the harmony secured by the omission of the question, and after he had secured the nomination, he injected his views upon the subject at a time when he could not be taken from the ticket without great demoralization. The nomination was secured, therefore, by crooked and indefensible methods, but the democrat who loves his country has to make his decisions upon conditions as he finds them, not upon conditions as he would like to have them.

After having stated that I shall support the ticket, and after having given my reason for so doing, I think it due to the democrats of the nation to say that while the fight on economic questions is postponed, it is not abandoned. As soon as the election is over I shall, with the help of those who believe as I do, undertake to organize for the campaign of 1908, the object being to marshal the friends of popular government within the democratic party to the support of a radical and progressive policy to make the democratic party an efficient means in the hands of the people for securing relief from the plutocratic element that controls the republican party and for the time being is in control of the democratic party. This plan of organization will be elaborated soon. It is only mentioned at

this time that the readers of THE COMMONER may know that the contest for economic and political reform will begin again as soon as the polls close, and be continued until success is achieved.

THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

The intention of this editorial is to point out the main features of the democratic national platform. The plank on imperialism is positive, strong and satisfactory to the entire party, and this question becomes the paramount issue of the campaign.

The tariff plank is good, but it was made so on a close vote in the committee and largely against the opposition of Mr. Parker's adherents. The plank which was voted down favored "a wise, conservative and businesslike" revision, made "with due regard to existing conditions." The committee thought that these qualifying words emasculated the plank and left it so weak as to give no hope to tariff reformers.

The anti-trust plank is a good one. It demands the enforcement of the criminal clause of the criminal law against the trusts; it demands the abolition of rebates and discriminations, and it demands the withdrawal of the interstate commerce privileges from trusts when once convicted. The plank is infinitely superior to the republican plank, and with a president who desired to destroy the trusts, would be a sufficient plank, but as this trust plank was also substituted by the full committee, there is reason to fear that it may not be in keeping with the ideas of the candidate.

The labor plank is nearly all that could be desired. It declares against government by injunction; it favors arbitration and the eight-hour day, and denounces the methods that have been resorted to in the Colorado strike, but as these planks were added in the full committee, some uncertainty exists as to the candidate's position.

The platform declares in favor of the reduction of the army. Upon this the committee was unanimous. The sub-committee reported a plank in favor of an increase of the navy, but this was stricken out in the full committee.

The platform has a plank in favor of the enlargement of the scope of the interstate commerce commission and in favor of irrigation. The general clauses of the platform excite no dispute, and the appeal against the introduction of a race issue ought to have weight with the sober, thinking Americans.

On the whole, the platform is good. From a western standpoint its greatest defect is that it makes no mention of the money question. An attempt was made to secure a plank opposing the melting of the silver dollar, opposing the asset currency and branch banks, and expressing a preference for the United States note (ordinarily known as the greenback) over the bank note, but having refused to put in a gold plank, the committee was not willing to have any phase of the money question alluded to. While the motion to reaffirm the Kansas City platform was voted down, there was a considerable vote in favor of its reaffirmation, and the western members of the committee, together with a few from the south, stood together and secured enough changes in the platform to make it a presentable document and worthy of the support of the party.

CANNON'S COMPLACENT PHILOSOPHY

Speaker Cannon seemed to be the most popular man in the late republican national convention. His jokes were applauded, and the spirit that manifested itself in his utterances seemed to pervade the audience. His good nature was contagious and the delegates returned home sorry that they could not do more for him than they did. But his philosophy, while complacent, will not bear scrutiny. He did not approach public questions with the seriousness that should characterize one who has to deal with them. He was not the physician examining the patient to see what should be done, but the cheerful

neighbor who called in to assure the sick man that there wasn't much the matter with him and that he would be up in a few days.

His manner of dealing with the trust question was characteristic of his style. He charged that the democrats were "trust-busters with their lungs only." Without stopping to consider remedies proposed by the democrats four years ago, he swept the matter aside with the assertion that the republican party has done all that has been done and will do all that needs to be done. And so the public is expected to sleep on undisturbed.

Dealing with the subject of overcapitalization, he said:

"In the last two years the wind and the water that came from overcapitalization in forming the so-called trusts have been squeezed out, and there are people who make 'mouth bets' about the price of watered companies and companies that have gas on top of the water, made by the printing press certificate. 'Oh,' they stand around and say, 'why, there is the most extraordinary shrinkage in values that was ever known.'

"How much?

"Oh, a good many hundreds of millions, the *Wall Street Journal* says over \$1,600,000,000. (Laughter and applause.) And yet every dollar of property, every particle of property that was represented by this overcapitalization two years ago, is yet with us. (Laughter and applause.) Now, all the fools that bet it to go down and the fools that bet it to go up can fight it out. It don't make one particle of difference to the 80,000,000 people who live on the sweat of their faces and do a legitimate business." (Laughter.)

The "laughter" and "applause" are given as they were inserted by the Associated press. It makes no difference, according to him, whether corporations are overcapitalized or not. It matters not whether values are depressed or inflated, because the property itself is not changed in character. The watering of stock calls for no remedy and gives no reason for complaint. Hundreds of thousands of people have been swindled by the shrinkage in stocks. People who have been tempted to invest their savings in stocks have found themselves defrauded, but there is only laughter and applause when a witty republican calls attention to the fact. Doesn't it make

any difference to the eighty millions who do legitimate business? No one attempts to justify watered stock, and yet the republican party permits the watering process to go on. The men at the head of these corporations are allowed to use the stock market for their own enrichment. They are permitted to issue stock, pay big dividends to raise stock quotations and then they are allowed to pass dividends in order to squeeze out the purchasers. And all this is so unimportant that the republicans make merry over it.

An Episcopal minister of New York, in a recent sermon on gambling, said:

“Who are the heroes that are held up for the admiration of the rising generation? They are the gambling stock brokers, who, with their stock watering processes, their corners and their devious deals, are worse than the old feudal robbers. The clearest evidence that the American people are money mad is that they will tolerate these robber kings of gambling finance.

“These conscienceless rogues fling the whole code of honesty to the winds, defy the laws, rob men of their hard earnings, and then try to throw a sop of their ill-gotten gains to the church as ‘hush money.’

“If one preacher finds God’s law in the flames of the Iroquois theatre at Chicago, what kind of fire is not Wall street worthy of?”

No one doubts the truth of the minister’s indictment, and yet the republican national convention grows uproarious as the speaker of the house of representatives declares that it doesn’t make a particle of difference to the public generally, and the convention adjourns without devising a remedy or suggesting a plan for the protection of the public.

The industrial situation may seem funny and laughable to a lot of partisans who assemble at a national convention, but it is a sober, earnest matter with an increasing number of people. Speaker Cannon’s complacent philosophy will not always satisfy them; the time is coming when the republican party must render an account of its stewardship and when that time comes what is to be the answer? It has failed to protect the people’s interests and the people will sooner or later turn upon it and rend it for its infidelity.

ALTON BROOKS PARKER

Judge Alton Brooks Parker, democratic nominee for the presidency, was born at Cortland, N. Y., May 14, 1852, and is the son of John B. and Harriet Stratton Parker. His early education was obtained in the academy and normal school at Cortland, and at the age of sixteen he began teaching in order to obtain the means to continue at school and learn the legal profession. In 1877 he was nominated by the democrats of his district for surrogate and he was elected by a decisive majority. He was re-elected by an increased majority. In 1884 he was a delegate to the democratic national convention and in 1885 a delegate to the state convention that nominated David B. Hill for governor. In the latter campaign he was made chairman of the executive committee and handled the campaign with great skill, the election resulting in a democratic victory. In 1897 he was nominated for chief judge of the courts of appeals and was elected by a large majority.

Judge Parker was married at Rochester in 1873 to Miss Mary Schoonmaker, and two children have been born to them, John and Bertha. The son died at the age of seven. The daughter was married in 1899 to Rev. Charles Mercer Hall.

The Parker home is at Esopus, where the judge delights in raising fine cattle and in cultivating small fruits.

HENRY G. DAVIS

Henry G. Davis, democratic candidate for vice president, was born in Baltimore, Md., November 16, 1823. He received his early education in the public schools, but being left fatherless went to work when very young. He became superintendent of a plantation for a time, then began railroading, being successively brakeman, conductor and agent of the B. & O. He engaged in the mercantile business and then became interested in coal mining. He projected and carried to success the West Virginia Central and Pittsburg railway, of which he is president. He is also president of the Piedmont & Cumber-

land railway, and of the Davis National bank of Piedmont. He was a member of the West Virginia house of delegates in 1865, state senator from 1867 to 1869, United States senator from 1873 to 1881, and has been a delegate to six national democratic conventions. He was married in 1853 to Kate A. Bantz of Frederick, Md. Mr. Davis was one of the American delegates to the pan-American congress and is a member of the United States intercontinental railway commission. While his home is at Elkins, W. Va., he maintains his offices in Washington City, at 1517 H street.

THE CONVENTION'S DRAMATIC CLOSE

The democratic national convention met at St. Louis, Tuesday, July 6, at 12 o'clock noon and finally adjourned at 1:30 o'clock Sunday morning.

The platform adopted by the convention and the proceedings of the resolutions committee are printed in another column.

Alton B. Parker of New York and Henry Gassaway Davis of West Virginia were nominated for president and vice president, respectively.

The resolutions committee reported Friday evening at 8 o'clock and the platform being unanimously adopted the convention spent the entire night listening to nomination speeches. At 6 o'clock Saturday morning Mr. Parker was nominated.

The committee then adjourned until 2 o'clock in the afternoon. Meeting at that hour, it soon took a recess until 8 o'clock at night.

At 8 o'clock in the evening the convention assembled and began the work of selecting a candidate for the vice presidency. This work was interrupted by the rumor that Judge Parker had sent a telegram declaring that the convention must adopt a gold standard plank or he would decline the nomination. It subsequently developed that Judge Parker had sent to W. F. Sheehan the following dispatch:

"Hon. W. F. Sheehan, Hotel Jefferson, St. Louis: I regard the gold standard as firmly and irrevocably established and shall act accordingly if the action of the convention today shall be ratified by the people. As the platform is silent on the subject, my views should be made known to the convention and if it proves to be unsatisfactory to the majority, I request you to decline the nomination for me at once so that another may be nominated before adjournment. (Signed.)

"A. B. PARKER."

Judge Parker's dispatch created a sensation and after a number of speeches had been made on the subject the convention directed that a dispatch be sent to Judge Parker as follows:

"The platform adopted by this convention is silent on the question of monetary standard because it is not regarded by us as a possible issue in this campaign and only the campaign issues were mentioned in the platform. Therefore there is nothing in the views expressed by you in the telegram just received which would preclude a man entertaining them from accepting a nomination on said platform."

The following account is taken from the *Denver News* report:

St. Louis, July 9.—An exploding bombshell never stirred greater excitement or more amazement than was caused by Judge Parker's telegram intimating that he would not accept the democratic nomination for president because of the absence of a gold plank in the platform.

Wild with rage, scores of delegates, following the example of a few westerners, tore their badges from their coats, threw them on the floor of the convention hall and stamped upon them until words could relieve their overmeasure of passion.

Red-faced with indignation, Senator Tillman of South Carolina, whose eighteen votes had been given to Parker after much logrolling, rushed over to David B. Hill and shook his clenched right fist in the New Yorker's face.

"Why did you not tell us?" demanded the southerner. "You knew what Parker's views were. Why did you let us get into this hole? This message is an opprobrious and malicious insult."

"This telegram has not been correctly stated," replied Hill, wiping his perspiring forehead nervously. "We will talk it over."

"This may split the party," returned Senator Tillman in a loud voice, his anger causing him to forget that just above his head, to the left of the platform, a dozen auditors were eagerly listening to every word.

While the bombshell was tearing the convention into groups of delegates, excitedly discussing the amazing developments, David B. Hill, followed by William F. Sheehan of New York, Senator Tillman, Senator Carmack of Tennessee, to whom the telegram had come, and half a dozen other leaders among those who had supported Parker, retreated from the press of newspaper men and sought a quiet spot for conference in the west end of the building. Sergeant-at-Arms John I. Martin and several assistants kept at a distance the throng of spectators, while from the galleries thousands craned their necks to notice the portentous hobnobbing of the big men.

Strange scenes—scenes that never would have been predicted as among the possible when the night session ended in the broad daylight by nominating Judge Parker for president—were taking place on the convention floor. Delegates who had supported Parker from the first joined with those who had opposed him in lament at the predicament into which the convention had been tossed without warning.

Nominating speeches for vice presidential candidates and seconding addresses followed rapidly, but the attention of the delegates was elsewhere. Eloquent orators that would have been cheered until the rafters shook had the delegates been in an attentive mood passed almost unnoticed.

It was decided on the spot to hold a caucus of the Missouri delegation, and this was done later at the Southern hotel, where it was resolved to place Senator Cockrell again in nomination.

The Wisconsin supporters of Wall, led by Mayor David S. Rose of Milwaukee, saw a new chance for E. C. Wall and declared vehemently against the attempt of Judge Parker to "dictate to the party in national convention."

Through the aisles rushed men who declared that there must be a new nomination for president, that Parker had practically declined, that "one man" dictation could never be endured by the democratic party. Hearst's name was frequently shouted by delegates who pointed out that the developments of the day had made him the only logical candidate.

In the turmoil and excitement a lively boom to nominate W. J. Bryan was started. He was in his room at the Jefferson hotel, sick from a cold and his exertions of the past few days, but soon learned over the telephone what was going on in the convention. He had known that Judge Parker was likely to make an important move, but had not been informed that it was serious. He did not come to the convention hall.

Senator Culberson's speech, while he stood on a chair amid his Texas delegation, brought to a head the growing storm of protest against further proceedings until the delegates could learn whether the party had nominated a presidential candidate who would run.

"Until we learn that" said the senator, "we should not nominate a vice presidential candidate."

So the convention adjourned to 8:20 p. m. and the delegates, divided into anxious or angry groups, hurried out into the streets and to the hotels, there to continue their denunciation or defenses of Judge Parker.

When the hordes of delegates and visitors who had attended the convention heard of the developments similar scenes were enacted in the hotel lobbies. At the Southern, where the sub-committee on resolutions went into session over the question of inserting a gold plank to satisfy Parker, more delegates tore off their Parker badges and threw them on the floor. Missouri caucused and resolved to present Cockrell's name again. The South Carolina delegation resolved to abandon Parker and it was reported other delegations were preparing to follow.

From the convention hall had come David B. Hill and the others in the impromptu conference. Their deliberations were merged in those of the sub-committee on platform, where Senator Tillman was the chief accuser and the representative of wrath at the situation into which the friends of Parker had led the convention.

At 10:20, while Tillman was still speaking, there was a wild cry of "Bryan!" and in an instant 10,000 voices rose in a yell that nearly raised the roof. All voices on the platform were drowned, and Mr. Bryan made his way between rows of cheering delegates to his seat. From there he was escorted to the platform, and when order was restored the chairman threatened to clear the galleries if there were any more interruptions. Tillman began again, but there was a shrill yell of "Look out, Ben!" from the west gallery, and after a struggle with the police the offenders were ejected. They proved to be two men from Albany county, New York, named J. J. Mahoney and J. W. Forrest. The latter is president of the Albany anti-Parker league. They protested that they had not raised their voices, but they were thrown out without delay.

Senator Tillman gave way at 10:30, and there was renewed cheering as Mr. Bryan arose to speak. He had been in bed all day. He looked very ill and pale. His voice was so weak that when he began it was almost inaudible. Even when it strengthened a little as he warmed with his subject, it was only the ghost of the magnificent voice that rolled through the hall on Wednesday. It is said that Mr. Bryan is threatened with pneumonia. He is certainly very weak.

The audience listened with strained attention. And for once in the history of this convention it was perfectly still. As Mr. Bryan rose to the crucial point of the Parker telegram his voice seemed gradually to regain something of its old power, his animation returned. When he told how, in the resolutions committee, he asked Senator Hill what were Judge Parker's views on the money question, and Hill had answered that he did not know, the crowd saw the peculiar position in which Senator Hill and John Sharp Williams were placed, and cheered mightily.

Senator Pettigrew interrupted Mr. Bryan to ask what Mr. Parker would do about money questions if he were elected, and Mr. Bryan read from Judge Parker's telegram to show what he thought Judge Parker would do.

One of Mr. Bryan's sentences that the crowd seemed especially to enjoy was:

“It is a manly thing for a man to express his opinion before a convention adjourns, but I think it would have been a manlier thing to express his opinion before a convention meets.”

Later he said:

“I am not willing to send his naked question to him. I am not willing to say to him that we acquiesce in leaving silver out of the platform.”

When Mr. Bryan ceased there were loud cries of “Hill! Hill!” but Hill sat back in his chair and did not raise his head.

Senator Daniel followed with a speech intended to smooth out all difficulties and making sailing smooth and easy. Senator Daniel is not a happy speaker, and no one paid heed to his utterances, which in the noise and confusion were not well heard. But he effectively killed a great deal of time, referring copiously to Thomas Jefferson and history.

In justification of Senator Hill’s position, Senator Daniel said:

“The gold standard was so universally recognized that it was not even mentioned in the platform. It is not strange that Senator Hill had not discussed the measure in New York, as the issue is such an old one that it no longer attracts attention.”

When Senator Daniel had finished, General Weaver began to speak.

It was the first time he had addressed the convention and he had a very warm reception, for he is an old favorite. In a few minutes he had the enthusiastic attention of the audience. He said:

“The committee on resolutions tried its best to find out how Parker stood on the gold question. We were told by his chief sponsor, Senator Hill of New York, that he did not know. Senator Daniel has said that Judge Parker is a foot higher than he was yesterday. I want to say that that is an optical illusion. Judge Parker only appears to be a foot higher than he was yesterday because the convention is three feet lower.”

(Tremendous applause greeted this sally.)

“This is an attempt,” General Weaver went on, “to bring this question as an issue into this campaign. He has attempted to dictate to us and if we send this telegram to him it is equiv-

alent to saying, 'All right, Judge Parker, we'll give anything that you want so long as you will run.' I will reserve the right, when this question is put to a vote under parliamentary law, to ask for a roll call of the states so that the nation may know."

When General Weaver had finished in a whirlwind of applause there were calls for a roll on the sending of the telegram, but they were unheeded and Charles S. Hamlin, assistant secretary of the treasury under Cleveland, spoke on the gold side of the question. Senator Carmack of Tennessee, one of the alleged recipients of the alleged telegram, followed Mr. Hamlin. It was remarked that none of the speakers on the gold side referred to the direct charge of Mr. Bryan. General Weaver and Senator Pettigrew said that Mr. Hill had grossly deceived them about Mr. Parker's financial views. Mr. Carmack seems to have a loose tongue or a bad memory. At one point in his speech he said that in the resolutions committee Mr. Bryan had said that the nomination of Judge Parker would be platform enough on the money question. Mr. Bryan sprang to his feet with an emphatic and conclusive denial. Senator Carmack thought that the trust and the tariff issues were unimportant this year but the real issue of which the democrats would march proudly to victory was imperialism.

While Mr. Carmack was speaking, Mr. Bryan was making his way to the platform. When Carmack ceased Mr. Bryan brushed past him and attempted to speak. Carmack interrupted him rudely and said: "Mr. Bryan is going to read you a telegram purporting to have been received by me from Judge Parker. I never received a telegram from Judge Parker in my life." At this the Parker people applauded enthusiastically.

Mr. Bryan began with great earnestness:

"I want you gentlemen to know that if there is discord at this convention it is not my fault. We have not forced any issue, but this issue has been forced upon us."

THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

The democratic party of the United States in national convention assembled, declares its devotion to the essential prin-

ciples of the democratic faith which bring us together in a party communion. Under them local self-government and national unity and prosperity were established. They underlaid our independence, the structure of our republic and every democratic extension from Louisiana to California, and Texas to Oregon, which preserved faithfully in all the states the time between taxation and representation. They yet inspire the masses of our people, guarding jealously their rights and liberties and cherishing their fraternity, peace and development. They remind us of our duties and responsibilities as citizens and impress upon us, particularly at this time, the necessity of reform and the rescue of the administration of government from the headstrong, arbitrary and spasmodic methods which distract business by uncertainty, and pervade the public mind with dread, distrust, and perturbation.

The application of these fundamental principles to the living issues of the day is the first step toward the assured peace, safety and progress of our nation. Freedom of the press, of conscience and of speech, equality before the law of all citizens; the right of trial by jury—freedom of the persons defended by the writ of habeas corpus; liberty of personal contract untrammelled by sumptuary laws; supremacy of the civil over the military authorities; a well disciplined militia; the separation of church and state; economy in expenditures, low taxation, that labor may be lightly burdened; prompt and sacred fulfillment of public and private obligations; fidelity to treaties; peace and friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none; absolute acquiescence to the will of the majority, the vital principle of republics—these are the doctrines which democracy has established as proverbs of the nation and they should be constantly invoked and enforced.

We favor the adjustment and administration of laws giving labor and capital impartially their just rights. Capital and labor ought not be envious. Each is necessary to the other. Each has its right, but the rights of labor are certainly no less "vested" no less "sacred" and no less "unalienable" than the rights of capital.

Constitutional guarantees are violated whenever any citizen is denied the right of labor, to acquire and enjoy property or reside where interest or inclination may determine. Any denial thereof by individuals or organizations of government should be summarily rebuked and punished.

We deny the right of any executive to disregard or suspend any constitutional privilege or limitation. Obedience to the laws and respect for their requirements are alike the supreme duty of the citizens and the officials.

The military should be used only to support and maintain the law. We unqualifiedly condemn its employment in the summary banishment of citizens without trial or for the control of elections.

We approve the measure which passed the United States senate in 1896, but which a republican congress has ever since refused to enact, relating to contempts in federal courts, and providing for trial by jury in cases of indirect contempt.

We are in favor of the arbitration of differences between corporate employers and their employes, and we favor a strict enforcement of the eight-hour law on all government work.

We favor liberal appropriations for the dredging and improvement of the water ways of the country. When any water way like the Mississippi river is of sufficient importance to demand special aid of the government, such aid should be extended with a definite plan of continuous work until permanent improvement is secured.

We oppose the republican policy of starving home development in order to feed the greed for conquest and appetite for national "prestige" and display of national strength.

Large reductions can easily be made in the annual expenditures of the government without impairing the efficiency of any branch of the public service, and we shall insist upon the strictest economy and frugality compatible with vigorous and efficient civil, military and naval administration as a right of the people too clear to be denied or withheld.

We favor the enforcement of honesty in the public service, and to that end a thorough legislative investigation of those executive departments of the government already known to

teem with corruption as well as other departments suspected of harboring corruption, and the punishment of ascertained corruptionists without fear or favor in regard to persons. The persistent and deliberate refusal of both the senate and house of representatives to permit such investigation to be made demonstrates that only by a change in the executive and in the legislative departments can complete exposure, punishment and correction be obtained.

We condemn the action of the republican party in congress in refusing to prohibit an executive department from entering into contracts with convicted trusts or unlawful combinations in restraint of interstate trade. We believe that one of the best methods of procuring economy and honesty in the public service is to have public officials from the occupant of the White house down to the lowest of them, return as nearly as may be to Jeffersonian simplicity of living.

We favor the nomination and election of a president imbued with the principles of the constitution who will set his face strongly against executive usurpation of legislative and judicial functions, whether that usurpation be veiled under the guise of executive construction of existing laws, or whether it take refuge in the tyrant plea of necessity and superior wisdom.

We favor the preservation, so far as we can, of an open door for the world's commerce in the Orient without unnecessary entanglement in Oriental and European affairs, and without arbitrary, unlimited, irresponsible and absolute government anywhere within our jurisdiction. We oppose fervently as did Washington himself an indefinite, irresponsible, discretionary and vague absolutism and a policy of colonial exploitation, no matter where or by whom invoked or exercised; we believe with Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, that no government has a right to make one set of laws for those at "home" and another and a different set of laws, absolute in their character, for those unfortunates in the colonies.

All men under the American flag are entitled to the protection of the institutions, whose emblem the flag is. If they are inherently unfit for those institutions, then they are inher-

ently unfit to be members of the American body politic. Wherever there may exist a people incapable of being governed under American laws, in consonance with the American constitution, the territory of that people ought not to be a part of the American domain.

We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have done already for the Cubans and it is our duty to make that promise now, and upon suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people upon their feet and free and independent to work out their own destiny.

The endeavor of the secretary of war by pledging the government's indorsement for "promoters" in the Philippine islands to make the United States a partner in speculative legislation for the archipelago, which was only temporarily held up by the opposition of the democratic senators in the last session, will, if successful, lead to entanglements from which it would be difficult to escape.

The democratic party has been and will continue to be the consistent opponent of the class of tariff legislation by which certain interests have been permitted, through congressional favor, to draw a heavy tribute from the American people.

This monstrous perversion of those equal opportunities, which our political institutions were established to secure, has caused what may once have been infant industries to become the greatest combinations of capital that the world has ever known. These especial favorites of the government have, through trust methods, been converted into monopolies, thus bringing to an end domestic competition, which was the only alleged character. Upon the extravagant profits made possible by the protective system this industrial combination, by the financial assistance they can now give control the policy of the republican party. We denounce protectionism as robbery of the many to enrich the few and we favor a tariff limited to the needs of the government, economically administered and so levied as not to discriminate against any industry, class or section, to the end that the burdens of taxation shall be distributed as equally as possible.

We favor a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses and for the commonweal, and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions and its discriminations, keeping in view the ultimate ends of "equality of burdens and equality of opportunities," and the constitutional purpose of raising a revenue by taxation, to-wit, the support of the federal government in all its integrity and virility, but in simplicity.

We recognize that the gigantic trusts and combinations designed to enable capital to secure more than its just share of the joint products of capital and labor, and which have been fostered and promoted under republican rule, are a menace to beneficial competition and an obstacle to permanent business propriety.

A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.

Individual equality of opportunity and free competition are essential to a healthy and permanent commercial prosperity; and any trust, combination or monopoly tending to destroy these by controlling production, restricting competition or fixing prices, should be prohibited and punished by law. We especially denounce rebates and discrimination by transportation companies as the most potent agency in promoting and strengthening these unlawful conspiracies against trade.

We demand an enlargement of the powers of the interstate commerce commission, to the end that the traveling public and shippers of this country may have prompt and adequate relief from abuses to which they are subjected in the matter of transportation.

We demand a strict enforcement of existing civil and criminal statutes against all such trusts, combinations and monopolies, and we demand the enactment of such further legislation as may be necessary to effectually suppress them.

Any trust or unlawful combination engaged in interstate commerce which is monopolizing any branch of business or production should not be permitted to transact business outside of the state of its origin. Whenever it shall be established in any court of competent jurisdiction that such mo-

nopolization exists such prohibition should be enforced through comprehensive laws to be enacted on the subject.

We congratulate our western citizens upon the passage of the law known as the Newlands irrigation act for the irrigation and reclamation of the arid lands of the west, a measure framed by a democrat, passed in the senate by the nonpartisan vote and passed in the house against the opposition of almost all the republican leaders, the vote, the majority of which was democratic.

We call attention to the great democratic measure, broad and comprehensive as it is, working automatically throughout all time without further action of congress until the reclamation of all the lands in the arid west capable of reclamation is accomplished, reserving the lands reclaimed for homeseekers in small tracts, and rigidly guarding against the land monopoly as an evidence of the policy of domestic development contemplated by the democratic party should it be placed in power.

The democracy when entrusted with power will construct the Panama canal speedily, honestly and economically, thereby giving to our people what democrats have always contended for, a great interoceanic canal, furnishing shorter and cheaper lines of transportation and broader and less trammelled trade relations with the other people of the world.

We pledge ourselves to insist upon the just and lawful protection of our citizens at home and abroad and to use all proper measures to secure for them, whether native born or naturalized, and without distinction of race or creed, the equal protection of laws and the enjoyment of all rights and privileges open to them, under the covenants of our treaties of friendship and commerce and if under existing treaties the right of travel and sojourn is denied to American citizens or recognition is withheld from American passports by any countries on the ground of creed we favor the beginning of negotiations with the governments of such countries to secure by treaties the removal of these unjust discriminations.

We demand that all over the world a duly authenticated passport issued by the government of the United States to an

American citizen shall be proof of the fact that he is an American citizen and shall entitle him to the treatment due him as such.

We favor the election of United States senators by the direct vote of the people.

We favor the admission of the territories of Oklahoma and Indian territory. We also favor the immediate admission of Arizona and New Mexico as separate states and a territorial government for Alaska and Porto Rico.

We hold that the officials appointed to administer the government of any territory as well as the district of Alaska should be bona fide residents at the time of their appointment of the territory or district in which their duties are to be performed.

We demand the extermination of polygamy within the jurisdiction of the United States and the complete separation of church and state in political affairs.

We denounce the ship subsidy bill recently passed by the United States senate as an iniquitous appropriation of public funds for private purposes and a wasteful, illogical and useless attempt to overcome by subsidy the obstruction raised by republican legislation to the growth and development of American commerce on the sea.

We favor the upbuilding of a merchant marine without new or additional burdens upon the people and without bounties from the public treasury.

We favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada and with peoples of other countries where they can be entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufacture, mining or commerce.

We favor the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine in its full integrity.

We favor the reduction of the army and navy expenditure to the point historically demonstrated to be safe and sufficient.

The democracy would secure to the surviving soldiers and sailors and their dependents generous pensions, not by an arbitrary executive order, but by legislation which a grateful people stand ready to enact.

Our soldiers and sailors who defend with their lives the legislation and the laws have a sacred interest in their just administration. They must, therefore, share with us humiliation with which we have witnessed the exaltation of court favorites, without distinguished service, over the scarred heroes of many battles; or aggrandized by executive appropriations out of the treasures of a prostrate people in violation of the act of congress which fixed the compensation and allowance of military officers.

The democratic party stands committed to the principles of civil service reform and we demand their honest, just and impartial enforcement. We denounce the republican party for its continuous and sinister encroachments upon the spirit and operation of civil service rules, whereby it has arbitrarily dispensed with examinations for officers in the interests of favorites, and employed all manner of devices to overreach and set aside the principles upon which the civil service was established.

The race question has brought countless woes to this country. The calm wisdom of the American people should see to it that it brings no more.

To revive the dead and hateful race and sectional animosities in any part of our common country means confusion, distraction of business and the reopening of wounds now happily healed. North, south, east and west, have but recently stood together in line of battle from the fall of Peking to the walls of Santiago and as sharers of the common glory and common destiny we should share fraternally the common burdens.

We therefore depreciate and condemn the bourbon-like selfish and narrow spirit of the recent republican convention at Chicago which sought to kindle anew the embers of racial and sectional strife and we appeal from it to the sober common sense and patriotic spirit of the American people.

The existing republican administration has been spasmodic, erratic, sensational, spectacular, and arbitrary. It has made itself a satire upon the congress, the courts and upon the settled practices and usages of national and international law. It summoned the congress into hasty and futile extra session

and virtually adjourned it, leaving behind its flight from Washington uncalled calendars and unaccomplished tasks.

It made war, which is the sole power of congress, without its authority, thereby usurping one of its fundamental prerogatives. It violated a plain statute of the United States as well as plain treaty obligations, international usages and constitutional law and has done so under pretense of executing a great public policy which could have been more easily effected lawfully, constitutionally and with honor. It forced strained and unnatural constructions upon statutes, usurping judicial interpretation, and substituting congressional enactment. It withdrew from congress their customary duties of investigation which have heretofore made the representatives of the people and the states the terror of evil doers. It conducted a secretive investigation of its own and boasted of a few sample convicts, while it threw a broad coverlet over the bureaus which had been their chosen field of operative abuses, and kept in power the superior officers under whose administration the crimes had been committed. It ordered assault upon monopolies, but paralyzed by its first victory, it flung out the flag of truce and cried out that it would not "run amuck"—leaving its future purposes beclouded by its vacillations.

Conducting the campaign upon this declaration of our principles and purposes we invoke for our candidates the support not only of our great and time-honored organization, but also the active assistance of all of our fellow citizens who, disregarding past differences, desire the perpetuation of our constitutional government as framed and established by the father of the republic.

THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

In the resolutions committee, a sub-committee was appointed, composed of Daniels, Hill, Pattison, Hamlin, Cable, Poe, Davis, Dubois, Shively, Newlands, Williams and Bryan.

The sub-committee was in session the greater part of Thursday and by a vote of 7 to 3 adopted the single gold standard plank. Mr. Bryan, and Congressman Williams were in the convention at the time and had they been present, the vote would have stood 7 to 5. Those who voted for the gold plank were Senator Daniels of Virginia, former Senator David B. Hill, former Governor Pattison of Pennsylvania, and Messrs. Hamlin, Cable, Poe and Davis. Those who voted against the plank were Messrs. Dubois, Shively and Newlands.

The Associated press report is as follows :

St. Louis, July 8.—The committee on resolutions spent the entire night on the platform, and at 8:30 considered the last resolution of the draft submitted by the sub-committee. But this did not mean that the platform was finished and ready for the convention. The struggle continued, and at 10 o'clock it was clear that an agreement on the document as a whole could not be reached immediately.

During the watches of the long night in the committee room there were many dramatic scenes, not the least striking of which was the verbal encounter between Senator Hill and Mr. Bryan.

It occurred while Mr. Bryan was engaged in making one of his many attacks upon the gold standard plank as framed by the sub-committee. He was wrought up to high tension when, approaching the New York senator and shaking his finger dangerously near the nose of that gentleman, he exclaimed :

"You ought to have a gold platform to go with the gold candidate you are forcing upon the country."

Mr. Hill replied that he knew nothing as to Mr. Parker's monetary views.

"Do you mean to say," demanded the Nebraskan, "that you don't know Judge Parker's financial views?"

"I mean just that," responded Mr. Hill.

"You have no knowledge on that subject?"

"None."

"Have never asked him?"

"I have not. I have never sought to secure an expression of his views and he has never sought to convey them to me.

I only know that he is a democrat and a high-minded and pa-

triotic man, and I believe that he can be trusted implicitly on this, as upon other matters of public policy."

Mr. Bryan then demanded to know when the gold plank had been decided upon and why it had not been incorporated in the New York platform. Mr. Hill replied that the matter had first been discussed at the meeting of the delegation about ten days ago, and it was the result of insistence by other members of the delegation than himself.

At 4:40 this morning the committee on resolutions voted the gold standard plank out of the democratic platform by a vote of 35 to 15.

This was the third victory for William Jennings Bryan during the all-night session of the committee.

He had two successful efforts early in the evening and secured modifications of the tariff plank on two separate votes.

An effort was made to secure a recess after the vote on the gold plank, but it was voted down and the committee continued with its work on other features of the platform.

The contest was one of the most interesting features of the convention. The main fight was upon a proposed income tax plank, providing for an amendment to the constitution to meet the adverse decision of the supreme court upon the Wilson law. It was upon this amendment and the gold plank, the two propositions having been brought in conjunction, that Mr. Bryan made his strong fight.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi first offered the income tax amendment, and it was immediately antagonized by former Senator Hill, who stated that with such a plank in the platform New York could not be carried for the democratic nominees. He urged the adoption of a platform which will enable the democrats to win in doubtful states and elect their candidates.

Mr. Williams withdrew the amendment, saying that he, with many other democrats, was seeking harmony and an adjustment of all differences with a view of succeeding on a democratic platform.

Mr. Bryan then offered an income tax amendment and made a speech in favor of it. He asserted that while votes might be

lost among the very rich, the democratic party ought to consider the great mass of the people who bear the burdens of taxation and the expenses of the government.

Senator Daniels was very vigorous in his denunciation of the course the Nebraska man was pursuing. He said that he wanted to win and desired a platform which would bring to the democratic party the voters who had left it when pursuing a course which Mr. Bryan had shaped and advocated. He was tired of being forever in the minority and insisted that it would be absurd for democrats, facing victory, to take any action which would mean defeat. To lose New York meant defeat.

Senator Bailey and Senator Tillman, while believing in an income tax, said that in view of the statement of the New York member of the committee it would be unwise to insist upon the income tax plank.

Senator Bailey then asked unanimous consent to have both the income tax amendment and the gold standard plank dropped, but to this Mr. Hill objected and there was a prolonged discussion, Mr. Hill taking a leading part in it.

Mr. Hill began by saying that he was in this campaign not from personal motives, but because of his loyalty and enthusiasm for the democratic party. He hoped the party could cease its discussion and agree upon a platform in harmony with the views of the party generally. He was opposed to the insertion of an income tax plank, because he saw no necessity for making this new issue.

"I believe," he said, "it will hurt us, it will weaken our platform, but if the members of this committee think otherwise it should go in; but the question of the gold standard is of far more importance."

Mr. Hill urged that if the gold plank was adopted the party would be placed in a favorable position. If the party was in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, that was another thing. But he said, through no fault of the party, conditions had changed, and it had been proven that the gold standard was the solution of the question. Although the republican platform declared in favor of gold, he pointed out that the democrats in the platform could show that the repub-

licans were not responsible for the changed conditions which made the gold standard desirable, but the Almighty himself.

Speaking directly to the southern members of the committee Mr. Hill recalled the time of reconstruction and said he had always worked for democratic principles along democratic lines, that he had been the friend of the south in that trying period and since that time.

Mr. Hill, in the course of his speech, talked eloquently of the personality of Judge Parker. He said that in the course of a conversation about ten days ago with the New York jurist, the latter said in reply to a question about the kind of platform the democrats should adopt:

"I am entirely willing to leave that to the wisdom of the democratic party."

But while Mr. Hill did not assume at any time to speak for Judge Parker, the committee interpreted the inference of his speech to be that Judge Parker favored the insertion of a gold plank.

Mr. Hill declared that the democrats could not possibly nominate a better man than Parker and spoke at some length upon his peculiar qualifications for the office. He emphasized the fact that Judge Parker was in no sense an active candidate for the nomination, and that he had not dictated anything regarding the platform.

"I do not think it is improper for us to say we want to win," continued Mr. Hill. "We have stood defeats in the past and we can stand them again, it is true. This contest, for me, means that I shall devote myself from now until November to the campaign. I shall leave my business, but I shall do it gladly and I shall work hard for whomsoever the democrats nominate, but I think the platform is of the greatest importance. In conclusion he said:

"Nor should one of these planks be traded for the other. I earnestly hope each will be taken up separately, and considered on its individual merits."

Mr. Hill was applauded at the conclusion of his speech.

Mr. Bryan replied at length to the argument of Mr. Hill, and insisted that, in the face of past declarations of the party, a gold plank would now alienate many thousands of democratic voters.

Mr. Thomas of Colorado also made a strong protest against the gold standard plank.

Senator Carmack of Tennessee made a plea for the south and said that democratic success was necessary in the face of the republican policy of imperialism. It was said the democratic platform was dangerous to both. He hoped some agreement could be reached which would bring to the support of the democratic south, the democratic party of the east. As to the money question, that was for the time settled and he urged that that matter be not injected into the coming campaign as a disturbing element.

Mr. Shively of Indiana followed much the same line. If this money question was brought into the campaign, he said, it would raise a serious division in the democratic party, especially in Indiana. Several congressional districts would be endangered.

Mr. Fleming of Wisconsin was opposed to the gold plank and favored the declaration of the Williams platform. If this committee were so much divided, how was it possible to prevent a division among the seven million democratic voters.

Shortly before 4 o'clock Senator Daniels created a sensation in the committee by an attack upon Mr. Bryan, which soon evoked cries for order from several members.

Senator Daniels, who, some time before, called Senator Tillman to the chair, began by saying he questioned the propriety of a man whom the democrats had twice honored with the presidential nomination, and under whose leadership the party had twice been defeated, attempting to force his leadership upon the party again. Growing more impassioned, Senator Daniels said, regarding Mr. Bryan:

"The silver question was a question in Virginia ten years before the gentleman from Nebraska discovered it. But conditions have changed in the last few years and heroic diseases demand heroic remedies. We must consider New England, New York and that section of the country."

Again facing Mr. Bryan, Senator Daniels said:

"He has reviled every man whom any state has recommended for the presidency, and so far as I have been able to learn, has as yet presented no candidate of his own."

At this point Senator Daniels was interrupted with cries of "order." Senator Tillman, who was acting chairman, demanded order, and said: "Well, let us have order before this meeting degenerates into a conversational row."

Mr. Bryan asked that Senator Daniels be allowed to proceed and the latter resumed his speech by saying that he had not intended to enter into personalities.

Continuing, the senator said:

"I am convinced that the country is on the verge of a great catastrophe and calamity."

He said further that it was urgent that the democratic party recover the reins of government. "This is not the time," he said, "for selfish interest, for small conceptions of consistency, for personal likes and dislikes. It is not pleasant for me to give up my own opinion. But there are questions of expediency to be considered."

Senator Daniels favored the gold plank.

Mr. Poe of Maryland made a brief but vigorous appeal for the gold plank, declaring that if the party in its platform refused to recognize an existing fact which could neither be denied nor effaced, by omitting the gold plank, he feared that Maryland would be lost to the democrats in the fall elections. He pointed out that the gold plank recommended by the subcommittee was one which the silver and gold elements in the party could easily stand upon. He said that this plank did not call on the free silver advocates to retract or repudiate their former beliefs.

"It is simply," he said, "a recognition of an existing fact." Mr. Poe closed by saying that the democratic ticket would have a forlorn hope if the plank were omitted.

After several other members had been heard briefly the question was demanded. The gold plank was stricken out by a vote of 35 to 15.

Earlier in the night Mr. Bryan had withdrawn temporarily his income tax resolution. At this juncture an attempt was made to secure a recess, but it was unsuccessful. Senator Tillman remarked that "it was sun up and we might as well go ahead."

After the vote, however, many members left the committee room with heavy eyelids and refreshed themselves with coffee at a nearby restaurant.

The committee, after a lengthy debate on the plank, relating to separate statehood for the territories adopted a substitute offered by Delegate W. F. Timmons of Arizona with respect to Arizona and New Mexico as follows:

"We favor the immediate admission of the territories of Arizona and New Mexico as separate states."

In dealing with the subject of statehood for Oklahoma and Indian territory the committee was less emphatic in its declaration, confining the plank to a general recommendation of statehood for these two territories, as follows: "We favor the admission of the territories of Oklahoma and New Mexico."

The currency plank offered by Mr. Bryan was referred to a sub-committee consisting of Williams, Bryan and Hill, with authority to draft a financial plank for submission to the full committee. The opinion was expressed that these men might agree upon something and, if they should, it would probably eliminate any fight on the floor of the convention. One of the western members said that he did not expect Mr. Bryan to make a minority report, in view of the many changes he had been able to produce in the platform. The committee decided to continue work on the platform, and voted down all motions for a recess.

There was a suggestion that it might be necessary for the convention, which is to meet at 10 o'clock, to take a recess until 2 o'clock in order to give the committee time to formulate its report.

The Panama canal plank brought out a severe criticism from Senator Pettigrew. He said that the canal could not be built in ten years, and when completed it would be valueless, for sailing vessels would never go through it, steam vessels could not utilize it, because of the great consumption of coal. The plank was modified so as to promise to do what could be done when the democrats gain control of the senate. The committee then took up the trust plank. This was the subject

of considerable discussion, Senator Bailey being among the more important speakers in defense of the sub-committee's report.

Mr. Bryan offered an amendment to this plank declaring in specific terms for the prosecution of the trusts and reciting the manner in which it should be done. This was voted in by 23 to 20.

The majority of the votes came from Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, the territories, Porto Rico and Hawaii, while the negative votes were from the east and south. Severe comments were made by a number of representatives from these states to the effect that radical amendments were being put into the platform by men from republican states and territories which could not contribute a single electoral vote to the democratic candidate.

Mr. Pettigrew offered an amendment providing for the government ownership of railroads and telegraphs.

"Oh, that's silly," remarked Mr. Hill. "I don't mean that to be offensive," he added.

"Oh, I'll not take offense at anything the gentleman says," retorted Pettigrew, "and especially if it were a matter of opinion."

Pettigrew's amendment was voted down, and he remarked: "The gentleman from New York called the amendment 'silly,' but he put a plank in the New York platform two years ago not only for the government ownership of the coal carrying railroads, but of the coal mines as well. And the ticket got a larger majority in New York city than was ever before given a democratic candidate.

Reciprocity and the Monroe doctrine as handled by the sub-committee met the approbation of the full committee.

Senator Tillman said this plank would gain no votes, and there was no necessity, in his opinion, of mentioning the navy.

The first part of the navy plank was stricken out. The plank proposed by ex-Governor Thomas of Colorado, regarding labor, was adopted by the committee.

Mr. Bryan said that if his desired amendment to the trust plank should be adopted he would not press the plank favoring the imposition of an income tax.

Senator Tillman, upon noting a smile upon the faces of both Mr. Bryan and Mr. Hill, remarked to Mr. Bryan: "Since you and Mr. Hill seem to have become so chummy, I think we had better look further into the trust plank."

Discussion of it thereupon was resumed and Mr. Frank Cannon of Utah took the floor.

"I followed Mr. Bryan in 1896 and 1900," he said, "on the paramount issues of those campaigns, but now that he has abandoned those issues I will vote against this proposition he seems to want most."

Mr. Cannon, in concluding, contended that the paramount issue in this campaign was "victory," and that the issue should be "Rooseveltism."

Mr. Bryan defended his position on the trust question by saying that "victory" alone should not essentially be the paramount issue, and that unless a question was settled right it was never settled at all.

Senator Daniels called Mr. Shively to the chair and made a speech supporting the principles of anti-trust legislation. He took the position, however, that if enforced the existing interstate commerce law and anti-trust statutes are efficient, and he believed that a democratic administration could be depended upon to enforce them. Hence he considered it safe to omit the proposed plank.

The discussion continued at length and until Mr. Hill presented a substitute for the trust plank, which was unanimously adopted.

The compromise anti-trust plank offered by Mr. Hill and adopted provides that whenever a trust or combination effects a monopoly in the production or distribution of any articles of trade outside the state of its origin it may be restricted by appropriate legislation from continuing to do business in such state.

The question of race was taken up and after a brief discussion a plank deploring the injection of this issue into the campaign by the Chicago convention was adopted. It was introduced by Senator Daniels.

The committee resumed consideration of the financial ques-

tion on the basis of the following plank introduced by Mr. Carmack:

“The secretary of the treasury shall not melt the silver dollars that are now legal tender and convert them into subsidiary coin, thus reducing the volume of currency so fortunately increased by the recent remarkable increase of the gold production.”

The Carmack suggestion for a financial plank was voted down and the platform was adopted without a financial plank. The report, it said, will be unanimous, and there will be no minority report. The Carmack proposition was voted down without division and Mr. Carmack then offered the following, which the committee also failed to accept:

“We recognize that the great and unlooked for increase in the production of gold, amounting in the last five years to \$4,000,000,000, has been relieving the stringency caused by the scarcity of metallic money, and that because of that fact the money question as it was presented in the two last presidential campaigns, is not now acute or pressing for legislative relief; but it has at the same time vindicated the demands of the democratic party in the past for an increased volume of metallic money, that demand not being for silver as silver, or for gold as gold, but for a sufficient quantity of standard money to maintain the level of prices and transact the business of the country.”

Mr. Bryan presented a suggestion declaring it to be the sense of the democratic party that the volume of currency should not be diminished, but Mr. Hill complained that in view of the action of the committee last night in voting down the gold plank, the insertion of the proposed resolution would be a species of bad faith. The committee accepted this view and voted down the resolution. No further financial planks were suggested, and the platform, being considered complete, was then adopted by a rising vote and in the midst of general applause.

Just before the committee concluded its consideration of the platform the committee of the convention, consisting of Representatives James of Kentucky, Clayton of Alabama and Ball of Texas, appeared to secure information for the guidance of the convention as to when the committee would be able to report.

The reply of Senator Daniels, on behalf of the committee, was to the effect that the various planks of the platform had all been agreed upon, but that there had been such a number of changes made in the different documents as presented by the sub-committees as to render it impossible to make a satisfactory report to the convention before tonight.

The visiting committee withdrew, and the general committee took a recess until 6 o'clock, instructing the sub-committee to proceed with its work of putting the platform in shape, with the understanding that it be ready to report the complete document to the full committee at 6 o'clock this afternoon.

At 8 o'clock Friday evening the resolutions committee met. The platform was read and was subsequently reported to the convention.

DEMOCRACY MUST MOVE FORWARD

My selection as standard-bearer of the democratic party in 1896 and again in 1900 made me the nominal leader of that party, and as such I did not feel at liberty to engraft new doctrines upon the party creed. I contented myself with the defense of those principles and policies which were embodied in the platform. Now, that the leadership devolves upon another and I bear only the responsibility that each citizen must bear, namely, responsibility for my opinions, my utterances and my conduct, I am free to undertake a work which until now I have avoided, namely, the work of organizing the radical and progressive element in the democratic party.

The money question is for the present in abeyance. The increased production of gold has lessened the strain upon the dollar and while bimetallism is as sound in theory as it ever was, the necessity for it is not so apparent. I believe that the time will come when the people will again turn to bimetallism and reject the gold standard, but the period will not come while times are good and while the advocates of the gold standard can point to a reasonably sufficient supply of money.

Of course, it is absurd for those who said that we had money enough in 1896 to point with pride to a large increase since 1896, but inconsistent as it is they do so and as the present enlarged volume of money brings, in part at least, the advantages hoped for from bimetallism, it is useless to press the subject of bimetallism for the present. While the advocates of the gold standard intend a crusade against the silver now in circulation, they do not openly proclaim it, and we must wait until they attempt to carry out their purpose before the people can be awakened to a realization of that purpose. The advocates of the gold standard intend to withdraw the greenback from circulation and to substitute bank notes, but as they do not proclaim their purpose we must await an object lesson before the people will understand it. The advocates of the gold standard intend to substitute an asset currency for the present national bank currency, but they do not proclaim their purpose and until they attempt it the people cannot be made to understand it. The advocates of the gold standard intend to establish a branch bank system such as Jackson overthrew, but as they do not announce their purpose the people do not see it and will not see it until some open and overt attempt is made.

Time will open the eyes of the people and events will reveal the purposes of the financial group that has its home in Wall street and makes forays against the country as often and as rapidly as care for their own safety will permit.

But while the people cannot be brought at this time to consider the various phases of the money question, they can be brought to consider certain other questions with which the democratic party must deal. I have heretofore refused to take a position upon the question of the government ownership of railroads, first, because I had not until recently studied the subject, and, second, because the question had not been reached. Recent events have convinced me that the time is now ripe for the presentation of this question. Consolidation after consolidation has taken place until a few men now control the railroad traffic of the country and defy both the legislative and the executive power of the nation. I invite the

democrats, therefore, to consider a plan for the government ownership and operation of the railroads.

The plan usually suggested is for the purchase of these roads by the federal government. This plan, it seems to me, is more objectionable than a plan which involves the ownership and operation of these roads by the several states. To put the railroads in the hands of the federal government would mean an enormous centralization of power. It would give to the federal government a largely increased influence over the citizen and the citizen's affairs, and such centralization is not at all necessary. The several states can own and operate the railroads within their borders just as effectively as it can be done by the federal government, and if it is done by the states the objection based upon the fear of centralization is entirely answered. A board composed of representatives from the various states could deal with interstate traffic just as freight and passenger boards now deal with the joint traffic of the various lines. If the federal government had the railroads to build there would be a constant warring between different sections to secure a fair share of the new building and development, but where this is left to the state the people in each state can decide what railroads they desire to build or to buy. The maintenance of the track, the care of the stations, the handling of incoming and outgoing freight and passengers—all these things require the employment of men, and if the employment is left to state authorities instead of to national authorities, most of the objections that have been raised to government ownership will be answered.

The arguments in favor of the assumption of the ownership and operation of railroads by the government are numerous:

First—Extortionate rates would be prevented. So far it has been impossible to secure any real regulation of railroad rates. The railroads regulate the government instead of the government the railroads. When the government owns the railroads and operates them, there can be no question about the fixing of reasonable tolls.

Second—Discrimination would be prevented. At present the railroad authorities can kill one town and build up another,

destroy one locality and enrich another. And these discriminations are not always made out of consideration for the interests of the railroad, but are sometimes made because of the investments of officials in the town or locality to be favored. Great injustice has been done by these discriminations, and no way has been found to prevent them.

But there is another kind of discrimination which is operating against the nation's welfare and progress, namely, the discrimination in favor of the large city as against the small one. To the railroads more than any other influence is due the fact that the population is being driven from the country to the city. With fair and impartial rates the small town might again hope to be the home of the small factory, and those people who are being crowded into the cities where they live without the economic, sanitary, intellectual and moral advantages which they deserve, would be scattered more evenly throughout the country to their own great benefit and to the nation's good.

Third—The politics of the nation is being debauched by money. This money is drawn from the great corporations that desire special privileges or immunity from punishment, and is used to corrupt not only the voters, but legislatures. How can this corruption be stopped so long as enormous wealth can be made by watered stock and by the exploitation of the public? The railroad is to a certain extent a monopoly. As soon as a line is built between two points the field is occupied and it is impossible to have competition. If a second road is built for the purpose of securing competition, the traffic between the two terminals must support two roads instead of one, and it is impossible for two roads to carry the passengers and the freight at as low a cost as the one road could. This being true, the result usually is that the competing lines are soon consolidated and the attempt at competition given up. Legislation has been attempted against consolidation, but so far such legislation has been very ineffectual. The benefits to be derived by the railroads from the destruction of competition are so enormous that they have thus far been able to protect themselves by the giving up of a small part of the benefit

to those who are in a position to interfere with them, but whose views can be modified by an argument addressed to the pocketbook.

Fourth—Another objection to the private ownership of railroads has been forced upon me with increasing emphasis during the last few years, namely, the corrupting influence of these great railway corporations over the young professional men of the country. The railroads have lawyers in every county and general attorneys at every state capital. These men stand high in their profession and are usually men of character. Their connection with the railroad has in many instances made them not merely the attorneys for the road in legal matters, but lobbyists for the road in political matters. These men have controlled conventions, dictated nominations, written platforms and so shaped appointments that the masses have been ignored and their interests disregarded. The United States senate today contains so many men who are obliged to the railroads that it has been impossible to secure an amendment of the interstate commerce law, although for years the interstate commerce commission, composed of both republicans and democrats, has been pleading for an amendment.

It is not necessary to believe that United States senators actually draw salaries from these railroads at the same time that they draw salaries from the government, although it is known that salaries have been offered to senators by railroads having business before that body, and it is known today that there are men there who did receive salaries from railroads just before their election and it is not known that those salaries have been relinquished.

If the railroads were owned by the several states instead of by private corporations, the railroad officials would be selected by the people and responsible to the people, whereas now these attorneys are selected by the railroads, paid by the railroads and subservient to the railroads.

Fifth—Another objection to the private ownership of railroads—and it is an objection that all recognize—is the use of the pass in politics. In some of the states the constitution

forbids the use of a pass by public officials, but even in such states officials sometimes use passes and when an official in such a state accepts a pass, having violated the law, he puts himself where the railroad can blackmail him and force him to vote for measures desired by the railroads.

So powerful is the influence of the pass that it was impossible to secure at the last session of congress consideration of a resolution introduced by Congressman Baker of New York asking whether the giving of a pass was a violation of the interstate commerce law. The Pennsylvania railroad and the Baltimore & Ohio road secured large appropriations from the last congress for the enlargement of the depot facilities at Washington, and it is a notorious fact that representatives of the roads were present in the lobbies of the capitol building giving passes to the members of congress who voted with them and refusing passes to the members who voted against their demands. Any one who has had any experience in politics cannot be blind to the fact that the use of the pass often controls conventions, determines the selection of legislators, governors and often judges. When the recipient acts upon questions that involve the interests of the people, either his mind must be influenced by favors received or he must constantly brace himself against that influence. These are some, not all, of the reasons that may be given in favor of the government ownership and operation of the railroads. By leaving the matter to the state each state can act for itself and be governed by the sentiment of the people, moving as slowly or as rapidly as that sentiment demands. But I feel assured that the time has come when the democratic party as a party should turn its face toward the solution of this great question, and by the advocacy of the government ownership of the railroads bring to the people relief from the economic evils that have followed private ownership, and relief from the political corruption which seems indissolubly connected with the private ownership of railroads.

Whether the various roads shall be secured by purchase or condemnation is a matter that each state can decide for itself. It may be wiser to begin by building new lines where they

are now needed and thus determine the value of the old lines by the operation of the new ones. But the means to be employed for the securing of the lines and the rules to be adopted for the operation of them, will be found easy after the public has determined that the people, acting through their government, should take upon themselves the work of controlling this great branch of the business of the people.

While the democratic party in the nation is advocating the government ownership of railroads, the democratic party in the cities should upon the same theory espouse the cause of municipal ownership of municipal franchises. Private contracts for water, lighting and street car facilities have been the fruitful source of municipal corruption, and there is no solution of these municipal problems that does not involve municipal ownership. The progress made in this direction in European cities shows what can be done, and it is only a question of time when in each city in the United States the people acting through their municipal government will do for themselves, without the intervention of corporations, that which is now done at greater expense by private corporations. The municipal operation of the street car lines will result in such a reduction in fares that people can live farther from the center of the city and thus secure healthier locations. There are many questions of sociology that affect the municipal population and the democratic party must meet all of these with an eye single to the public welfare.

We have also reached a time when the postoffice department should embrace a telegraph system as well as a mail system. While the telegraph lines do not reach as many people as the railroads do, and while the abuses of private ownership have not been so open and notorious, yet there is no reason why this nation should not do what other nations are doing in this respect. In the small towns the postmaster could act as telegraph operator and thus a great economy could be effected. In the larger cities the telegraph system could be under the control of the postmaster and such employes added to the postal service as might be necessary. It is safe to say that the cost of messages could be reduced one-half, and yet have the

system self-supporting. There is no good reason that can be urged against the government ownership and operation of the telegraph system in connection with the postal department. The matter has already been investigated by congress and favorable action taken, but the influence of the telegraph companies exerted through their corporate interests and through the franking privilege has been sufficient thus far to prevent any action being taken. The democratic party ought to take up this reform and make it a part of its creed.

The private monopoly must be destroyed. The democratic platform adopted at Kansas City declared the private monopoly to be indefensible and intolerable. This declaration was reproduced in the St. Louis platform adopted a few days ago. To what extent this will be overcome by the influences that surround Judge Parker no one can yet declare, but it is evident that the conservative democrats, as they call themselves, will never give the country any relief from the trusts. The government ownership of railroads will exert a tremendous influence toward the destruction of private monopolies, for most of the great trusts have been built up by railway discriminations and rebates, but the democratic party cannot content itself with any partial remedy for the trusts. It must declare war upon every private monopoly and it must prosecute that war relentlessly until the principle of private monopoly has been eradicated and industrial independence again secured.

The door of opportunity must not be closed against the young men of this country. The right of the citizen to build up an independent business and to enjoy the fruits of his toil must be guaranteed to him. It is the basis of our industrial development and it is the guaranty of our political liberty. The state should be encouraged to employ every power that it has to prevent the incorporation of a private monopoly, and the power of congress over interstate commerce should be invoked to resist any and every effort to use a state charter for the exploitation of the whole country. A line must be drawn between the inalienable rights of the natural man and the law-conferred rights of a corporation. A corporation has no inalienable rights; it has no rights except those given it by

law, and the people cannot be presumed to desire the creation of a man-made giant, having both the power and the disposition to trample upon the rights of the God-made man. The private monopoly must be destroyed, root and branch.

The democratic party has in two campaigns stood for an income tax. The plank was omitted this year because the men in control of the party thought it would jeopardize success in the eastern states. This objection may have weight when the appeal is made to a particular section and to the wealthy men of that section, but it cannot have weight when the party goes forth, as it must ultimately, to appeal to the masses. It is unnecessary to say that a progressive democratic party must favor a tariff for revenue only. It cannot favor the taxation of the many for the benefit of the few.

An income tax is just and without it it will be difficult to secure any effectual tariff reform. When the people understand the income tax the popular demand for it will be so great that no party will dare to ignore it merely to court favor with the comparatively few who are now avoiding their share of the expenses of the government and throwing too large a portion of the public burden upon the poor.

Even as now organized the democratic party stands for the election of senators by the people and it ought to stand for direct legislation as far as the principle can be conveniently applied. Everything that brings the government nearer to the people is good. There is more virtue in the people than ever finds expression through their representatives.

Our party should also consider whether our federal judges should not be elected by the people to serve for a limited period. The life position in the civil service is not in harmony with our theory of government and the appointment of judges for life is not justified by experience. The president must rely upon his advisers when he appoints United States judges and the people at large can make the selection better than any president can. Elections for a stated period would bring the judiciary into closer touch with the people whose servants the judges are.

I suggest, not for the purpose of insisting upon it, but

merely to bring the matter to public attention, that it may be found desirable to change the method of selecting postmasters. At present they are appointed by the president upon the recommendation of congressmen. The postoffice department is now a great political machine presided over by a man skilled in political maneuvers, and the wishes of the people in the various communities are entirely ignored. Why should a federal administration ignore the wishes of the people whom the postmaster is expected to serve? If a system can be devised whereby the federal government will still retain the power of appointment and the power of removal and yet be restricted in appointment to persons named by the local community, a step in advance will have been taken. The right of local self-government can thus be vindicated and the use of the postoffice department for the benefit of the congressmen or for the benefit of the administration prevented. Such a change would also make it impossible for a federal administration to force colored postmasters upon white communities for political purposes. Is there any good reason why the president in making appointments should not consult the convenience and the will of the people who patronize the postoffice?

The differences between labor and capital are becoming more and more acute. And why? Because capital has not only been permitted to monopolize the resources of the government and feed fat upon the toil of the people, but it has been given a free hand in dealing with labor. It has been permitted to use labor for its own enrichment and then to dictate terms to the wage-earner. The democratic party must be the champion of the man who toils—not his defender when he does wrong, not his apologist when he is led into error, but his exponent in the effort to secure the protection of his rights and the conservation of his interests. The democratic party is not the enemy of wealth; on the contrary, it is the best friend of honestly acquired wealth, for by preventing the acquirement of wealth by illegal and unjust methods it would give to the possessor of wealth the honor and the distinction to which his thrift, energy, industry and economy ought to entitle him.

The democratic party, if it is to be a power for good in this country, must be the defender of human rights. It must devote itself to the protection of human rights. It must declare, establish and defend the true relation between man and property, a relation recognized by both Jefferson and Lincoln—a relation which puts man first and his possessions afterward; a relation which makes man the master of that which he has created, a relation which puts the spiritual and moral life of the nation above its material wealth and resources. This is the great struggle of today and it is a struggle in which the democratic party must take an important part.

The contest above outlined must be made whether the party wins in November or not. A single election is but an incident in the life of a party. For more than a century the democratic party has stood forth as the representative of certain great ideas. Jefferson founded it, Jackson defended it, and even Cleveland could not destroy it. If Mr. Parker is elected his administration will rid us of imperialism and of the threat of a race issue and give us greater freedom in the taking up of economic questions. Nothing that he can do or say as president will thwart the purpose of the democratic masses to rid the party of plutocratic influences or tendencies. The republican party is growing more and more plutocratic and it can furnish a home for all who believe in the rule of wealth. The democratic party cannot be a plutocratic party; it cannot belie its history; it cannot disappoint the hopes of its members. The fight must go on and must go on until victory is secured. Can we win? Who can doubt it? To those who think that a temporary victory of the conservative element ends progress in the democratic party let this reply be made:

O ye of little faith! Go forth into the fields and see how the myriad grains, bursting forth from their prison in the earth, push forward toward the light. Watch them as under the influence of sunshine and shower they grow to maturity and furnish food for the race. Go into the orchard and see the seed or the grafted twig grow into a great tree whose leaves furnish shade and whose fruit gives nourishment to man. Measure if you can the mighty forces behind the grain and the

tree, and know ye that the forces behind the truth are as irresistible and as constantly at work. God would have been unkind, indeed, had He made such ample provision for the needs of man's body and less adequate provision for the triumph of those moral forces which mean more to the race than food or clothing or shelter. He is a political atheist who doubts the triumph of the right. He lacks faith in the purposes and the plans of God who for a moment falters in the great struggle between truth and error—between man and mammon.

THOSE LITTLE QUESTIONS

Congressman Williams of Mississippi, in his reply to Mr. Bryan, complained because Mr. Bryan was proposing that certain questions be submitted to Candidate Parker. Mr. Williams described them as "little questions." When the readers of *THE COMMONER* know what the questions were, they can better judge whether they were little or not. They were:

First—Do you favor a diminution of the volume of silver dollars?

Second—Do you favor an asset currency?

Third—Do you favor branch national banks?

Fourth—Do you prefer the national bank note to the United States note, commonly known as the greenback?

These questions were rejected by the committee because the committee wanted to avoid any mention of the money question. When, however, the Parker telegram came and his friends proposed to answer the telegram by declaring that the silver question was no longer an issue, the friends of bimetallism felt that the party's position ought to be stated, or at least the candidate's position known on those phases of the money question which are before the country.

The questions submitted by Mr. Bryan in his amendment are not only pertinent, but they are important questions. Whether 578,000,000 of silver dollars should be retired or not is not a little question; it is a question of vast proportions and

one that must be met. Whether we are to have an asset currency or not, is not a little question, but one of great magnitude affecting the entire country and affecting it vitally. Whether we are to have a great national bank with branches spreading over the country, like the bank which Jackson destroyed, is not a little question, but one whose importance cannot be overstated.

Whether we are to have a currency of bank paper or a currency of government paper is a question that has nothing to do with the silver question, but has a great deal to do with the nation's welfare. To call these "little questions" is not to belittle the questions, but to disclose a profound ignorance of the issues before the country. It was evident that Mr. Parker's friends would vote down any proposition that was displeasing to him, and the amendment was withdrawn not only in the interest of harmony, but because an adverse vote upon it might have been accepted by Mr. Parker as an indorsement of the republican position on these questions. But any one who describes them as "little questions" has yet to learn much of the money question and much to learn of the issues before the country. The plutocratic element in the democratic party which now rejoices in a triumph over the rank and file will find in the questions described by Mr. Williams as "little," issues with which Mr. Parker will have to wrestle if elected and when he begins to take the Wall street side of these questions he will have the same experience that Grover Cleveland had.

PHILIPPINE DELEGATES NOT ADMITTED

The national democratic convention refused to admit the delegation from the Philippine islands on the ground that the supreme court decided that the islands are not a part of the United States. That being the case, the convention did not feel that delegates from colonies had a right to participate in the convention. The action of the convention was correct. The democratic party cannot very well object to colonialism

and at the same time allow colonial delegates to sit in the convention. There seems, however, to have been an additional reason for refusing seats to the delegation. The editor of THE COMMONER has it upon good authority that the colonial government in the Philippine islands went actively to work to control the democratic convention with a view to securing an indorsement of the colonial policy of the administration. In the city of Manila the anti-administration element in the democratic party secured fifty-two delegates out of the seventy, but the government officials drummed up men to act for the outside provinces and in that way made a showing in the convention. Manila contains a large majority of the democrats of the islands, and yet the outside districts represented by local men under the influence of the colonial offices, controlled the convention and sent a delegation to St. Louis. The fact that this attempt was made and made successfully to control the delegation from the Philippine islands only shows how dangerous it would be to have these islands a part of the United States and their representatives recognized in the councils of the party or of the nation. It would be impossible to prevent fraud and nearly as impossible to investigate it so far away, and we would find the corrupting influences now so powerful at home still more powerful in remote colonies. The democratic party is to be congratulated upon the unanimity with which it spoke against imperialism and colonialism. The party's position on this important question is so righteous that if Mr. Parker were wrong on everything else it would be worth while to bear with his errors in order that imperialism might be stamped out and the country again planted upon the Declaration of Independence.

DEATH OF PAUL KRUGER

Paul Kruger is dead. The president of the Boer republic has been called to his account. As the leading figure among the South African burghers in the struggle to retain their

independence his name and face has become familiar to the world. The hearts of the American people were with him, and but for our nation's conduct in the Philippines American sympathy would have been unhesitatingly expressed for him and his compatriots. It is a sad and melancholy reflection upon this country that a people struggling for liberty looked in vain to the United States for a friendly word of encouragement and sympathy.

Bereft of country and then bereft of his life companion, he awaited "the inevitable hour." Death found him with his work finished and his name indelibly written upon the pages of history. Hasten the day when liberty and self-government will be so universal that no patriot will end his life amid conditions as discouraging as those which hemmed in Paul Kruger during the closing days of his career!

CHRONICLE LAYS ASIDE MASK

The *Chicago Chronicle*, which has for eight years been masquerading as a democratic paper, lays aside its false pretense and comes out as a republican organ. Good riddance. The democratic party is the stronger for its withdrawal. Its commendation of democracy—a sin which it committed but rarely—did the party harm. Its open opposition will be a testimonial. Now if a few more of its plutocratic colleagues will follow the example of the *Chronicle*, the party may hope to merit public esteem.

The *Chronicle* is owned by a republican banker named John R. Walsh. It is the servile defender of every scheme for the spoliation of the public and if so many of the republican leaders were not themselves engaged in the same nefarious business they would ask for an injunction against the *Chronicle* to prevent its use of the republican name.

On another page will be found an editorial from the *Chronicle*. It is quoted to show that the *Chronicle* in leaving the party carries its venom with it, and that it proposes to follow on the

outside of the party the same malicious and mendacious course that it followed when it was using the livery of democracy for the service of the republican party. Now that the *Chronicle* is republican, THE COMMONER will be glad to quote from it, for its editor is indiscreet enough to say many things in behalf of the republican party to which the republican leaders would not dare to give expression.

THE WRITING OF THE PLATFORM

The papers have credited Mr. Bryan with an influential part in the writing of some of the planks of the democratic national platform. While he did what he could and feels gratified with what was accomplished, he would have been powerless but for the active and constant support of a number of strong and faithful men.

General Weaver, of Iowa; Senator Newlands, of Nevada; ex-Senator Pettigrew, of South Dakota; Mr. Tarpey, of California; Senator Dubois, of Idaho; Mr. Barkworth, of Michigan; Governor Beckham, of Kentucky; Congressman Jackson, of Kansas; Mr. Flemming, of Wisconsin; Mr. Hurd of Missouri; Mr. Vesaley, of Minnesota; Mr. Green, of Rhode Island; Mr. Butcher, of Oregon; Mr. Goodman, of Washington; Mr. Roy Stafford, of Oklahoma; Mr. Fitch, of New Mexico; Mr. Timming, of Arizona; and a number of others were with us in the thick of the fight on every question.

Senator Bailey of Texas did splendid work in the shaping of the tariff and anti-trust planks of the platform, and in the fight against the gold plank. Ex-Gov. Thomas of Colorado suggested the plank on the Colorado situation. A number of southern members of the committee, among them Senators Clark of Arkansas, Tillman of South Carolina and Carmack of Tennessee, opposed the gold plank with considerable vehemence, and the majority on this question was larger than any other upon which the vote was taken. Congressman Williams of Mississippi and ex-Congressman Shiveley of Indiana, Mr.

Maginnis of Montana, and Mr. Rhodes of Alabama voted to strike out the gold plank.

The principle of the income tax was advocated by all but one of the members who spoke upon the subject, but a large majority opposed the insertion of it in the platform on the ground of expediency.

The contest over the platform was a memorable one. The last session occupied sixteen hours, but as a result the committee made a unanimous report and presented a platform which, while not embodying all that each desired, did present several definite and clearly defined issues.

THOSE LABOR PLANKS

The *Chicago Chronicle* in an editorial under the caption "Amending the Platform," asserts that Mr. Bryan has been guilty of "making additions to the platform," and further asserts that "there is not a syllable in the democratic platform as telegraphed to Chicago on the subject of arbitration in labor troubles or about the eight-hour day in government work."

Mr. Bryan is in no wise responsible for what was "telegraphed to Chicago," but he is responsible for what appears in *THE COMMONER*. The best proof of what is in the platform is the platform itself. A copy of the platform certified by the official stenographer as correct in every word similar to the one read to the convention contains this plank under the sub-head of "Capital and Labor":

We favor the enactment and administration of laws giving labor and capital impartially their just rights. Capital and labor ought not to be enemies. Each is necessary to the other. Each has its rights, but the rights of labor are certainly no less "vested," no less "sacred," and no less "inalienable" than the rights of capital.

We favor arbitration of differences between corporate employers and their employes, and a strict enforcement of the eight-hour law on all government work.

The *Chronicle* further says that "as to government by injunction the platform is equally silent about that also, unless reference is made to the indorsement of the senate bill on the subject of punishing contempt of court, which failed to pass in 1896."

Immediately following the planks above quoted the following appears in the platform adopted at St. Louis:

We approve the measure which passed the United States senate in 1896, but which a republican congress has ever since refused to enact, relating to contempts in federal courts and providing for trial by jury in cases of indirect contempt.

Substantially the same words were used in the "injunction plank" of the Chicago platform. That platform said:

We approve the bill passed at the last session of the United States senate, and now pending in the house of representatives, relative to contempts in federal courts, and providing for trials by jury in certain cases of contempt.

The *Chronicle's* inability to find what it does not want to find is in no wise chargeable to THE COMMONER or to Mr. Bryan. The platform speaks for itself.

"FRENZIED FINANCE"

Thomas W. Lawson, the Boston financier, is engaged in writing a series of articles for *Everybody's Magazine*. These articles are entitled "Frenzied Finance; The Story of Amalgamated." Mr. Lawson's conscience appears to have been quickened because he says that he has "unwittingly been made the instrument by which thousands upon thousands of investors in America and Europe have been 'plundered.'" He wishes to inform these investors of his intention in the past that they may acquit him of intentional wrong-doing.

Mr. Lawson declares that the "system" to which the Amalgamated belongs "has for years as boldly, as coarsely, and as cruelly robbed the American people as the coolie slaves are robbed by their masters," and he ventures the prediction that

when he has concluded his disclosures, the people will not be contented with the restoration of the vast sums which the Amalgamated took from them and from which others took in lesser amounts, but by equally flagrant methods, but will demand the overthrow of the "system" itself.

It must be admitted that Mr. Lawson draws a terrible picture even in his brief introductory chapter; and yet, however terrible the picture may appear, it is no worse in appearance than a large number of people have suspected as to the real character of the "system" that is now preying upon them. It will, however, be advantageous to have the story told by one who seems to have had intimate dealings with the chiefs of the "system."

Mr. Lawson explains that the "system" is "a process or device for the incubation of wealth from the people's savings in banks, trust and public funds." He says that through the workings of this "system" during the last twenty years "there has grown up in this country a set of colossal corporations in which unmeasured success and continued immunity from punishment have bred an insolent disregard of law, of common morality, and of public and private right, together with a grim determination to hold onto, at all hazard, the great possessions they have gulped or captured." He declares that through this "system" billions of dollars have been taken from millions of people and these dollars have been given over to a "score or two of men with power to use and enjoy them as absolutely as though these billions had been earned dollar by dollar by labor of their bodies and minds." He declares that because of Amalgamated alone, to his personal knowledge, more than \$100,000,000 were lost by the people; that more than thirty suicides resulted; that twenty previously reputable citizens were made prison convicts. Mr. Lawson pays a high tribute to the stories told by Henry D. Lloyd in his work "Wealth against Commonwealth" and to Miss Ida M. Tarbell in her recent sketches; but he says that however thorough these writers may have been in gathering the facts, however relentless their pens and vivid their pictures, they dealt but with things that are dead. Mr. Lawson proposes to deal with the

living present and it is not at all difficult to believe that he is determined to be very thorough in dealing with this subject, because in his introductory chapter he lays out a wide range for himself. Unquestionably the reading public will await with great interest the disclosures of Mr. Lawson.

The people will undoubtedly be greatly interested in the chapter which Mr. Lawson describes in advance in this way:

I shall devote some space to pointing out the evils and dangers of the latter-day methods of corrupting law-makers, and show how one entire Massachusetts legislature, with the exception of a few members, were dealt with as openly as the fishmongers procure their stock-in-trade upon the wharves; how upon the last day of the legislature, because their deferred cash payments were not promptly forthcoming, they turned, and made necessary the hurried departure for foreign shores of a great lawyer and his secretary, with bags of quickly gathered gold, and all evidences of the crimes committed and attempted; how after the ship arrived at an island in foreign seas the great lawyer's dead body received hurried burial, and his secretary's was later dropped, with weights about his feet, to the ocean's depths; and how ever since the natives whisper among themselves their gruesome suspicions.

Another chapter that will unquestionably be awaited with interest is described by Mr. Lawson in this way:

I shall devote a chapter to the doings of certain financial reputation sandbaggers and blackmailers; show how through their agencies they hold up corporations and their managers for large sums, which upon being paid start into motion a perfected system for the false moulding of public opinion for the purpose of making more easy the plundering of the people. I shall photograph the men and draw accurate diagrams of the machinery through which their nefarious trade is carried on.

Even those who maintain that a court should be above criticism will be interested in the chapter described by Mr. Lawson in this way:

I shall draw a picture of two dress-suit cases of money being slipped across the table at the foot of a judge's bench in the court room, from its custodian to its new owners, upon the

rendering of a court decision; and I shall show how the new owners frustrated a plot whereby they were to be waylaid and the bags of money recovered.

Those who imagine that in supporting the republican party in 1896 they were in fact waging a battle in support of "national honor," as well as those who followed the democratic banner to defeat, will be interested in the chapter described by Mr. Lawson in this way:

I shall deal with a bit of the nation's history in which within a few days of the national election of 1896 a hurry-up call for additional funds to the extent of \$5,000,000 was so promptly met as to overturn the people in five states and thereby preserve the destinies of the republican party, of which I am and have always been a member.

There can be little doubt that the Boston financier is well informed as to the methods of the trust system and it may be that the disclosures he will make will serve to arouse the American people to the importance of protecting their government and their property from the iniquitous "system" that has grown up in this country and which unless checked at an early day, must result in the complete destruction of popular rule and the enthronement of a plutocracy that can be displaced only by revolution.

MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH IN THE ST. LOUIS CONVENTION

At the democratic national convention at St. Louis Mr. Bryan, in seconding the nomination of Senator F. M. Cockrell to be president, spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Convention: Two nights without sleep and a cold make it difficult for me to make myself heard. I trust that my voice will improve in a moment, but as I desire to speak to the delegates rather than to the galleries, I hope they at least will be able to hear.

Eight years ago a democratic national convention placed in my hand the standard of the party and commissioned me as its candidate. Four years later that commission was renewed. I come tonight to this democratic national convention to return the commission. You may dispute whether I have fought a good fight, you may dispute whether I have finished my course, but you cannot deny that I have kept the faith. (Applause.)

As your candidate I did all that I could to bring success to the party; as a private citizen I feel more interested in democratic success today than I ever did when I was a candidate. (Applause.)

The reasons that made the election of a democrat desirable were stronger in 1900 than in 1896, and the reasons that make the election of a democrat desirable are stronger now than they were in 1900. (Applause.)

The gentleman who presented New York's candidate dwelt upon the dangers of militarism, and he did not overstate those dangers. Let me quote the most remarkable passage ever found in a speech nominating a candidate for the presidency.

Governor Black, of New York, in presenting the name of Theodore Roosevelt to the republican convention, used these words:

"The fate of nations is still decided by their wars. You may talk of orderly tribunals and learned referees; you may sing in your schools the gentle praises of the quiet life; you may strike from your books the last note of every martial anthem, and yet out in the smoke and thunder will always be the tramp of horses and the silent, rigid, upturned face. Men may prophesy and women pray, but peace will come here to abide forever on this earth only when the dreams of childhood are the accepted charts to guide the destinies of men.

"Events are numberless and mighty, and no man can tell which wire runs around the world. The nation basking today in the quiet of contentment and repose may still be on the deadly circuit and tomorrow writhing in the toils of war. This is the time when great figures must be kept in front. If the pressure is great the material to resist it must be granite and iron."

This is a eulogy of war. This is a declaration that the hoped for, prayed for, era of perpetual peace will never come. This is an exalting of the doctrine of brute force; it darkens the hopes of the race. (Applause.)

This republican president, a candidate for re-election, is presented as the embodiment of the warlike spirit as "the granite and iron" that represents modern militarism.

Do you, men of the east, desire to defeat the military idea? Friends of the south, are you anxious to defeat the military idea? Let me assure you that not one of you north, east, or south, fears more than I do the triumph of that idea. If this is the doctrine that our nation is to stand for, it is retrogression, not progress. It is a lowering of the ideals of the nation. It is a turning backward to the age of violence. More than that, it is nothing less than a challenge to the Christian civilization of the world. (Applause.)

Some twenty-six hundred years ago a prophet foretold the coming of One who was to be called the Prince of Peace. Nearly two thousand years ago He came upon the earth, and the song that was sung at His birth was "Peace on earth, good will toward men." (Applause.) For almost twenty centuries this doctrine of peace has been growing; it has been taking hold upon the hearts of men. For this doctrine of peace, millions have gladly given their lives; for this doctrine of peace, thousands have crossed oceans and labored in distant lands, aye, even among savage tribes. This doctrine of peace, the foundation of Christian civilization, has been the growing hope and inspiration of the world. And now, an ex-governor of the largest state in the union presents for the office of president of the greatest republic of all history, a man who is described as "granite and iron," as one who represents, not the doctrine of peace and arbitration, but the doctrine that the destinies of nations must still be settled by their wars. (Applause.) Will you democrats of New York present a graver indictment against President Roosevelt than that? Can you of the south present a more serious accusation? I do not ask concerning the character of the president. He may have every virtue; his life may be exemplary in every way; but if he shares the views

of the man who placed him in nomination, if he believes with his sponsor that wars must settle the destinies of nations; that peace is but an idle, childish dream, that women may pray for it; that men may prophesy about it; but that all this talk of "orderly tribunals and learned referees" is but an empty sound—if he believes these things he is a dangerous man for our country and for the world. (Applause.) I believe he ought to be defeated; I believe he can be defeated; and if the democratic party does what it ought to do, I believe he will be defeated. (Applause.)

How can he be defeated? As your candidate I tried to defeat the republican party. I failed, you say? Yes, I failed. I received a million more votes than any democrat had ever received before, and yet I failed. Why did I fail? Because some who had affiliated with the democratic party thought my election would be injurious to the country, and they left the party and helped to elect my opponent. That is why I failed. I have no words of criticism for them. (Applause.) I have always believed, I believe tonight, I shall ever believe, I hope, that a man's duty to his country is higher than his duty to his party. (Applause.) I hope that men of all parties will have the moral courage to leave their parties when they believe that to stay with their parties would injure their country. The success of our government depends upon the independence and the moral courage of its citizens. (Applause.)

But, my friends, if I, with six million and a half votes, failed to defeat the republican party, can those who defeated me succeed in defeating the republican party? If under the leadership of those who were loyal in 1896 we failed, shall we succeed under the leadership of those who were not loyal in 1896? (Applause.)

If we are going to have some other god besides this modern Mars, presented to us by Governor Black, what kind of a god is it to be? Must we choose between a god of war and a god of gold? (Applause.)

If there is anything that compares in hatefulness with militarism, it is plutocracy, and I insist that the democratic party

ought not to be compelled to choose between militarism on the one side and plutocracy on the other. (Applause.)

We have agreed upon a platform, after a session of sixteen hours. We entered the committee room at 8 last evening and left it at 12 today. But I never employed sixteen hours to better advantage in my life. (Applause.) I helped to bring the party together. The report was unanimous and we can go before the country with a united party. (Applause.)

How did we reach an agreement? The platform is not all that we of the west desired; it is not all that our eastern democrats desired. We had to consent to the omission of some things that we wanted in the platform. They had to consent to the omission of some things that they wanted in the platform. But by mutual concession we agreed upon a platform, and we will stand on that platform in this campaign. (Applause.)

But, my friends, we need more than a platform. (Applause.) We must nominate a ticket, and that is the work now before this convention. Had a majority of you come to this convention instructed for any man I not only would not ask you to disregard your instructions; I would not, if I could prevent it, permit you to disregard your instructions. (Applause.)

I believe in the right of the people to rule. I believe in the right of the people to instruct their delegates, and when a delegate is instructed, the instruction is binding upon him. But no candidate comes with a majority instructed for him. That means that you, the delegates, are left to select a candidate upon your own responsibility—and a grave responsibility it is, grave indeed is the responsibility resting upon the delegates assembled in this convention!

I have not come to ask anything of this convention. Nebraska asks nothing but to be permitted to fight the battles of democracy; that is all. (Applause.) Some of you call me a dictator. It is false. You know it is false. (Applause.) How have I tried to dictate? I have said that I thought certain things ought to be done. Have you not exercised the same

privilege? Why have I not a right to suggest? (Applause.) Because I was your candidate, have I forfeited forever the right to make suggestions? Sirs, if that condition was attached to a nomination for the presidency, no man worthy to be president would ever accept a nomination, (Applause) for the right of a man to have an opinion and to express it is more important and more sacred than the holding of any office however high.

I expressed my opinion in regard to the platform; I made my suggestions. Not all of them were adopted. I should like to have seen the Kansas City platform reaffirmed. (Applause.) I am not ashamed of that platform. I believe in it now, as I believed in it when I was running upon it as your candidate, but the delegates do not agree with me, and their will is supreme in the making of the platform. When they veto my suggestions, I must submit; there is no other court to which I can appeal.

Neither have I attempted to dictate in regard to candidates. I have not asked the democrats of this nation to nominate any particular man. I have said and repeat that there are men in every state qualified for the presidency; I have said and repeat that out of the six and a half millions who voted for me in both campaigns, we ought to be able to find at least one man fit to be president. (Applause.) I have made these suggestions, but they are only suggestions. I am here tonight as a delegate from Nebraska. I have not confidence enough in my own judgment to tell you that I can pick out a man and say, "This man must be nominated or we shall lose." I have, I think, a reasonable faith in my own opinions; at least I would rather stand by my opinion if I believe it right than to accept the opinion of any one else if I believe that opinion to be wrong. (Applause.)

But Nebraska is not here asking for the nomination of any particular man. We have a platform on which we all can stand. (Applause.) Now give us a ticket behind which all of us can stand. (Applause.) Go into any state you please for a candidate. I have not as much faith as some have in the value of locality. I have never believed much in nominating candi-

dates from doubtful states on the theory that their personal popularity would elect them.

I have so much confidence in democratic principles that I think a democrat ought to vote for a good man from any other state rather than vote for a bad man from his own state. (Applause.) The state pride argument is often given too much weight. I have found that when people come with a candidate and tell us, first, that we must carry a certain state, and, second, that their man is the only one who can carry that state, they do not put up a bond to deliver the votes. (Applause.) And then, anyhow, a state which is so uncertain that only one democrat in the nation can carry it, cannot be relied upon in a great crisis. (Applause.)

Select a candidate. If it is the wish of this convention that the standard shall be placed in the hand of the gentleman presented by California, a man who, though he has money, pleads the cause of the poor (Applause); the man who is best beloved, I think I can safely say, among laboring men, of all the candidates proposed; the man who more than any other represents opposition to the trusts—if you want to place the standard in his hand and make Mr. Hearst the candidate of this convention, Nebraska will be with you in the fight. (Applause.)

If you think that the gentleman from Wisconsin who, though faithful in both campaigns, was not with us on the money question—if you think that Mr. Wall, who agrees with the East on the gold question and with the West on other questions, would draw the party together, place the standard in his hand, and Nebraska will be with you and contribute her part. (Applause.)

If you prefer an eastern man and can find some one who will give both elements of the party something to believe in, something to trust in, something to hope for, we are willing to join you in selecting him as the standard-bearer.

Not all of the available men have been mentioned. There is in the state of Pennsylvania a man whom I desire to suggest, and I do it without consulting his delegation and without the consent of the man himself. He is an eastern man, who

voted with us in both campaigns, although against us on the money question, but, I believe, he is in sympathy with the people; a man twice governor of a great state; a man who only two years ago when again a candidate, carried the state of Pennsylvania, outside of the two great cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburg. (Applause.)

If you eastern democrats who insist that your objection to me is that I believe in free silver—if you are willing to take ex-Governor Pattison, a gold man, I am willing to let you have your way on that question, for I will trust his honesty on all questions. (Applause.) But I only mention these candidates by way of illustration.

I desire to second the nomination of a man whose name has already been presented, and I second his nomination, not because I can assert to you that he is more available than any other person who might be named, but because I love the man and because on the platform we have adopted there is no good reason why any democrat in the East should vote against him. I desire to second the nomination of Senator Cockrell of Missouri. (Applause.)

He is the Nestor of the senate; he is experienced in public affairs. He is known; he has a record, and can be measured by it. I would be willing to write my indorsement on his back and guarantee everything he did. (Applause.)

It is said that he comes from the south. What if he does? I do not share the feeling that some have that the democratic party cannot take a candidate from the south. It is said he was in the Confederate army. What if he was? I do not share the belief of those who say that we cannot afford to nominate an ex-Confederate. (Applause.) That war, that cruel war, occurred forty years ago. Its issues are settled; its wounds are healed, and the participants are friends. We have another war on now, and those who know what the war between democracy and plutocracy means, will not ask where the candidate stood forty years ago; they will ask where he stands today—on which side he is fighting in the present conflict.

The great issue in this country today is "democracy versus plutocracy." I have been accused of having but one idea—silver. A while back it was said that I had only one, but then it was tariff reform. But there is an issue greater than the silver issue, the tariff issue or the trust issue. It is the issue between the democracy and plutocracy—whether this is to be a government of the people, and administered by officers chosen by the people, and administered in behalf of the people, or a government by the moneyed element of the country in the interest of predatory wealth. This issue is growing.

I ask you to help us meet this issue. You tell me that the republican candidate stands for militarism. Yes, but he also stands for plutocracy. You tell me that he delights in war. Yes, but there is another objection to him, and that is that he does not enforce the law against a big criminal as he does against a little criminal. The laws are being violated today, and those laws must be enforced. The government must be administered according to the maxim: "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none." (Applause.)

We have had the debauchment of elections. It was stated the other day that into the little state of Delaware, two hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars were sent at one time just before the election of 1896. Some say that our party must have a great campaign fund and bid against the republicans. Let me warn you that if the democratic party is to save this nation, it must save it, not by purchase, but by principle. (Applause.) That is the only way to save it. Every time we resort to purchase, we encourage the spirit of barter. Under such a system the price will constantly increase, and the elections will go to the highest bidder. If the democratic party is to save this country, it must appeal to the conscience of the country. It must point out the dangers to the republic; and if the party will nominate a man, I care not from what part of the country he comes, who is not the candidate of a faction, who is not the candidate of an element, but the candidate of the party, the party will stand by him and will drive the republican party from power. (Applause.) ,

You could, I believe, take a man from any southern state—a man who would appeal to all democrats who love democratic principles, and to those republicans who begin to fear for their nation's welfare, and he would poll a million more votes than the candidate of any faction whose selection would be regarded as a triumph of a part of the party over the rest of the party. (Applause.)

I simply submit these suggestions for your consideration. I am here to discharge a duty that I owe to the party. I knew before coming to this convention that a majority of the delegates would not agree with me in regard to the financial plank. I knew that there would be among the delegates many who voted against me when I sorely needed their help. I am not objecting to the majority against me, nor to the presence of those who left us in 1896 and have since returned, but I am here, not because I enjoy being in the minority, but because I owe a duty to the more than six million brave and loyal men who sacrificed for the ticket in recent campaigns. (Applause.) I came to get them as good a platform as I could; I have helped to get them a good platform. (Applause.) I came to help to get as good a candidate as possible, and I hope that he will be one who can draw the factions together; one who will give to us who believe in positive, aggressive, democratic reform, something to hope for, something to fight for—one who will also give to those who have differed from us on the money question something to hope for, something to fight for. And I close with an appeal from my heart to the hearts of those who hear me: Give us a pilot who will guide the democratic ship away from the Scylla of militarism without wrecking her upon the Charybdis of commercialism. (Applause.)

MR. BRYAN'S SPEECHES DURING THE CLOSING HOURS OF THE CONVENTION

Following is Mr. Bryan's first speech on the last night of the St. Louis convention, delivered while Judge Parker's telegram was under discussion:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the convention: I do not know whether I can make myself heard by you. I was informed that some action was being taken here and I came over.

I understand that you have received a telegram from the candidate, which has been read to you, and which I have read, and that a motion has been made to send back a reply, and that the question now is on the resolution directing the sending of this reply.

I wish to state the facts in this matter and then to make a suggestion.

We had a protracted session of the committee on resolutions. For sixteen hours we were in session the last time. When the platform was reported from the subcommittee it contained the gold standard plank of which you know. It was discussed in committee. It was stated by members that it would be unfortunate to insert the plank, and finally, by a vote of thirty-five to fifteen the gold plank was excluded.

I then introduced some separate resolutions. I had previously introduced a resolution reaffirming the Kansas City platform. That was voted down. When we refused to declare in favor of the gold standard and refused to reaffirm the Kansas City platform, we left the question open as to the monetary standard.

I called attention to the fact that there were certain questions before congress upon which we ought to express an opinion. I called attention to the fact that a bill had been reported by a committee authorizing the melting of silver dollars into subsidiary coin at the discretion of the secretary of the treasury. I pointed out that the purpose of the bill was to gradually melt up the silver dollars and recoin them into subsidiary coin of limited legal tender. I pointed out that the purpose of the bill was to decrease the amount of standard money just to the extent of the melting of the coin. But the committee refused to adopt it, saying that, as we had left the gold and silver question out entirely, we ought not by any suggestion to bring any phase of the money question into the campaign.

I introduced a resolution declaring our opposition to any contraction of the currency by the melting or retirement of any of the silver dollars. They objected that that brought in the question. I scratched out "silver dollars" and made it read that we objected to the contraction of the volume of metallic money. They said that the words "metallic money" might bring in the silver question. I scratched out "metallic money" and put in "standard money"—that we were opposed to the contraction of the volume of standard money; but they said: "We do not want to bring the money question in at all."

I then proposed a resolution condemning the asset currency, and called attention to the fact that it had no connection with the silver question, but they said that if we touched on any phase of the money question, it would bring in all of it.

I called attention to the fact that we had to meet this issue; that we had to have either a perpetual debt or an asset currency, if we had the national banks of issue. But they were so anxious to get harmony and bring the party together that we might fight this battle as a unit, that they were not even willing to declare against an asset currency and branch banks.

I then proposed a resolution declaring that the United States notes furnished better money than the national bank notes. I was trying to get a declaration on that principle which has no connection with the silver question, but has a connection with a vital, living, throbbing question. But they said: "In the interest of harmony we must leave that out," and thus every proposition on our side was voted down, and they put it on the ground that as the gold proposition on their side had been voted down, no phase of the question should be touched.

When we came to read over the final draft I found that, inadvertently, a phrase had been used in the last paragraph which might raise this question. Here is the paragraph:

"But also the active assistance of all of our fellow citizens, who disregarding past differences upon questions no longer in issue," etc.

I moved to strike out "upon questions no longer in issue," on the ground that it was a declaration that the money question was settled, and substantially a declaration for the gold standard. On motion in that committee it was stricken out, and here (exhibiting) is the official draft of the platform with those words stricken out. I find that copies had been given out to the newspapers before this correction was made, and as the platform appears in the papers those words (the words stricken out) are in it.

The committee took every precaution to keep this question out, and now I understand it is proposed that we shall make a declaration in this telegram that :

"The platform adopted by this convention is silent upon the question of the monetary standard because it is not regarded by us as a possible issue in this campaign, and only campaign issues are mentioned in the platform. Therefore there is nothing in the views expressed by you in the telegram just received which would preclude a man entertaining them from accepting a nomination on said platform."

In the committee I asked Senator Hill if he knew Mr. Parker's views on the gold standard. He said he did not; that he had never talked with him on that subject, and that he did not know his views upon it. Now, my friends, if you send this telegram and say that this question is no longer an issue, you simply say it is settled on the gold standard side; and I insist that if you are going to declare for the gold standard, you should be honest and manly and say so in the platform. (Applause.)

Senator Tillman has said that we all know where Mr. Parker stands; that we all knew in the committee. How did we know? Only by his silence. That was the only way. Judging by his silence, I believed he was for the gold standard, and I have insisted for months that he ought to state his position, so that the American people could sit in judgment upon it and not enter a convention blindfolded on this subject. (Applause.)

If this convention will adopt a plank declaring that the gold

standard has been established in this country and is accepted, I shall offer no objection to the plank except to vote against it. (Applause.)

But I appeal to you to be candid with the voters of this country. (Applause.) I appeal to you to take them into your confidence. If there is any objection to our saying this plainly, why should we say it by inference; and if you say that you are willing to say this in regard to the gold standard because it is settled, then I insist, that having entered upon the money question, you shall say in the platform whether or not the party favors the melting up of the silver dollars, whether it favors the asset currency, the branch banks, and the national bank currency. (Applause.) And if the convention does not want to do this; if it wants simply to send this telegram, then I insist that if we are going to tell Mr. Parker that his views are unimportant on this question, because it is not an issue, we shall tell him that his views are important on these other phases of the financial question which are before the country. (Applause.)

Mr. R. F. Pettigrew of South Dakota: May I ask the gentleman from Nebraska a question?

Mr. Bryan: Certainly.

Mr. Pettigrew: As I recollect the telegram of Judge Parker, it practically says that the gold standard is irrevocably established and he would veto any bill to disturb it. I want to know if his language would admit of any other interpretation?

Mr. Bryan: The words "firmly and irrevocably may mean that there is no——

Mr. Pettigrew: He says he will act accordingly if he is elected.

Mr. Bryan: Yes—"irrevocably established, and (I) shall act accordingly." If he means that it is established beyond the power of the American people to change it, I would deny it, for the American people have the right to fix their standard and to change it whenever they please. (Applause.) If, however, he simply means that, so far as he is concerned, he is

opposed to any change, and that he wants to go into office with the understanding that all the influence of the executive will be used to prevent any change in the standard, then I understand it to mean that if president, and having the veto power which enables him to override anything less than two-thirds of both houses, he will use that power even if the majority of the people want to change the standard. (Applause.)

I am sorry that this question ever arose. I joined in the report of the platform committee because I wanted harmony. I joined in it because I wanted to put a united party back of our candidate. I think it is a manly thing for a man to express his opinion before the convention adjourns; but it would have been manlier to have expressed it before the convention met. (Applause.) It is a manly thing to express his opinion before the delegates act finally upon his position, but it would have been a manlier thing had he expressed his opinion before the voters throughout the country went to their caucuses and their primaries and sent instructed delegates here. (Applause.)

We can not be blamed for the injection of this question at this time. It is the judge's fault that he did not speak sooner, and not our fault. He has been invited to speak on numerous and sundry occasions. It is not our fault that this question was ever raised. His friends brought the gold plank into the committee and tried to make it a part of the platform; but, having been offered and having been stricken out and the convention having acted, I am not willing to send this naked statement to him, and thereby write into our platform a plank that we intended to leave out of the platform. (Applause.)

I shall, therefore, oppose this telegram, or possibly as amendments must be acted on first, I will propose some amendments to the telegram, and then if the motion to send the telegram is defeated, you can propose your gold standard plank and let the convention vote upon it. If the gold standard is right, why run from it? (Applause.) If it is good, why be afraid of it? And if it is bad enough to scare you out of putting it in your platform, it is bad enough to leave out, either directly or indirectly. (Applause.)

SECOND SPEECH

Following is Mr. Bryan's speech on the last night of the St. Louis convention supporting his amendment to the answer proposed to Judge Parker's telegram:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the convention: I will first read the amendment which I propose to the telegram, and then I desire to submit a few remarks in answer to some things which have been said. Here is the amendment:

"But as you will, if elected, be called upon to act on certain phases of the money question, we desire to know whether you favor reducing the volume of silver dollars, whether you favor an asset currency and branch national banks, and whether you prefer national bank currency to United States notes."

I wish to take up several matters, and I will take them up in order. I was willing in the committee to do everything possible in the interest of harmony, and I want you gentlemen to know that if there is discord in this convention, you can not lay it at my door. (Applause.) I have been the harmonizer. When they voted down my proposition to reaffirm the Kansas City platform, I did not present a minority report, and when we voted down their proposition for the gold standard and they did not present a minority report, we supposed that settled the matter. And my point now is that after we have done our part, after in the interest of harmony we have given up our contentions, they should not force upon us something worse even than their original proposition. (Applause.)

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Carmack) says he proposed a resolution, and I was willing to accept it. He read you part of it; let me read you all of it:

"We recognize that the great and unlooked for increase in the production of gold has relieved the stringency caused by the scarcity of metallic money, and that because of that fact the money question as presented in the last two presidential campaigns is not now acute and does not require legislative relief. But it has at the same time vindicated the demands of the democratic party in the past for an increased volume of metallic money, that demand not being for silver as silver or for gold as gold, but for a sufficient quantity of standard

money to maintain the level of prices and transact the business of the country." (Applause.)

That was proposed by Senator Carmack as a substitute for the gold standard resolution offered by Senator Hill, and Senator Hill refused to accept it. I told him I would be satisfied with it if he would accept it. (Applause.) So in the interest of harmony—

Mr. E. W. Carmack of Tennessee: If the gentleman will permit me, that is not exactly correct. The Hill plank—

(At this point there was much disorder.)

Mr. Bryan: Do not interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. Carmack (to Mr. Bryan): You need not do that.

Mr. Bryan: If I make any mistake, I want to be corrected.

Mr. Carmack: I am much obliged to the gentleman, but I will say to him that he need not trouble himself to cause his friends to keep order while I address the convention. I will try to do that in one way or another.

The correction I want to make in the gentleman's statement is that the Hill plank had already been voted down by the committee, and I offered this as an independent resolution and he accepted it.

Mr. Bryan: My recollection, although I may be mistaken, because this covered several hours, is that when Senator Hill was speaking of the necessity of having something in the platform on that subject, this was proposed to meet the case, and I was willing to accept it; but Senator Hill refused to accept it. That resolution not only stated that it was not now acute and did not need relief, but it stated the principle for which we contended in two campaigns. And I wanted it in the platform. (Applause.) So much for that.

Something was said about my saying that Mr. Parker ought to be accepted as a platform. We were discussing platforms and several other things, and I suggested that we might not need any platform if we had a candidate whose record was known. I think it was in that connection that I suggested that the proper thing to do, if that was their plan, was to nominate Grover Cleveland, for he had such a record that he would not need any platform. (Applause.)

But, my friends, I think my recollection on the subject is corroborated by my question to Senator Hill and his answer that he did not know the opinion of Judge Parker. I think that verifies my position, for if Senator Hill did not know Mr. Parker's opinion, I would hardly say Parker himself ought to be accepted as a platform.

But I desire to refer to two or three arguments that have been made. It is said first that we ought to recognize the gold standard as the established law, that it is the established law. Why not recognize it? My answer is if this is the law, then why say anything about it? Shall we put in our platform a recognition of all the laws we have? If this is law, if we, therefore, ought not to object to it, then why is it necessary to state it?

Senator Daniel says that we have been defeated twice on the silver issue, and that we ought to acquiesce in the will of the majority. We have been defeated twice on the tariff issue. Why not acquiesce in the will of the majority there? (Applause.) Why resist the will of the majority? Why shall we array ourselves against "a settled public opinion" on the tariff question? This is not logic. And if it is true that we ought to accept the gold standard as established merely because we have been defeated on the issue in two campaigns, then by the same logic, we have no right to contest the protective tariff. (Applause.)

It is said that Judge Parker did not discuss this question and that nobody asked his opinion, because this question is so settled in New York that nobody ever thinks of mentioning it. If that is true, then how did anybody discover that it was not in the platform? (Laughter and applause.) If it is so well settled that they never think of it, that they never ask about it, that they never talk about it, then why are they so quick to discover its omission from the platform? (Applause.) It is not logical, my friends.

But, sirs, there is another question, and I speak of it with some emphasis. My friend here (Mr. Hamlin of Mass.) holds out before you people of the south the danger of black domi-

nation, and you are virtually threatened that, if you do not accept the gold standard, if you do not admit that it is irrevocably established, never to be interfered with, the people down east will let you suffer from your black peril. In 1896, when, as the candidate of the party, I had all the south behind me, and was speaking for things in which the south believed, my friend here (Mr. Hamlin) did not feel it necessary—and I do not speak it in censure—to join with us in order to help you out. (Applause.) Nor is he willing to admit now that the people of Massachusetts will join with you to save you from this peril unless you bow before their golden idol. (Applause.) I did better than his people will do. I told you that while I believed in the doctrine I have been preaching, I would support a gold standard man to help you out. I was willing to waive my position on that subject. (Applause.)

You were asked what difference it makes whether or not the man believes in the gold standard; whether or not his opinion is known, if he believes in it. The gentleman reminds you that I said I would support Governor Pattison, who is a gold man. I said I would. I told you he was a gold man. But, my friends, if we had nominated on that platform a man known to be a gold man, people could have gone and voted as I would have gone and voted—voted knowing that he was a gold man, but trusting him on the other questions. But now our candidate comes and injects into the platform this question, and makes it not merely a gold standard plank, but, as has been suggested, makes it an irrevocable gold standard proposition, denying us even the right to oppose it at a future time. The republican platform is not so strong on this subject as this telegram would make our platform.

There may be one advantage in having this brought out now; yes, two. One is that having nominated the candidate, it is very embarrassing to do anything that he objects to, and all of this feeling of embarrassment will help to fasten the gold standard on the party. That is one advantage in bringing it up now.

But, my friends, my objection to having this fight made in favor of the gold standard was that it would jeopardize the

success of our campaign. I want us to win in this campaign. (Applause.) I want us to defeat the republican party; and I think it is infinitely embarrassing that this question should come in. I was rejoicing yesterday, I was exceeding glad, that a difference which I feared we might not be able to reconcile, had been reconciled, and it is distressing to me that this opposition must be met. But if the question is presented, what else can we do? Will you drive us home like cowards and tell the people there that we did not dare to express ourselves? (Applause.) We have our people's interest to represent; we have their welfare to guard.

You have been told that it is to the east to which you must look. Some reference has been made to the Force bill. I think, if my memory serves me aright, that when the Force bill was before the senate, the south and the north and the east did not furnish democrats enough; they had to come west to get enough senators to save the south from the Force bill. (Applause.) We now have some senators from the northwest, and when the gold standard plank was before the committee and the question was asked, "Would its adoption do any harm," gentlemen arose not only from all the northwestern states, but from states north of the Ohio, and from states south of the Ohio, and declared that that plank would jeopardize success in those states.

We did not want this issue presented; we did not want this subject touched; but the action of the candidate has brought the subject in. I know but two ways of getting it out. One is so to amend this telegram to Mr. Parker as to state our side, not on dead issues, but on living ones; and the other is to amend your platform and put in a plank that will meet the case. If you want to amend your platform, I will agree now to Senator Carmack's plank. Will the friends of Judge Parker accept that as a sufficient declaration on the subject? (Applause.)

I insist that the question having been raised, you ought to meet it; you ought to meet it candidly; you ought to meet it fairly; you ought to meet it honestly. It is my candid opinion that an open, frank declaration will not lose you any more

votes than an attempt to dodge this issue and to ignore it, now that it has been raised. (Applause.) And if the question of money is to be in the campaign, we should know the candidate's position on several questions. If this attempt to contract the currency by melting silver dollars is successful the administration can, by melting silver dollars, rob this nation of \$578,000,000 of its standard money, and thus take away from the people almost all the benefit that has come from the increased production of gold.

If the money question is in the campaign and we are to know that Judge Parker will put his veto to any attempt to interfere with the gold standard, we ought to know whether he is going to sign a bill which will give us an asset currency and make it so that we can not tell from day to day what is behind the dollars we carry in our pockets. (Applause.)

We ought to know whether he is going to put his signature to a bill which will give us a branch bank system and fasten upon this country a money monopoly like that which Jackson destroyed, and by destroying which made himself immortal in democratic history. (Applause.) These things we ought to know. We ought to know whether in this contest between government money and bank money our candidate stands on the side of the bank or on the side of the people. (Applause.)

If he had kept his views to himself on the gold standard question, we might have been willing to take our chances on the others, but now that you have him sure on your side on that subject, it is a little unfair to leave us uncertain as to his position on these other questions.

THE AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. Bryan: Allow me a word.

Mr. Williams: No, sir.

Mr. Bryan: I merely want to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. Williams: I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska for the purpose of withdrawing his amendment.

Mr. G. V. Menzies, of Indiana: Mr. Chairman—

The Permanent Chairman: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. Menzies: In view of the fact that it is getting on to 1 o'clock, that the session has been prolonged and the delegates are tired and worn out, I think, sir, a motion to adjourn would be in order.

The Permanent Chairman: The motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. Menzies: I think a motion to adjourn is always in order.

The Permanent Chairman: A motion to adjourn is not in order when another motion is pending.

Mr. Menzies: It seems that nobody on the floor can get recognition.

Mr. Bryan: Mr. Chairman, I am going to withdraw the amendment I offered. Our delegation is going to vote for New York's candidate for president. We are not going to do anything that can by any possibility mar our chances for success, and if you think a record vote on this question would do that, I will withdraw the amendment. (Applause.)

MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH IN THE ST. LOUIS CONVENTION ON THE ILLINOIS CONTEST

Below will be found the speeches made by Mr. Bryan in support of the minority report presented by him in the Illinois contest. Mr. C. D. Caspar, the Nebraska member of the credential committee, gave Mr. Bryan his proxy in this contest and Senator J. S. C. Blackburn of Kentucky, C. L. Wood of South Dakota, T. A. Ball of Missouri, E. E. McCausland of Wisconsin, D. C. Heyood of South Carolina, J. J. Fitzgerald of Rhode Island and Wm. Buckholz of Oklahoma joined in the minority report which recommended seating the contestees in the Sixth, Tenth, Eleventh and Eighteenth districts and recommended the seating of the contestants in the Second,

Third, Ninth, Twelfth, Fifteenth, Sixteenth, Twenty-first, Twenty-third and Twenty-fifth districts. The minority also recommended the seating of Hon. Edward F. Dunne of Chicago and Hon. Silas Cook of East St. Louis as delegates at large in the place of Hon. John P. Hopkins of Chicago and Hon. Benjamin Cable of Rock Island.

In the argument reference was made to the petition signed by eight hundred and seventy-two of the thirteen hundred and twenty-one of the delegates to the Illinois state convention. The petition reads as follows:

"Whereas, The state democratic convention of Illinois, held at Springfield, June 14, 1904, disregarded democratic precedent and ignored the rights of the democrats of various congressional districts through their duly chosen representatives, and

Whereas, Acquiescence in such a violation of democratic principles would injure the party in the state and therefore interfere with its legitimate progress, and

Whereas, The presiding officer of said convention by arbitrary and unfair rulings and by refusal of roll calls on all questions, excepting on instructions for president, prevented the delegates from giving expression to their wishes and the wishes of their constituents.

Therefore, I, the undersigned, having been a duly elected delegate to said convention, join in petitioning the democratic national convention and the democratic national committee to seat and recognize as delegates to the democratic national convention only such persons as received a majority of the votes of the legally elected delegates as cast in caucus of their respective congressional districts, at said state convention, as shall be shown by evidence presented in proper form.

I also respectfully petition that the following delegates at large be given seats in said democratic national convention: Hon. Edward F. Dunne of Chicago, Hon. A. M. Lawrence of Chicago, Hon. Samuel Alschuler of Aurora, Hon. Silas Cook of East St. Louis. (Signed)

.....Delegate.

From County, Illinois.

Postoffice address

In support of the minority report Mr. Bryan said:

Mr. Chairman: I move to substitute this minority report for the majority report in the Illinois contest, and I ask a separate vote on the delegates at large and the district delegates. In order that both sides may be heard, I ask that fifteen minutes on a side be given for the discussion of the merits of the contest.

The Temporary Chairman: Gentlemen of the convention, you have heard the motion made by the gentleman from Nebraska. The chair is advised that later on the gentleman will renew his motion in a different form. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska to speak in favor of the motion he has made.

Mr. Bryan: I want to open and close.

The Temporary Chairman: The chair will give each side equal time. The gentleman from Nebraska supporting the affirmative has the right to open and close the debate. The chair will mark the time which the gentleman takes on his first speech, and will ask him afterward to state how much time he wants for his second speech, and will give the sum total of the time occupied by his two speeches to the other side in the middle.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Bryan).

Mr. William Jennings Bryan of Nebraska: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Convention: I came to this convention in the hope that we would be able to agree on a platform and on candidates, and have nothing to stir up feeling or arouse contention. (Applause.) I still hope that we shall be able to agree upon a platform that will represent the sentiments of all of us, so that we can present it to the country as the platform of a united party. (Applause.) I will go further than that. I still hope that we shall be able to present to the country a ticket behind which we can stand as a united party. (Applause.) And, I regret that I am compelled to come in at this time and present a subject upon which your votes will be

asked. But, if there is one democratic principle more fundamental than another it is that the majority has a right to rule. (Applause.) If you destroy the binding force of that principle, there is nothing that can hold a party together. (Applause.) It is because I want the democratic party to stand on the Jeffersonian principle of majority rule that I present the minority report in this case. (Applause.)

In the state of Illinois the majority was not allowed to rule. (Applause.) That convention was dominated by a clique of men who deliberately, purposely, boldly trampled upon the rights of the democrats of Illinois. (Applause.) The evidence shows that no band of train robbers ever planned a raid upon a train more deliberately or with less conscience than they did. (Applause.) And the men who planned it and who carried it out, have the audacity, the impudence, and the insolence to say that, because they certified that what they did was regular, you can not go behind their certificate. (Applause.) If that is good law in a democratic convention, it ought to be good doctrine in a court; and if it is good doctrine in court, then the only thing train robbers will have to do in the future is to make a report of their transactions, and certify over their own signatures that it was a voluntary collection taken up for religious purposes, and deny the right of the robbed to go behind the returns. (Applause.)

They tell you that the law of the party in Illinois permits the state committee to present the chairman, and they deny the right of the convention to override the wish of the committee. Such a rule would be undemocratic if in force for such a doctrine would permit a past committee to fasten itself upon a new convention and dominate a new set of delegates. (Applause.)

But, my friends, that is not the law, for two years ago John P. Hopkins, the same chairman of the same committee, presented the recommendation of the committee and asked a vote upon it and submitted the committee's recommendation to the convention. Two years ago he recognized the right of the democrats in the state convention to elect their temporary chairman. This time he did not dare to do it, for if he had

done it he would have been repudiated by the convention there assembled. (Applause.) The minority presented a minority report, or wanted to, but the chairman of the committee, Mr. Hopkins, brought Mr. Quinn up to the convention platform, and handing him the gavel said that he was the chairman of the convention, and Mr. Quinn, seizing the gavel, began his rule of unfairness, tyranny, and despotism. (Applause.)

Then they had a sub-committee of the state committee put on the temporary roll the delegates whom they wanted, but when the credentials committee brought in a minority report they refused to consider it and refused to allow a vote upon it. And yet, in spite of the fact that that convention was not allowed to act upon the credentials of its own members, was not allowed to decide upon its own delegates—in spite of all that, the committee did not unseat enough, for more than half of the men actually seated by the Hopkins committee have signed petitions asking that the contestees be sent home and that democrats who represent the people of that state be substituted for them in this convention. (Applause.)

In the hearing before the committee it was asked, “Why did they not present a minority report from the committee appointed to select delegates at large?” There was a contest in that committee; there was opposition to Hopkins and Cable; but why should they expect a minority report to be voted upon? Why should they expect it, when the chairman had already held that a minority report was only advisory and could be put into the waste basket, and need not be acted upon? They are estopped to ask why a minority report was not filed.

They made no attempt, they declared no purpose to substitute delegates for the delegates selected by the various districts. We admit in the report that if they had legally substituted other men for the men selected by the districts, they might have done so, but it must be the act of the convention. The convention never attempted it; the convention was not asked to do it; and the evidence shows that the resolution which is a part of the record and upon which they rely was

never introduced and was never passed, but that it is a fraud pure and simple, presented here in defense of their claim. (Applause.)

Now, my friends, what is the duty of this democratic convention? These democrats of Illinois are not like the democrats of the south. Down south the democrats have all the local offices, and they can reward their workers for their loyalty to the party. Up in Illinois there is a strong republican majority and the democrats of Illinois, in many parts of the state, at least, are struggling against overwhelming odds; they are actuated by love of principle, not by hope of office.

But, what will you tell those men? Will you endorse the action of that convention? Will you approve the methods employed? If they had a majority of the convention, why did they not permit roll calls? Would they deny the opposition that right if they had had the votes to control by fair means? Men do not do wrong, as a rule, unless they think it is necessary to do so to carry out some object, and the only ground upon which you can decide that these men did wrong unnecessarily is to decide that they were so perverted in conscience that they did wrong from choice rather than from necessity. (Applause.) Their whole conduct shows that their purpose was conceived in sin, brought forth in iniquity and carried out to the destruction of democratic hopes in that state.

Give the democrats of Illinois something to hope for. Do not tell them that when they go to a democratic convention, they must go armed as to war, prepared to fight their way up to the chairman of the convention. Let the republican party stand as the representative of physical force, if it will; our party stands for government by the consent of the governed. (Applause.)

What could they do? They could either resort to force and risk the killing that would result, or, it is said, they could bolt. Yes, three-fourths of the convention could have walked out and left one-fourth in charge as the regular convention. They hoped for roll calls. They knew that whenever they could get a roll call they could assert their rights. They had only this one roll call, and when the convention was over these

men had to submit to the disfranchisement of a majority of the democratic voters of Illinois, or they had to bring their protest to this convention.

So this petition was signed, and these men, eight hundred and seventy-two, ask this convention to seat the men who have the right to seats from the districts as shown by the evidence? They do not ask you to seat any one man. They do not ask you to seat any set of men. They do not ask you to seat Hearst men, or Parker men, or anybody's men. They ask you to seat the choice of the democrats, no matter for whom they may be. (Applause.)

That convention was so openly, so notoriously a gag-ruled and gang-run convention that two of the men who had been out and had made a canvas in the state for governor, refused to be candidates before that convention. I honor Judge Prentiss of Chicago and Mayor Crolius of Joliet, (Applause) who refused to be candidates before that convention, and if Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Cable had any respect for the right of a majority to rule, they would be ashamed to be here, the representatives of a minority of that convention. (Applause.) But, my friends, if they have not learned to be ashamed to misrepresent a great state, you ought to teach them that they can not do it with the approval of the democratic party of the United States. (Applause.)

Now their sin rests upon them; you do not bear it. But if you decide to seat these men, these delegates from the districts, against the evidence presented in behalf of the contestants from the districts; if you decide to seat these two national delegates, in spite of the protests of eight hundred and seventy-one members, then you endorse their conduct; you take from the shoulders of Hopkins and Quinn and Cable the odium that they ought to bear, and put it upon the democratic party of the nation. (Applause.)

You have not this condition in other states today, but let this convention endorse this conduct, and the next national convention will see more than one state here with delegates chosen as the result of gavel rule. And it is because this question transcends in importance the interest of any state or

any candidate or any faction that I am here to present the minority report and to ask you to do to the democrats of Illinois that justice which this gang deliberately and insolently denied them. (Applause.)

(Mr. Menzies of Indiana and Mr. Quinn of Illinois spoke for contestees.)

SECOND SPEECH

Mr. William Jennings Bryan of Nebraska: Mr. Chairman—
The Temporary Chairman: The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. Bryan: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first speaker (Mr. Menzies) said that I had not heard the evidence. I stayed in the sub-committee of the national committee and heard evidence until nearly 3 o'clock in the morning (Applause), and I heard more evidence than the gentleman who talked to you and who questioned my knowledge of this case. (Applause.) More than that, I have examined affidavits; I have examined petitions; I have examined protests, and I know ten times as much about the facts of this case as the gentleman who denied my right to speak in this case. (Applause.)

The gentleman desires to make use of the report of the national committee. The national committee referred this case to the credentials committee on the ground that the national committee did not have time or authority to investigate the merits, and in doing so, by unanimous vote said "in some congressional districts there was evidence to show that questionable methods prevailed; in some it appears that delegates selected by district caucuses were replaced by persons who had not been selected by the delegates from the districts and in some instances it was at least doubtful whether the substitutions were properly made." That was the unanimous report of your national committee after listening nine hours to the testimony. (Applause.)

And now this committee considers the case for two hours, does not take any evidence, but only hears arguments, and

then reports that there was no fraud and that you ought to seat these contestees.

Mr. Quinn, the chairman of the Illinois convention, says that he was unanimously re-elected five hours after he began his gavel rule. Yes, my friends, everything done in that convention was unanimous. (Applause.) It was unanimous. If you do not believe it, read the sworn testimony of the highwaymen who raided the convention. The gentleman says that he is not a man who bolts or who waits until after the convention to decide, but he is the man who with gavel rule tries to force upon the loyal democrats of his state two men who supported Palmer and Buckner in 1896. (Applause.)

These two men who seek seats in this convention against the protests of eight hundred and seventy-two delegates were the men who kept the path hot between the Palmer and Buckner headquarters and republican headquarters when the hundreds of thousands of democrats of Illinois were marching up to support the ticket. (Applause.)

Mr. Quinn asks, "Where does the protest against John P. Hopkins come from" and he wanted me to answer it. I will answer it. It comes from eight hundred and seventy-two better democrats than John P. Hopkins ever was. (Applause.) I am willing that the men who left us shall come back and share with the party in the shaping of its destiny; but God forbid that the loyal democrats of Illinois shall by force and intimidation be made to march beneath the soiled banner of these men. (Applause.)

VON PLEHVE'S ASSASSINATION

The assassination of M. Von Plehve, the Russian minister of the interior, calls attention again to the fatal errors of those who attempt by violence to right the abuses of government. According to Hon. Andrew D. White, late ambassador to Germany, he had aroused great resentment and made himself bitterly hated by his cruel and despotic methods, but his

assassination will aggravate rather than relieve the situation. The bloody deeds of the nihilists have retarded reforms in the land of the czar; they have encouraged the advocates of militarism and embarrassed the friends of constitutional government. While the punishment may sometimes seem deserved when the ruler has been merciless and unprincipled, yet the real punishment falls upon the innocent and earnest reformers whose protests against misrule are confounded with the threats of the violent and lawless. Mr. White is quoted as saying:

"At that time M. Plehve had not arrived at the position of full minister of the interior, but was the first assistant minister in that department, and in that capacity took up various American matters, especially the dealings of the Russian government with some of the American insurance companies. The Russian government had made the companies a great deal of trouble, and I was instructed from Washington to discuss the matter, General Bacheller, now judge of the international court in Egypt, very ably representing the companies.

"I think both General Bacheller and myself found M. Plehve very agreeable and, apparently, as far as his government allowed him, reasonable. I also met him socially at various times and found him agreeable and interesting.

"I was, therefore, greatly surprised at learning when he was promoted to the first place that his whole character seemed to change.

"His part in the horrible massacre and plunder of the Jews, men, women and children, at Kishineff, cause him to be regarded with abhorrence by the whole world. Even more frightful has been his connection with the destruction of the liberties of Finland. In my mind that is the most wicked thing in the history of the last two centuries. There is no time to go into it here further than to say that it has turned the best, the most civilized, the most educated and the most loyal province of the empire into a land in which the opposite of these characteristics is more highly developed than in any other part of the empire. Other things done by him were also calculated to bring most bitter hatred against him.

"He attempted to help his cause by a defense of his conduct toward Finland which was published in an American magazine. But it certainly must have failed to convince any thinking man at all aware of the circumstances.

"During two summers I lived mainly in Finland, coming frequently to St. Petersburg, and the transition in passing from

the cultivation and civilization of Finland to the atmosphere of Russia was the most depressing I have ever known.

"I do not wonder at his assassination, although I deeply lament it. Among other reasons for this regret it will doubtless be made a pretext for new oppression and new cruelties toward the Finlanders. Assassination always defeats its purpose, and this will be no exception to the rule.

"I can only account for M. Plehve's atrocious, reactionary and despotic conduct since he came to the position of minister on the theory that he felt that the clique in control of the Winter palace, men and women, who seem to have brought the present emperor into subjection to them, obliged M. Plehve, as a condition of his tenure of office, to do their will.

"His ambition doubtless led him to adopt their radical and religious hatred, as well as their detestation of anything like constitutional government.

MR. ROOSEVELT'S THREAT

In President Roosevelt's speech of acceptance there is one paragraph that is attracting attention. He says: "Three years ago I became president because of the death of my lamented predecessor. I then stated that it was my purpose to carry out his principles and policies for the honor and interest of the country. To the best of my ability I have kept the promise thus made. If next November my countrymen confirm at the polls the action of the convention you represent I shall under Providence continue to work with an eye single to the welfare of all our people." It will be seen that he does not now promise to carry out the principles and policies of his predecessor but feels at liberty to map out a policy of his own. This may be construed as a threat to run things according to his own views hereafter regardless of the principles and policies of his predecessor. If so, why does he not outline a policy? To be sure he is going to stand by the high tariff, but that was to be expected. No well informed man expects the republican party to reform the tariff. It is powerless to resist the demands of the manufacturers who every four years submit themselves to the fat-frying process and scare their employes with the

threat of reduced wages. But on the trust question—what is the president going to do? The republican platform is so general and non-committal that the president is free to do most anything—or nothing. Will he enforce the criminal law against trust magnates? Will he propose new and efficient remedies? He ought to take the people into his confidence and give some intimation of his policy. Judged by his past he will do nothing to harm the monopolists, but then he was carrying out the policy of his predecessor. What will his policy be? And the laboring men, where do they come in? Is he for them or against them? On imperialism and militarism he goes beyond his predecessor and on the race question he is quite different from Mr. McKinley, but on economic questions some expect him to become a reformer. He has shown no reform symptoms thus far. No one who is afraid to speak out during the campaign is likely to be courageous after the election, but there are some who hope and these find, or profess to find, encouragement in the words above quoted.

SHALL THEY RULE OR BE RULED?

Governor LaFollette of Wisconsin delivered an address July 18, 1903, at Chautauqua, N. Y., on the subject "Representative Government." Although Governor LaFollette has not so far declared himself in favor of government ownership of railroads, what he said on that occasion and the things he has since said would lead one to believe that the time will come when the Wisconsin governor will be in the forefront of those who are battling for one of the most important reforms in the history of the government.

Asserting that the people are rapidly losing control of their own government, Governor LaFollette pointed out that the New York legislative investigation of the Erie railway disclosed that more than \$1,000,000 was spent in one year for "extra legal service," and that money paid to political bosses was charged to "the India rubber account." He also showed

that more recently the treasurer of the New York Central Railway company testified that his company had paid for legislation in one year \$60,000 and in another year \$205,000. He also quoted from the correspondence which passed between the late C. P. Huntington and General Colton in regard to the payment of money for the passage of legislative measures and for the control of congressmen. In one of the letters from Mr. Huntington, that great railroad magnate used this language: "It is very important that his friends in Washington should be with us, and if that should be brought about by paying Carr, say \$10,000 to \$20,000 a year, I think we could afford to do it, but of course not until he had controlled his friends."

Having made this showing, Governor LaFollette said: "If there were no further evidences of the power of the railroads in legislation than that which is afforded by the statements from the record of the interstate commerce commission, it ought to arouse the entire country to such action as will bring congress to a sense of its responsibility to the people for some measure of justice and fair play."

The governor added: "The gravest danger menacing republican institutions today is the overbalancing control of city, state and national legislatures by the wealth and power of public service corporations."

In another portion of his speech Governor LaFollette read a letter bearing upon the action of the last congress. This letter was written to him by a United States senator under date of February 9, 1903. In this letter this senator wrote:

"It is expecting too much from human nature that senators, whose every association is with the great railroad corporations and whose political lives largely depend upon them, should, in good faith, make the railroads a servant of the people and to be subject to the decision of the commission when a question of rates is raised. The senate committee is by a decided majority men who bear those relations to the railroads."

Well did Governor LaFollette say that the problem presented is a momentous one, that it asks for no appeal to passion or prejudice or fear, but calls rather for courage and patriotism and self-sacrifice—and calls sternly for solution.

Governor LaFollette said: "Shall the American people become servants instead of masters of their boasted material progress and prosperity, victims of the colossal wealth, this free land has fostered and protected? Surely our great cities, our great states, our great nation, will not helplessly surrender to this most insidious enemy which is everywhere undermining official integrity and American institutions. Surely, we shall not permit this government to abandon its traditions, its memories, its hopes, and become the instrument of injustice and oppression. Surely, the American people will do their plain duty now as they did in the greatest epoch of this country's history. Surely, we shall meet the issues presented with rectitude and unfaltering devotion, strong in the faith of ultimate triumph."

The *Commoner* is convinced that the only way to avoid a surrender to the insidious enemy which is undermining official integrity and corrupting political conventions is government ownership of railroads.

ELECTING POSTMASTERS

Why should a president be permitted to turn the postoffice department into a partisan machine and use thousands of postmasters as paid agents to advance his political fortunes? He should not. Why should a member of congress be permitted to build up a personal organization composed of the postmasters recommended by him but paid by the government and use this organization to defeat other congressional aspirants in his own party? He should not. Why should a chief executive be permitted to fill the most frequented office in the community with a postmaster objectionable to the community and reward him for his services with the money paid in by the community? He should not. Why should the "Great Father at Washington," as the Indians call him, be permitted to electioneer among the colored voters of the north by appointing black postmasters in the south against the protest of the pat-

rons of the office? He should not. And yet all these things are openly and notoriously done today. The election of post-masters by the people whom they are to serve will correct all these abuses. It is in harmony with democratic principles; it is consistent with the doctrine of local self-government. What objection can be raised to it? Can a president know the aspirants more intimately than the community and better judge of their qualifications? Is he more interested than the community in prompt, honest and efficient service? By leaving the appointment, the removal and rejection for cause in the hands of the president, by restricting appointment to a list furnished by the community, the rights and interests of both the federal government and the various communities can be protected. Presidents and congressmen will then run on their own merits and not on the machines which they have built up; the public service will be improved and communities will be protected from the impositions that are now practiced upon them.

THE PRESIDENT'S ACCEPTANCE

The president in his speech of acceptance takes advantage of the division in the democratic party on the money question and boldly asserts his party's devotion to the gold standard, but he does not discuss those phases of the question upon which he is likely to be called upon to act.

On the trust question he follows the republican platform in classing the trusts and the labor organizations together. This classification is made entirely in the interest of the trusts and his failure to specify any legislation against the trusts or any legislation in favor of labor shows that the trusts are to be unmolested and that labor is to be unaided if he is successful this fall.

On the tariff question he "stands pat." No revision of the tariff need be expected while he is in the white house.

His reference to imperialism is neither candid nor courageous. He boasts of what we have done for the Filipinos

but he avoids the vital issue involved, namely, whether we are going to adhere to the doctrine of self-government or adopt a colonial policy, which if adopted, will nullify the principles set forth in the declaration of independence. He dodges nearly every issue.

EX-GOVERNOR PATTISON DEAD

The death of ex-Governor Robert E. Pattison of Pennsylvania, is not only a loss to the party but a shock to those who attended the late democratic convention, and especially to those who served with him on the resolutions committee. He was present at the all-night session of the committee and while not in the best of health he did not appear to suffer more than the other members. It seems that he fell a victim to pneumonia and died on August 1. He has had a phenomenal record of success. Twice he overcame the republican majority and was elected governor of his state and twice he overcame the enormous republican majority in Philadelphia. As a member of the Pacific railroad commission he presented a minority report that showed both his moral courage and his sympathy with the people. He was a valuable man in the councils of his party and his place will be hard to fill.

STATE OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS

The question of state ownership of railroads, as distinguished from federal ownership, is deserving of serious consideration. It would not only avoid the centralization which would necessarily accompany federal ownership but it would actually strengthen the state's position. It would also hasten the introduction of the system, for under state ownership any state desiring to buy or build a road could do so, while under federal ownership it would be necessary to carry the entire country for the proposition before a start could be made. Then,

too, state ownership avoids another difficulty. One system proposed for the purchase or condemnation of the roads would be more satisfactory in one section while another system would be more satisfactory in another section. Under state ownership each state could adopt its own plan and satisfy its own people.

Since the editorial on state ownership appeared the editor has learned that Germany has now the system of state ownership. Judge Van Wagenen of Sioux City, Ia., secured from the American consul at Frankfort, Germany, the information given below. The questions and answers show that the empire only owns 798 miles of the mileage, the rest being owned by the various German states:

Q. Are the railroads owned by the imperial government or are they owned by both?

A. They are owned by the various German states, a federal government and private parties.

Q. How many miles owned by the imperial government?

A. 798 miles.

Q. How many miles owned by Prussia?

A. 16,075 miles.

Q. How many by Alsace-Lorraine?

A. 798 miles. (This is a German federal road.)

Q. Is government ownership popular with the people?

A. They appear not to discuss this question and seem to be well satisfied with the existing conditions, that is practically government ownership.

Q. How many miles owned by private parties in all Germany?

A. 2,573 miles.

The total mileage of all railroads owned by the various German governments was 28,601 miles at the end of the year 1900.

In arriving at the mileage I figure one kilometer equal to five-eighths of a mile. The following shows the number of kilometers:

| Owned by. | Kilometers. |
|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Bavaria | 5,750.9 |
| Saxony | 2,442.4 |
| Wurtemberg | 1,594.1 |
| Baden | 1,612.9 |
| Hesse | 1,130.1 |
| Mechlenburg-Schwerin | 1,163.3 |
| Saxe-weimar | 312.6 |
| Mechlenburg-Strelitz | 160.1 |
| Oldenburg | 521.7 |
| Brunswick | 402.4 |
| Saxe-meininger | 250.7 |
| Anhalt | 268.9 |
| Saxe-altenburg | 164.3 |
| Saxe-coburg and Gotha | 281.0 |
| Schwartzburg-Sanderhausen | 75.4 |
| Schwartzburg-rud | 106.1 |
| Waldeck | 39.3 |
| Reuss Sr. | 43.3 |
| Reuss Jr. | 62.5 |
| Schaumbarg-Lippe | 24.3 |
| Lippe | 83.5 |
| Lubeck | 10.7 |
| Bremen | 51.2 |
| Hamburg | 40.3 |

It may be added that there are several international trains in Europe, running through several countries. It would be as easy to provide for interstate commerce over state railroads as it is now to provide for through freight and passenger trains over different lines.

POPULAR ELECTION OF SENATORS

Among the planks inserted in the democratic national platform without opposition was the one endorsing the election of senators by popular vote. This reform has been growing for a third of a century. A resolution proposing the amendment has four times passed the house of representatives and four times has been ignored by the senate. In 1900 the democrats for the first time endorsed it in a national platform and

now it is endorsed for a second time. With a president earnestly in favor of this reform, as the democratic candidate doubtless is, it would be easy to secure the submission of the necessary amendment and this reform would be the gateway to other reforms. If Judge Parker did nothing more than secure this great and needed constitutional change he would justify his election.

ARE WE TO HAVE A "YELLOW SCARE" INSTEAD OF A "WHITE ONE?"

In an address delivered by Mr. Bryan, he said that the people were entitled to the gold standard if they wanted it; that if they concluded that the gold standard made money too plentiful and wanted a radium standard, that they were entitled to that, too, adding that there is said to be just two pounds of radium in the world.

Referring to this statement, the *New York Evening Post* says:

"The implication would seem to be that an analogous dearth of the yellow metal stands in the way of its serving as an acceptable medium of exchange. Unfortunately for the covert insinuation, the United States treasury yesterday, for the first time in its history, held over one billion dollars in trust funds; and its holdings of gold amounted to \$846,655,068. Mr. Bryan is fairly good at pursuing issues, but he seldom overtakes them."

Although Mr. Bryan's statement as to the radium standard was a bit of pleasantry, it is a fact that already there is dissatisfaction shown with the gold standard by some of the stalwart advocates of that standard. The objection these gentlemen make is that on account of the increase in the production of gold recently, money is becoming altogether too abundant. While seriously speaking, it is not at all probable that anyone would advocate a radium standard, it is a solemn fact that there is, just now, in certain quarters a protest against the gold standard.

On the same day the *Evening Post* printed this criticism, the *Wall Street Journal* directed attention to statements made by W. R. Lawson of the *London Financial Times*, and United States Treasurer Ellis M. Roberts. The *Journal* states that it is a remarkable fact that just at the time when the candidate of the party which has so long opposed the gold standard has announced that the issue is "irrevocably" settled in this country, some of the political economists are "looking ahead so far as to say that the time is not far off when gold will go the same way as silver has and no longer be available as the world's standard of value." The *Journal* points out that in the last century nearly \$9,000,000,000 of gold has been taken from the mines of the earth, \$3,000,000,000 of which has been produced since 1891. While the *Journal* admits that this production is a tremendous gain to the world's wealth, it says that "it is clear that there might be such an increase in the yellow metal that it would no longer be the best commodity to serve as a standard of value in making exchanges of commerce." Indeed, the *Journal* says that "some of our writers on financial subjects think that already the stocks of gold are heavy," and that "the point has been made by some that the circulation of money in the United States has outgrown the needs of the people and that we are carrying an excessive supply of gold."

Mr. Lawson of the *London Financial Times* thinks that the estimate made by our director of the mint that the per capita circulation of the money in the world is \$9.47, is "undoubtedly a prodigal allowance of money." Mr. Lawson says that American currency has been inflated to the amount of \$760,000,000 in the past seven years and that this has become "an embarrassment of riches." Mr. Lawson further says:

"Bankers as a rule look to quantity only. 'More gold! More Gold!' is their one cry. But gold is not invulnerable any more than silver was. It is in much the same position today as silver was 30 years ago. Precisely the same causes and influence are working against it, and the end will be the same. The legal, or conventional, value of monetary metal can only be maintained so long as it does not materially exceed the commercial value. In the case of silver, when the two values diverged sufficiently the so-called silver standard snapped.

In the case of gold the same process of divergence between the conventional and commercial values has begun, and when the breaking point is reached the so-called gold standard will snap. The breaking point might have been reached ere now, but for the huge hoards of gold which the treasuries and the state banks of Europe are accumulating. Europe is unconsciously preparing for a counterpart of the American silver crisis in 1893—for a yellow scare, instead of a white one.”

Mr. Roberts' address from which the *Wall Street Journal* quotes, was delivered before the North Carolina Bankers' association and was entitled "Is Our Currency Growing Too Fast?" Mr. Roberts' address was not delivered as an answer to Mr. Lawson; but Mr. Roberts took up the subject of our growing money circulation and contended that the currency was not growing too rapidly. As a proof that our currency has not outstripped our growth in wealth and commerce, Mr. Roberts says "that between 1890 and 1900 the national wealth grew 44.9 per cent, farm products 53 per cent, the value of manufactures 39.1 per cent, exports 62.5 per cent, bank clearings 43.7 per cent, and deposits in national and savings banks 68.5 per cent. The money in circulation increased 43.7 per cent. This growth in circulation was 1 per cent less than that in national wealth, 9 per cent less than the increase in farm products, 4 per cent more than that in manufacturers, the same as that in bank clearings, 12.5 less than that in national and savings bank deposits, and 19 per cent less than that in our exports. So far as the actual gold is involved, says Mr. Roberts, we can rest secure and satisfied. The complaint is often heard that gold as currency in coin and certificates involves too heavy a burden of cost. This ratio to the total circulation in the United States is 43.6. Bank notes are as sound and strong as the credit of the United States, that is to say, as minted gold, and as human ingenuity can secure. They constitute only 17.2 per cent of the total circulation. They are, however, not legal tender nor money of final redemption." Nevertheless, Mr. Roberts thinks that in view of the large additions to bank notes in circulation during the past year, "no need exists for artificial methods to incite to more rapid and abnormal growth."

It would be interesting if the New York *Evening Post* would give its readers the benefit of its opinion of Mr. Lawson's statements. Does the *Post* agree with the London financier that "Europe is unconsciously preparing for a counterpart of the American silver crisis of 1893?"

If we are to have "a yellow scare instead of a white one," what will the *Post* do for a standard?

HAIL JENSEN, HERO!

A dispatch from Corliss, Wis., describes the heroism of James Jensen, a farmer boy of 18, who lost his life a few nights ago flagging a train. He stood upon the track waving his straw hat in front of the headlight and in his anxiety to attract the attention of the engineer, stayed on the track too long and was run over—but his signal prevented a train wreck. "He saved others, himself he could not save." Who will deny to him the crown that his self-sacrificing bravery won? President Roosevelt talks of "strenuousness" as if it could only be shown by clubbing "inferior people" into sullen submission to foreign made laws; he seems to ignore that moral strenuousness which finds ample field for employment in noble example, in resistance to temptation and in unselfish service to others. James Jensen deserves to have his name recorded among the brave—he died at his post of duty—he gave his life for others.

"Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friend." But those for whom this farmer boy died were not friends but strangers! Hail, Jensen, hero!

STATE OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS

The *Wall Street Journal* in an editorial criticizes Mr. Bryan's position in favor of state ownership of railroads. The *Minneapolis Journal*, in an editorial likewise finds fault with the plan of state ownership. Opposition is to be expected from both these sources. If the Wall street and Minneapolis papers were

advocating the ownership and operation of railroads by the federal government their criticism of state ownership would be more in point. But it is evident that they are finding fault with the method of securing government ownership, whereas their real objection is to any kind of government ownership of railroads. The *Wall Street Journal*, in fact, concludes with the statement that it does not believe that government ownership is necessary and it does not believe that the people will favor government ownership of any kind "if the railroads will themselves, in the interest of fair play and public protection, favor a policy of widest publicity of their affairs and of reasonable government regulation of rates." The "if" in that sentence is the important word. If the railroads will act fairly—but the railroads have refused. Not only have they refused to act fairly, but they have filled the United States senate with their representatives and have impudently obstructed all remedial legislation attempted by the people. Not only do their representatives oppose any legislation regulating railroads, but they are the representatives of all other forms of organized wealth and stand between the people and relief of every kind.

The *Minneapolis Journal* sees in state ownership "a continual tangle not only on the question of rates but in the manner of operation." It has visions of trains "stopping at each state line to change crews, etc." These difficulties are not only imaginary, but those who imagine them ignore existing facts. Train crews change now, not at state lines to be sure, but at division points. Sometimes there are two or three divisions in a state. Take the New York Central from New York to Buffalo—how many times do the crews change? Any one who has traveled any distance on a train knows that conductors change as well as engineers and brakemen; and yet the traffic goes right on. In traveling over the Burlington from Chicago to Lincoln, Nebraska, the passenger is carried by at least three train crews, and three different conductors punch his ticket. In traveling from New York to Chicago the interests of the passengers are looked after by several different train crews and as many conductors; and it may be that his car is carried through Canada, twice across the international boundary, and

yet travel is not interrupted. Would it be any more embarrassing to have the division point at the state line rather than ten miles to either side? Some of the opposition papers have used the mail service as an illustration of the necessity of federal ownership, if we have government ownership at all. But the operation of the mails, instead of being an argument against state ownership is an argument in its favor. It shows how easy it is for the federal government to operate its mail service without owning any railroads at all. It has its mail cars but it can have those run over state lines as well as over private ones. The fact that the mail service is conducted so successfully without the federal ownership of any of the railroads shows how easily interstate commerce can be conducted with the state owning the railroads. Interstate commerce will then, as now, be regulated by the federal government. Interstate rates will be subject to the control of the government. No state could interfere with or embarrass another state even if it wanted to do so; and the people of the state could be safely relied upon to look after local rates.

Not only is state ownership feasible but it has already been tried in other countries. Advocates of private ownership of railroads may be expected to fight state ownership more bitterly than they would federal ownership, for the reason that state ownership is a thing that can be tried at once; whereas, federal ownership must be postponed until a majority of both houses and the president concur in the purchase or building of a railroad. If, after congress acted, the constitutionality of the act were raised, and the supreme court decided against its constitutionality, it would then be necessary to secure two-thirds of both houses before a constitutional amendment could be submitted, and then three-fourths of the states would have to concur, or it would be necessary to have a convention of the states. The difficulties in the way of federal ownership are so much greater than the obstacles in the way of state ownership that all advocates of private ownership may be expected to attack state ownership, as the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Minneapolis Journal* have done. But these attacks, instead of answering the argument in favor of state ownership merely

prove the effectiveness of the remedy.

It would have been very difficult to obtain municipal ownership of municipal franchises through the actions of congress, because it would have been necessary to secure a majority of both houses and the concurrence of the president, and this would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible. But as each locality had the right to undertake the matter for itself, the cities most advanced in this reform made experiments, and their success induced other cities to try it.

So in the matter of state ownership of railroads. If the states that are ready for it make the attempt, their success will be an object lesson which will be potent in bringing other states to state ownership.

The friends of private ownership also know that under federal ownership they can play one section against another and can urge the representatives of different sections to object to any purchase or building that does not include their section. If an experiment is attempted in one section, the sectional argument will be used against it; and if an attempt is made to take all the railroads at once, the magnitude of the undertaking will be emphasized to frighten the people out of the attempt.

State ownership rids the country of the evils of private railroad monopoly, and it is not open to the objection that can be made against federal ownership. It operates along the line of least resistance. The objections that will be made by the great metropolitan dailies can not deceive the people when the advantages of an immediate state ownership are brought to their attention. When the people see that the relief is in their own hands and that it can be obtained without the sacrifice of their devotion to local self-government, the victory will be hastened.

MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH

Addressing the Nebraska democratic state convention, held at Lincoln Wednesday, August 10, Mr. Bryan said:

"I desire, in the first place, to express my appreciation of the splendid delegation that the democracy of the state sent to the St. Louis convention. We worked together with harmony and enthusiasm. We helped to make a good platform. The platform did not contain all that we wanted but we kept out some things that we objected to. I did what I could to prevent the nomination of Judge Parker, but he was nominated and I want to see him elected. While he does not stand with western democrats on all questions he stands for enough that is good to justify us in giving him a cordial support. He will, if elected, put an end to imperialism, which we believe is a menace to our country. With imperialism out of the way the army can be reduced and the expenses of that department cut down. He will be able to put to rest the race issue that now interferes with the consideration of economic questions and he will substitute the spirit of peace and progress for the blustering, warlike spirit which President Roosevelt has introduced. Mr. Parker's election will not end our fight for economic reforms; it will open the way for a more effective fight by removing the things that distract public attention. Let no one think that our cause can be aided by his defeat. We can never help our party or our element of the party by endangering our country's welfare. We can not afford to risk a continuance of the policies for which President Roosevelt stands. If our principles are sound, as I believe they are, Mr. Parker's election can not endanger them, even if he opposes us on some questions. Those have little faith in the triumph of the truth who think that our cause can be defeated by the opposition of any president. Let us elect him and then with some of the evils removed we can proceed with renewed vigor to attack the other evils."

UNEMPLOYED LABOR

The *Chicago Tribune* of August 4 has an editorial acknowledgment that times are not what the republican leaders boast them to be. Under the heading, "Not the time to strike," the *Tribune* says that the laboring men ought to ask "Is it expedient, not is it lawful?" and insists that it is "most unbusinesslike to quit work to compel an employer to do what he can not afford to do or what he can not be made to do because there is so much unemployed labor that he can get all the labor he

needs." The *Tribune* compares the industrial conditions three or four years ago, with conditions now. It says that then manufacturers were "working their plants up to the limit and competing so warmly for labor that few men were idle, while now conditions are reversed, and if any man gives up his job, there are other men eager to take it, at the wages he refused." It declares that there is "less work doing in this country than four years ago," and a larger number of people to do it. How can this confession be made to harmonize with republican pretensions? The republican party boasts that it has established the gold standard; it boasts that it has given protection to American industries; it brags about everything, and claims credit for all that the Lord has done; and yet, according to the *Tribune*, we are on the down grade. With men being turned out of employment and laborers unable to strike for better wages because the army of the unemployed is waiting to take their places with these conditions, what is to be promised the laboring men. The republicans have had everything their own way. They have been aided by a large increase in the gold supply; they have been favored by good crops, and yet employment is scarcer and business not so good. What remedy has the republican party to offer? What promise does it make? Pointing with pride to "favorable conditions" that are fast passing, can not quiet the solicitude of those who look forward to harder times. What is the republican party going to do about it?

The fact is that republican legislation is not responsible for such prosperity as we have had and there is nothing in the republican program that promises real and permanent prosperity for the future. A high tariff has made the manufacturer richer at the cost of the consumer; the trusts have made the trust magnates opulent, but it has been by extortion and exploitation; and Providence, by opening up new gold fields, has temporarily rescued the republican party from the natural consequences of a gold standard, but the end is coming. It is only a question of time when the democratic party will be called upon to save the country from the conditions which the republican party is creating; and when that time comes, the

money question will be found to be a live issue. In the meantime the election of Judge Parker will save us from the extravagance and menace of imperialism and militarism and leave the people free to grapple again with the economic questions which confront the nation.

JOKING IS UNSAFE

Mr. James Dunbar, a republican, presided at the New Albany, Ind., Chautauqua and in introducing Mr. Bryan amused the audience with a bit of fiction which is reported as follows in a "Special to the *Record-Herald*:"

"Louisville, Aug. 6.—William J. Bryan received his pay in a gold draft for lecturing at Glenwood Park Chautauqua between New Albany and Jeffersonville. Mr. Bryan demanded pay in the yellow metal, according to James Dunbar of New Albany, who, in introducing Mr. Bryan, said:

"The board of directors of the Chautauqua, thinking to please Mr. Bryan, offered to pay him in the silver paid into the coffers of the association by the people who had come to hear him. Mr. Bryan said he wanted to be paid in gold.

"This rather complicated matters, and messengers were dispatched to a bank to get the silver changed into gold. The bank was closed, and the incident was ended by the directors agreeing to forward a draft on a New York bank payable in gold.'

"Mr. Bryan smiling assented to Mr. Dunbar's statement."

Mr. Bryan not only did not assent to the statement but denied it. After stating that he had not heard before of the committee's dilemma, he replied in a humorous vein. The audience enjoyed the bit of pleasantry but the *Record-Herald's* correspondent takes the matter seriously and rushes it to his paper as if it were an actual occurrence.

The incident, however, serves to emphasize the bimetallist's advantage. He believes in the use of both gold and silver and he believes in gold certificates and in silver certificates as well as in gold and silver. The silver certificate makes it as convenient to use silver as to use any other form of paper money. Very few people carry gold—less people carry gold than carry

silver. Silver certificates and gold certificates are more convenient than the coin.

JUDGE PARKER'S ACCEPTANCE

THE COMMONER is gratified to be able to commend the speech made by Judge Alton B. Parker on the occasion of his notification. He takes a strong position against imperialism—a position entirely in harmony with the party's position in the campaign of 1900. His utterances on this subject and on the kindred subject of militarism make this an important if not the most important issue of the campaign. With Judge Parker in the executive chair Philippine independence will soon be an accomplished fact and one of the evil results of republican rule removed. Judge Parker's condemnation of the president's disregard for constitutional limitation is strong and clear, and his analysis of the powers of the co-ordinate branches of the government sound and statesmanlike.

He uses the Colorado troubles as an illustration of the danger of lawlessness upon the part of the authorities. It is to be hoped that his formal letter of acceptance will cover other phases of the labor question—the eight-hour day, arbitration and government by injunction.

His treatment of the tariff question is not as satisfactory as it might be. He concedes too much when he says that it will be impossible to change the political complexion of the senate during the next four years. One-third of the senate goes out next spring and another third in two years and it is not at all impossible that he may have a democratic senate after 1906. If the senate is to be republican during his entire administration, then the only change to be hoped for is a change of executive with only such legislative reform as a republican senate will consent to. On the trust question, too, his speech is general rather than specific. The failure of the president to enforce the law is properly criticized but there is nothing in his speech calculated to make the trust issue a vital one in the campaign. The declaration of his purpose not to be a candi-

date again in case of his election will go far to convince the public of his purpose to discharge his duty with an eye single to his country's good as he understands that good. His desire to remove selfish consideration contrasts most favorably with the three years' effort of the present incumbent to secure a second term. The speech is sure to make the judge friends and will increase his growing chances of success.

JEFFERSONIAN PRINCIPLES

Jefferson not only announced great fundamental principles, but he applied them to so many different questions that he can be read as an authority on all questions of today. He was opposed to imperialism and believed in self-government; he was for a republic composed of equal and self-governing states and entirely opposed to the colonial idea.

He was opposed to a large army and believed that a government was stronger when resting upon the love of the people than when tolerated only because of fear.

He was so opposed to the principles of monopoly that he only excepted copyrights and patents. Here is the amendment which he suggested to the constitution: "Monopolies may be allowed to persons for their own productions in literature, and their own inventions in the arts, for a term not exceeding — years, but for no longer term, and for no other purpose." At another time he suggested fourteen years as the limit for patents.

His hostility to monopoly was exemplified in 1787 in a communication to John Jay, in which he said; "A company had silently and by unfair means obtained a monopoly for the making and selling of spermaceti candles (in France). As soon as we (Lafayette assisted him) discovered it, we solicited its suppression which is effected by a clause in the Arret."

He denounced as a fatal fallacy the doctrine that a national debt is a blessing.

He was the relentless enemy of banks of issue. At one time, he declared that banks of issue were more dangerous

than standing armies. At another time he said: "I hope we shall crush in its birth the aristocracy of our monied corporations, which dare already to challenge our government to a trial of strength, and bid defiance to the laws of our country."

In 1819 he said; "Interdict forever to both the state and the national government the power of establishing any paper bank; for without this interdiction we shall have the same ebbs and flows of medium, and the same revolution of property to go through every twenty or thirty years."

He warned his countrymen against the dangers of an appointive judiciary holding office for life.

Of the freedom of speech he said: "The liberty of speaking and writing guards our other liberties."

Of the freedom of the press he wrote: "Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost."

He was the author of the statute of Virginia guaranteeing religious liberty, and was also the father of the University of Virginia. He favored a free school system which would bring to every child an opportunity to secure an education.

He was an advocate of the jury system; and he argued in favor of freeing the slaves three-quarters of a century before Lincoln issued his emancipation proclamation.

His writings fill many volumes and cover almost every conceivable subject, but through all that he said there runs the evidence of a great heart as well as a great intellect.

There is need today of a revival of Jeffersonian principles. He was not an enemy of honestly acquired wealth, but he believed that the government had no right to exaggerate by favoritism the differences between individuals. He believed that all should stand equal before the law and that every department of government, executive, legislative and judicial, should recognize and protect the rights of the humblest citizen as carefully as it would the rights of the greatest and most influential.

Jefferson's principles, applied to the problems of the Twentieth century, would restore the republic to its old foundations and make it the supreme moral factor in the world's progress.

The application of his principles today would restore industrial independence and annihilate trusts. The application of his principles today would drive the money changers out of the temple, insure to the people a stable currency and harmonize labor and capital by compelling justice to both.

Society today has its aristocratic and its democratic elements; whether Jefferson's principles are applied depends upon which element controls the government.

CANADIANS ATTACK TOBACCO TRUST

The Canadian government has inaugurated a fight against the tobacco trust which seems likely to succeed. A bill has passed the house of commons providing for the revocation of the excise license held by manufacturers who sell goods subject to the condition that the purchaser shall not sell or deal in goods of a like kind produced by any other manufacturer or dealer. The measure is a good one and suggests a new anti-trust remedy. Our congress should pass such a law and thus put an end to one of the vicious practices of the trust.

THE "OIL" LITERATURE

An Iowa minister has called attention to a book entitled "The Rise and Progress of the Standard Oil Company," written by Gilbert Holland Montague and published by Harper Bros. It was sent to him without solicitation and without charge and he learned that it had also been sent to other ministers. The book purports to be an impartial review of the growth of the Standard Oil company but it is in fact a plausible plea for the company, evidently intended to relieve the company from censure and to justify the monopoly. As inevitable—"a natural development" as apologists says.

While control of prices, secret rebates, unfairness to competitors and all other sins charged against the company are

cheerfully admitted the tone of the author is apologetic throughout as will appear from the following quotations:

"That the industrial efficiency of the favored company was superior to that of other refiners seems equally demonstrable. By the sheer superiority of its organization, and, so far as is known, quite unaided by discrimination in rates, the Standard Oil company had obtained in 1892 its pre-eminent position."

Wm. H. Vanderbilt is quoted as saying of the Standard Oil officials:

"They are very enterprising and smart men. I never came in contact with any class of men as smart and as able as they are in business. They are very shrewd men. I don't believe that by any legislative enactment or by anything else, through any of the states or all of the states, you can keep such men down. You can't do it. They will be on top all the time."

"An explicated narrative—such as this has pretended to be—should bear its own judgment upon the agents who accomplished the oil monopoly. That judgment—if the narrative has succeeded in logical clearness—runs somewhat as follows: Since the railway and economic conditions the progress of the Standard Oil company was quite inevitable. Since it showed at an early time bright promise of industrial efficiency it readily acquired, after the fashion of the period, proportionate discrimination in freight rates."

"If the Standard Oil company were not the strongest refiner, its most powerful rival would most certainly have seized the same control over transportation that the Standard Oil company in fact secured. In the last analysis, monopoly by the Standard Oil company was, under existing conditions, inevitable, simply because it was most efficiently organized."

"And so in what seems at first sight an unaccountable and suspiciously rapid growth may be discerned signs of inevitable development—the operation of motives which are, at any rate, explicable."

"In the period from 1895 to the present, it may be added, the difference between the price of crude oil and the price of refined oil has remained almost constant, which shows that this power of fixing the price of crude oil has not been abused, in spite of the fact that the Standard Oil company during these years refined over eighty per cent of the output of oil."

"There is, he (Mr. Archibald) admits, a certain amount of monopolistic power, coming from the aggregation of capital itself, which keeps prices higher than they would be under severe competition; but at present this power and its effect upon prices are very slight and the lessened cost of doing busi-

ness on a large scale more than compensates in lowered prices for the slight monopolistic power of getting higher prices."

"The statement has frequently been made that the Standard has reduced its prices in the territory of its competitors and maintained prices at more profitable rates at non-competitive points. Such a practice, as an instance of ordinary business competition, is not extraordinary. A similar charge could be brought against most large businesses."

"The undoubtedly large profit accruing to the Standard Oil company from the utilization of by-products is owing entirely to its superior mechanical efficiency and organization."

"The power of the Standard Oil company is tremendous, but it is only such power as naturally accrues to so large an aggregation of capital; and in the persistence with which competition against it has continued, in the quickness with which that competition increases when opportunity for profit under existing prices appears, and in the ever present possibility of competition which meets the Standard Oil company in every direction of every part of its policy, lie the safe-guards against the abuse of this great power."

The above quotations illustrate the tone of the book and the fact that it is being sent to ministers free indicates that a systematic effort is being made to win over to the defense of trust methods those whose duty it is to speak out against immorality wherever practiced. Praising the smartness of the men at the head of the oil company, asserting that the managers have not yet abused the power given by monopoly, arguing that latent competition will prevent extortion and pleading that some other company would have secured a monopoly if the Standard Oil company had not—these defenses are presented with adroitness and repetition. The word "inevitable" is used several times—he falls back on destiny and suggests the helplessness of those who are the victims of monopoly to prevent the control of the market. The fact is that there is nothing natural about a monopoly until the tendency to injure others can be called a natural tendency. Every monopoly rests upon a corporation and every corporation is created by law. The law makers have either given corporations too much power or executives have allowed the corporations to act beyond their legal authority. The remedy is to put the government in the hands of men who are at heart op-

posed to private monopolies and who will in the interest of the public rigidly enforce existing laws and enact such new laws as may be necessary. "A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable."

AN ANSWER TO CRITICISM

Some of the eastern democrats and some of the populists have criticized Mr. Bryan's statement giving his reasons for supporting Judge Parker. The eastern democrats find fault because the support is given without endorsing the methods employed to secure the nomination and without holding out hope of economic reform. The criticism is not valid. Mr. Bryan owes a duty to the loyal democrats of 1896 and 1900 as well as to the organization and he could not help the ticket by pretending to be delighted with the nomination, neither could he help the ticket by trying to deceive those who have trusted him. He can do the most good and render the best service to the ticket by pointing out that in spite of all he himself has said—in spite of all any one else can say—it is better to support the ticket than to assist in the election of President Roosevelt. He has given reasons that seem to him sufficient and satisfactory, and he hopes to be able to give additional reasons after Judge Parker's letter of acceptance appears. The good effect of Mr. Bryan's statement is already apparent. Many have announced their intention to support the ticket who before were in despair. They see now that they can support the ticket and still continue the fight for economic reform; they see that the election of Judge Parker will remove imperialism, militarism and the race question and clear the way for a fight on economic questions. Neither is the populist criticism valid. It is more important that reforms shall be secured than that those reforms shall come through any particular party. The total populist vote is small compared with the number of democrats who desire reform. Mr. Bryan can do the cause of reform more good by helping these democrats to control the democratic party than he could by joining the

populists. If Judge Parker carries out the democratic platform we shall make progress during his administration; if he refuses to carry out the platform he will make it easier for the reform element to regain control of the organization.

THE NAVY LEAGUE

On another page will be found a quotation from the literature now being circulated by the Navy league, a society recently organized for the stimulation of sentiment in favor of a large navy. It is called a "patriotic" movement—strange it is always patriotic to increase taxes but never patriotic to reduce them. The appeal shows how the Navy leaguers in the various nations, "patriotically" of course, play each other against the people.

It is announced that President Roosevelt and Attorney General Moody are honorary vice-presidents of the league. If the Navy league in each of the countries named uses an increase in the navy of other countries as a reason for another increase in the navy at home it is not easy to see where a limit can be placed. Such a movement is entirely in keeping with the war-like spirit that pervades the speech of ex-Governor Black, placing President Roosevelt in nomination; it is in keeping with the imperialistic spirit that has grown out of a colonial policy in the Philippines. It is the swaggering, bullying, blood and thunder policy that is expected to attract those of "easy international morality"—as Mr. Roosevelt once described it. An effort was made to secure an endorsement of this policy by the democratic national convention—in fact it was endorsed by the sub-committee but the full committee rejected it without the formality of a roll call. This nation does not need to compete with other nations in the size of its navy unless it intends to vie with them in schemes of exploitation and conquest. It is about time for the formation of a "patriotic" organization having for its object the protection of the interests of the farmers and laborers and peaceful progress. But as

such a society could not hold out the alluring promises of life-positions, commissions and valuable contracts it could not arouse any great amount of enthusiasm.

WASTED TIME

How much time is wasted! A reasonable amount of time should be spent in social intercourse; but it should be made to contribute to one's general growth and upbuilding. The social intercourse that boys find on street corners and at the depot, and in bar rooms is not helpful or elevating.

Did you ever stand in a crowd at one of these places and listen to the conversation? Very little is heard that prepares one for usefulness or happiness, but much is heard that degrades and demoralizes. Let us draw a picture of two brothers—twin brothers, if you please. They play together as boys, they divide the chores as they grow up and keep each other company at school. But when they finish the high school they begin to drift apart. The more studious one is anxious to prepare himself for some useful career. He remains exemplary in his habits, he is economical, saves a part of his money and a part he spends on books. He acquaints himself with history, he makes himself familiar with science, he searches out the secrets of nature, he reads what the philosophers, the preachers, the orators and the poets have said. He puts in his spare hours adding to his store of knowledge and all of his time to developing character.

The other thinks that he knows enough and feels that he has earned a good time. What his brother spends on books he spends for cigars, drinks and fun. While his brother is reading, he is gossiping with young men of similar habits, telling doubtful stories and exchanging experiences. He keeps late hours and is neither refreshed by sleep nor strengthened in purpose for the next day's work.

Which one of these boys is most likely to succeed? Which will be most likely to have a competency in his old age? Which will contribute most to the welfare of the country?

Which will get most real happiness out of life?

These pictures are reproduced every day in every community. The boys described may not be twin brothers, they may be simply brothers or they may be the sons of neighbors—boys who started with equal chances.

Yet, with these object lessons before them, thousands of young men are wasting their time, sapping their strength and throwing away great possibilities. A society in each community for the improvement of the boys just budding into manhood would do much to lessen the number of criminals and to decrease the number of wretched and wrecked lives.

JUDGE PARKER'S ONE TERM PLEDGE

There is nothing particularly new in the single term idea, but the emphasis Judge Parker gave to his pledge not to accept renomination must convince men generally of his perfect sincerity on this point. The American people, during the past three years, have been provided an excellent opportunity for learning the dangers involved in a national administration that, anxious to succeed itself, places political ambition above public welfare. Not only did Judge Parker make his pledge emphatic, but he clearly pointed out the advantages derived to the public when the occupant of the white house has made it clear that he will under no circumstances accept renomination and is therefore in a position to discharge his duty with an eye single to public interests, and that independence is known of all men. Judge Parker said:

“I accept, gentlemen of the committee, the nomination and if the action of the convention shall be endorsed by an election by the people, I will, God helping me, give to the discharge of the duties of that exalted office the best service of which I am capable and at the end of the term retire to private life. I shall not be a candidate for, nor shall I accept, a renomination. Several reasons might be advanced for this position, but the controlling one with me is that I am fully persuaded that no incumbent of that office should be placed in a situation of possible temptation to consider what the effect of action taken

by him in an administrative matter of great importance might have upon his political fortunes. Questions of momentous consequence to all of the people have been in the past and will be in the future presented to the president for determination, and approaching this consideration, as well as in weighing the facts and the arguments bearing upon them, he should be unembarrassed by any possible thought of the influence his decision may have upon anything whatever that may affect him personally. I make this statement, not in criticism of any of our presidents from Washington down who have either held the office for two full terms or sought to succeed themselves; for strong arguments could be advanced in support of the re-election of a president. It is simply my judgment that the interests of this country are now so vast and the questions presented are frequently of such overpowering magnitude to the people that it is indispensable to the maintenance of a befitting attitude before the people, not only that the chief magistrate should be independent, but that that independence should be known of all men."

It will be interesting to look over the record concerning recommendations for the single term.

In his first annual message, President Jackson suggested an amendment to the constitution, "to limit the service of the chief magistrate to a single term of either four or six years." This recommendation was renewed by President Jackson in his sixth annual message.

In his letter accepting the republican nomination, Mr. Hayes, in 1876, said:

"The declaration of principles by the Cincinnati convention makes no announcement in favor of a single presidential term. I do not assume to add to that declaration, but believing that the restoration of the civil service to the system established by Washington and followed by the early presidents can be best accomplished by an executive officer who is under no temptation to use the patronage of his office to promote his own re-election, I desire to perform what I regard as a duty in stating now my inflexible purpose, if elected, not to be a candidate for election to a second term."

In his inaugural address, President Hayes said:

"In furtherance of the reform we seek, and in other important respects a change of great importance, I recommend an amendment to the constitution prescribing a term of six years for the presidential office and forbidding re-election."

In his first letter of acceptance Mr. Cleveland stated in very strong language the objections to a second term, saying:

“When an election to office shall be the selection by the voters of one of their number to assume for a time a public trust instead of his dedication to the profession of politics; when the holders of the ballot, quickened by a sense of duty, shall avenge truth betrayed and pledges broken, and when the suffrage shall be altogether free and uncorrupted, the full realization of a government by the people will be at hand. And of the means to this end, no one would, in my judgment, be more effective than an amendment to the constitution disqualifying the president from re-election.

“When we consider the patronage of this great office, the allurements of power, the temptations to retain public place once gained, and, more than all, the availability a party finds in an incumbent whom a horde of office-holders, with zeal born of benefits received and fostered by the hope of favors yet to come, stand ready to aid with money and trained political service, we recognize in the eligibility of the president for re-election a most serious danger to that calm, deliberate and intelligent political action which must characterize a government by the people.”

In his letter accepting the democratic nomination in 1896 Mr. Bryan said:

“So deeply am I impressed with the magnitude of the power vested by the constitution in the chief executive of the nation and with the enormous influence which he can wield for the benefit or injury of the people; that I wish to enter the office, if elected, free from every personal desire except the desire to prove worthy of the confidence of my countrymen. Human judgment is fallible enough when unbiased by selfish considerations, and, in order that I may not be tempted to use the patronage of the office to advance any personal ambition, I hereby announce, with all the emphasis which words can express, my fixed determination, not, under any circumstances, to be a candidate for re-election in case this campaign results in my election.”

The importance of making the president ineligible for re-election will yet be appreciated by the people generally to the extent that the prohibition will be incorporated into our constitution.

Human nature is as yet too frail to withstand the temptation to use for selfish purposes the great patronage of the executive. If it is argued that a nation might be in such a crisis that it could ill afford a change in the administration, it may be said in reply, first, that the same argument could be made at the close of a second term, and second, that when the nation reaches a condition where only one man out of the whole population is able to assume and properly discharge the duties of the executive it will scarcely be worth saving.

Representatives of the "National Business league" are agitating the proposition to amend the constitution so as to lengthen the presidential term to six years and making the president ineligible to re-election. Endorsements of the plan have been received from business men and organizations throughout the country. In opposing the re-election of a president, the league representatives declare: "The president during his first term, naturally anxious to succeed himself, is kept busy considering the demands of politicians and planning for a second term; meanwhile important legislation for the general good waits."

The principal affirmative argument in favor of lengthening the presidential term is that business interests are disturbed by a presidential election. If this argument is to have a controlling influence we might as well choose the executive for life, or, in order to reduce the disturbance to a minimum, establish an hereditary succession. There are political reasons in favor of the present length which outweigh any business considerations.

Jefferson was an advocate of frequent elections. In a letter written to Samuel Adams in 1800, he said: "A government by representatives elected by the people at short periods, was our object; and our maxim at that day was 'where annual election ends, tyranny begins;' nor have our departures from it been sanctioned by the happiness of their effects."

Sixteen years later he said: "The rights of the people to the exercise and fruits of their own industry can never be protected against the selfishness of rulers, not subject to their control at short periods."

The fact that commercial reasons are deemed sufficient by some to justify the surrender of a principle absolutely necessary for the protection of the public shows the dangerous pre-eminence given to money and money making.

To lengthen the presidential term is simply to enlarge the stake for which great interests play. The trusts could increase their campaign contributions fifty per cent if they could secure control of an administration for six years instead of four.

Short terms are necessary not only to protect the people from their public servants, but also to moderate disappointment and discontent. The sooner the people can hope for remedy the more patiently do they submit to that which they consider error or injustice.

A four years' term is long enough for a good president and too long for a bad one.

THE CRIMINAL CLAUSE

In a recent issue, THE COMMONER said: "If it be true that the beef trust magnates have conspired to prevent the election of Mr. Roosevelt, then Mr. Roosevelt has it in his power to immediately call every one of these magnates to time. He has it in his power to place every one of these men behind the bars. The beef trust magnates care nothing for the injunction process. Like every human being, however, they are afraid of the criminal process."

Referring to this statement, the *Fremont (Neb.) Herald* says: "Perhaps Mr. Bryan has forgotten that the 'Elkins bill' has repealed the criminal clause of the Sherman law. It was all there was in the law that had any terrors for the corporations that habitually violated it, and now it has been taken off at their demand. People generally seem to have forgotten it."

The *Herald* is in error. The Elkins bill did not in any way relate to the Sherman anti-trust law and did not repeal the criminal clause of that law.

The Elkins bill did repeal the provision in the anti-rebate law, providing for imprisonment; but that is an altogether different law from the Sherman law.

The Sherman law remains on the statute books just as when it was enacted. Its constitutionality has been upheld by the United States supreme court.

The chief feature of the Sherman anti-trust law, and, indeed, the very first section provides for criminal prosecution. The republican administration has not made an effort to enforce that section.

It would be well if the editor of the *Fremont Herald* would examine the record and show his readers that the Elkins bill had no relation whatever to the Sherman anti-trust law; also that the Sherman anti-trust law remains upon the statute book just as it was enacted and, under republican administration, remains on the statute book unenforced.

DAVIS ON LABOR

The *Lincoln (Ill.) Courier* publishes an extract from a letter recently written by Vice-Presidential Candidate Davis in which he discusses his labor record. He denies the charge that he employed injunctions against his men and asserts that he, on the contrary, declined to apply for an injunction when it was suggested by one of his superintendents. In the letter he says:

"I am glad to have your letter calling my attention to the publication placing me in an attitude of hostility to the laboring class. No one who knows me personally or is at all acquainted with the circumstances of my life, will put any credence in the statements to which you refer. I think I can well claim that I belong to the laboring class.

"For many years I worked in the ranks as a wage-earner and I know what it is to earn my living by the sweat of my brow. On the other hand I have been a large employer of labor, in railroads, coal mines, lumber mills, etc., and have never had any serious trouble with our men. I can recall but two instances in which there were strikes, and these were of short duration and peaceably settled. No man has even been discharged from our service because he was a union man, or

been evicted from a company's house for any reason. I think you will find that the conditions of the road man and the miner in connection with the enterprises I have directed will compare most favorably with those in other localities of the country.

"I have always believed, and my conviction came from the hard school of experience, that, measured by the character of the work he does and the cost of living every man is entitled to full compensation for his services.

"I am charged with having instituted proceedings which led to an injunction against strikers, by Judge Jackson, of this state. The fact is, I had nothing whatever to do with the case, and knew nothing about the matter until I read of it in the newspapers. The injunction did not apply to the men in our employ nor pertain to them in any way. On the contrary I remember on one occasion one of our superintendents suggested an injunction against our men and I declined to consider it."

THE DINGLEY RATES

A reader of *THE COMMONER* asks whether it is true that the tariff duties in the Dingley bill were made exceptionally heavy in order that they might be used for the purpose of obtaining reciprocity.

It is not at all probable that the tariff barons who were instrumental in persuading republican statesmen to pass a high tariff bill ever intended or expected that these rates would be decreased. But we have it on eminent republican authority that such was the intention of Governor Dingley, the father of the bill, and many of the men who assisted in framing the measure. On January 13, 1903, Senator Dolliver of Iowa said: "It is true that in the bill which he (Dingley) reported from the committee on ways and means, of which at the time I had the honor to be a very humble member, duties were put up for the express purpose of having them traded down."

THE BENNETT WILL

The supreme court of Connecticut has sustained the lower court in refusing to admit to probate as a part of the will the sealed letter instructing Mrs. Bennett to turn over to Mr. Bryan \$50,000 given to her in trust, said sum to be used by Mr. Bryan and his family or distributed by Mr. Bryan among educational and charitable institutions. This ends that branch of the case. As the opinion has not been handed down it is not yet known what influence this decision may have upon the two other cases now pending—one for the construction of the will and the other relating to \$30,000 bequeathed for educational purposes.

POWER OF GOLD

A Hartsville, Tenn., reader of THE COMMONER sends a clipping from the *Nashville American* and suggests that it provides a good text for an article on "the corruption of the voter." The *American* article follows:

"Party managers are frequently staggered by the extravagant demands made upon them during a campaign. Money, judiciously expended, is more effective on election day than all of the campaign oratory and brass band displays of former days. In the rural districts of the north and west the farmers and their neighbors have heard about the vast sums of money expended to get out the party vote in the big cities. The result is the farmer and his men require to be paid for leaving their work to go to the polls. It is astonishing to know how general this practice has become during the past ten or fifteen years.

"In the pending contest the dividing lines between the two parties, from a practical business standpoint, are so indefinite, that the independent vote this year promises to be unusually troublesome, and also expensive to both parties. It is difficult to estimate the cost of getting out the so-called independent vote. Even an expert like David Bennet Hill confesses that since the days of Roswell P. Flower and Levi P. Morton, and their expensive campaigns for the governorship of New York, there is no way of calculating what it will cost to round up the independent voters on election day.

"In this connection Mr. Hill says that Mr. Flower, after securing the nomination for governor, determined to be elected if it cost him every dollar of his accumulated millions. In the Flower campaign it became known to the boys that 'Uncle Roswell' was willing to pay for a big majority and the result was that independent votes went to a high premium. When Levi P. Morton was the republican candidate for governor, he was ambitious to go to Albany with the biggest majority ever given to a New York governor. It was understood that his treasure chest was wide open on that occasion, and ever since the price of independent votes throughout the country has had an upward tendency."

It is unquestionably true that the growing use of money in politics is an evil which demands serious consideration. No one acquainted with the facts can believe that the large campaign funds expended in recent years are either necessary or legitimate. In 1896 the republican party had admittedly the largest campaign fund in political history and in 1900 that party had a campaign fund which although perhaps not so large as that of 1896 was of gigantic proportions.

One may obtain a hint as to the immensity of the 1896 fund by the statement made by Thomas W. Lawson of Boston in the announcement of his series of articles entitled "Frenzied Finance; the Story of Amalgamated." In that announcement Mr. Lawson said:

"I shall deal with a bit of the nation's history in which within a few days of the national election of 1896 a hurry-up call for additional funds to the extent of \$5,000,000 was so promptly met as to overturn the people in five states and thereby preserve the destinies of the republican party, of which I am and have always been a member."

It must be remembered that this enormous sum of \$5,000,000 was collected "within a few days of the national election of 1896" and was simply an additional contribution to an already large fund.

In one voting precinct of Nebraska, republican leaders boasted that they spent more than \$100. As there are only a few more than 100 voters in the precinct referred to, this would mean a campaign fund of about \$200,000 for Nebraska alone if the same effort was made in all the precincts. Walter Well-

man, the Washington correspondent for the *Chicago Record-Herald*, writing in a recent issue of the magazine called *Success*, says that at the close of the campaign of 1896 Mr. Hanna was presented with an urgent appeal from Nebraska for another allotment of funds. "If we had \$50,000 more," telegraphed the chairman of the republican committee in Nebraska, "we would carry Bryan's own state for McKinley." Mr. Wellman says that Mr. Hanna took an inventory and found that there remained \$100,000 in the republican treasury and so the additional \$50,000 was sent to Nebraska.

Several years ago a Connecticut paper, speaking of the necessity of raising a campaign fund for that state, said that the twenty-four state committeemen should be required to collect \$1,000 each. "If any committeeman can not produce the same," said that Connecticut paper, "let him step down and make room for another who can do it. With the sum of \$24,000 assured beyond question, there should be no difficulty in securing enough more to enable all the legitimate expenses of the campaign to be met without heavy assessment on the candidates."

It will be observed that this sum of \$24,000 was suggested only as a beginning in Connecticut!

It is true that there are certain proper and legitimate expenses which can not be avoided, but it is a notorious fact that in many political campaigns, large sums of money are used for purposes which can not be defended. Men are hired to "work" when it is known that the money is intended for their votes. Some are purchased to remain at home while others are bought outright. As a rule, large campaign funds are collected from corporations that have favors to ask at the hands of the government and the money is subscribed in return for assurances that make it impossible for the party receiving the same to do its duty to the people. Mr. Havemeyer, in the sugar trust investigation a few years ago, testified that the trust gave liberally to the democratic party in New York and to the republican party in Massachusetts. When asked about New Jersey he said that that state was doubtful and that he would have to look at the books before he could say to which side the trust contributed.

It does seem that in recent years the use of large campaign funds gives a great advantage to the party which the corporation supports. Addison put it well when he said: "A man who is furnished with arguments from the mint, will convince his antagonist much sooner than one who draws them from reason or philosophy. Gold is a wonderful clearer of the understanding; it dissipates every doubt and scruple in an instant; accommodates itself to the meanest capacities; silences the loud and clamorous and cringes over the most obstinate and inflexible.—Phillip of Macedon was a man of most invincible reason this way. He refuted by it all the wisdom of Athens; confounded their statesmen; struck their orators dumb; and at length argued them out of all their liberties."

In the heat of a campaign the strong partisan might rejoice in the fact that his party had the largest campaign fund; but no lover of his country can, on reflection, doubt the corrupting influence of immense campaign funds drawn from insolent and arrogant monopolies. The time will come when an appeal to the reason of men will be a greater power in politics than a resort to the checkbook. But in this day the monopolist, bent upon securing unjust favors at the hands of the government, places implicit confidence in the power of "argument from the mint."

"The wisdom of Athens" has on several occasions been "refuted" by gold that "wonderful clearer of the understanding;" but when "argument from the mint" has shown itself powerful enough to confound statesmen, strike orators dumb, dissipate doubt and refute logic, it is but a short step to the power of gold to "argue the people out of all their liberties."

THE FREE PASS

The *Chicago Chronicle* has the following to say concerning railroad passes:

"It is suggested by a financial paper that the so-called 'free pass' evil can best be reached by requiring the railroad companies once a year to make public a list of names of persons receiving passes and the reasons for granting such passes.

"It is safe to assert that most of the outcry against railroad passes comes from people who want them and can not get them. As to the 'evil' of passes, there is room for argument and difference of opinion.

"In point of fact relatively few passes are issued which deserve the designation 'free.' Those that are issued as a matter of charity are entitled to the name; so are those of a purely courtesy character. Both classes together form a small proportion of the whole number of railroad passes.

"A railroad company is like any other business institution; it aims to get value received for what it furnishes. Hence, when it gives a pass over its line the man who gets the pass is likely to have done something for it or is expected to do something for it. He takes the transportation instead of cash for his services.

"The argument that railroad passes may be used to corrupt public functionaries requires no other answer than that money can be used for the same purpose. Would the objectors, therefore, abolish money along with railroad passes?"

"The whole matter of railroad passes is really a detail of the railroad business with which the public has no concern. It has been agitated by socialistic propagandists until it has developed into a sort of political issue when it should be nothing of the kind.

"There is no more reason why a railroad should be obliged to publish its record of passes than that it should be obliged to publish its expenditures for advertising, track material or train operation. The matter is one for its stockholders."

It is interesting because it admits that railroads aim to get value received for passes. It admits that the official "takes the transportation instead of cash for his services." It regards it as a conclusive answer to say that money could be used for the same purpose. It inquires whether those who object to the pass in politics would also be in favor of abolishing money in order to prevent bribery?

The *Chronicle* being an ultra corporation paper, its editorial on this subject proves the purpose of the pass and also shows how indefensible the system is. It is supporting Candidate Roosevelt. Will it say that he would have received from the railroads an equivalent in money as willingly as he received the free train for his presidential campaign tour?

IMPERIALISM BEARING FRUIT

The *Sunday Sun* of a year ago, a paper published at Manila, and edited by Edward F. O'Brien, contains some items that ought to be of interest to those complacent republicans who have watched with unconcern the development of their party's policy in the Philippines. It seems that Major Glenn was to leave the Philippines and a farewell reception was given in his honor by "Lawton Post, Veteran Army of the Philippines." The editor of the *Sun* says that Major Glenn's hearers "went mad with enthusiasm," and adds that "it is safe to say that no such reception was ever accorded any person leaving Manila for the home country." The following is the report as it appears in the *Sun*:

"Perhaps the greatest sensation in Manila since the last issue of the *Sunday Sun* was caused on Friday evening, September 4, by the speech of Major Edwin F. Glenn, Fifth infantry, on the occasion of the farewell reception given in his honor by Lawton Post, Veteran Army of the Philippines. Major Glenn spoke straight from the shoulder, severely scoring the policy of the civil government, and handled his subject without gloves. His hearers went mad with enthusiasm, and it is safe to say that no such reception was ever accorded any person leaving Manila for the home country.

"Major Glenn bitterly scored the policy, 'the Philippines for the Filipinos.' He derided the race, stating that the average native of the Orient lies from preference. He scored the wealthy and so-called intelligent class of Filipinos whom he alleged kept up the late insurrection and whom he scored as too cowardly to go into the field and fight, but who stayed at home and furnished information to the men in the field—the pretended friends and amigos of the Americans. Continuing, Major Glenn laid it down that the head of the government must be an American among Americans. Capital must be encouraged—not discouraged. By antithesis the present government was bitterly criticised for its pro-Filipino policy.

"Continuing, Major Glenn said: 'Russia will take Manchuria and Korea, and she wants Japan. Russia wants to fight Japan, but Japan will not be so foolish as to engage in a war with Russia unless she has the support of other nations. Nothing is so detrimental to the race in my belief as peace. We want war, but the serious question is: "Do we want war

with Russia?" The bear has never been phazed by war, but if we go to war with her we will leave signs.'

"Terminating his remarks, Major Glenn quoted the following lines from a poem entitled 'The Little Brown Brother,' which appeared in the *Sunday Sun* of July 4:

I'm only a common soldier man in the blasted Philippines.
They say I've got brown brothers here, but I dunno what it means.

I like the word fraternity, but still I draw the line—

He may be a brother of William H. Taft, but he ain't no friend of mine.'

"Throughout his remarks he was interrupted continually by uproarious applause."

It is only a little while ago that one of the high officials in the navy put forth the doctrine that war was necessary to keep people in good spirits, and now we find that Major Glenn is declaring that "we want war;" that "nothing is so detrimental to the race as peace."

The major ought to receive a cordial reception at the White house, for after reading what he said at Manila one can hardly doubt that he will indorse the president's statement to the students at West Point, that a good soldier "ought to be not only willing to fight, but anxious to fight."

If any republican readers think that a carpet bag government in the Philippines is likely to make friends of the Filipinos so long as that government is held in force by a standing army, he ought to read the language used by Major Glenn. The Filipinos would be less than human beings if they ever learned to love this government so long as we not only govern them without their consent, but through our army officers give them to understand that we have a contempt for them as well as for their rights. Surely the time is not far distant when they will see how bloody and brutal is the whole doctrine of imperialism, and when they understand its true nature they will understand that imperialism must ultimately dominate this country if we are to practice it in the Philippines.

"ANXIOUS TO FIGHT"

The president, in his now famous speech to the cadets at West Point, laid down a doctrine which can not with safety be endorsed by the American people. To say that "a good soldier must not only be willing to fight, but anxious to fight," is to say that a desire to kill is a necessary part of the soldier's equipment. If that be true it is necessary that the army be reduced to the smallest limit consistent with public security and it is not certain that any foreign danger can equal the danger that arises from the training of men to desire to take human life. That a man can sincerely accept the Christian religion, as the president does, and still manifest the delight that he does in bloodshed and slaughter shows how difficult it is to bring the physical man into subjection to the spiritual man. Mr. Roosevelt seems to enjoy more than his predecessors the exercise of power. He has no natural aptitude for the exercise of authority, for self-control is the first essential in the rules, but he loves to give commands. It is this passion for power that makes him a dangerous man in the White house. Judge Parker is the very antithesis of President Roosevelt. He is judicial in temperament and deliberate in action; his inclinations are toward peace rather than toward war. He would stimulate the youth of the land to follow business pursuits rather than to prepare for carnage. Four more years of the physical strenuousness and political uncertainty of Rooseveltism and the country would be on the verge of nervous prostration; four years of Parkerism will not bring the economic reforms which the people need but they will give the people a rest and prepare them to renew the struggle in earnest in 1908.

BOER ADDRESS AND REPLY

During the St. Louis convention several of the Boer generals and soldiers called upon Mr. Bryan at Nebraska headquarters and presented an address. The address and reply will be found below :

THE ADDRESS

St. Louis, Mo., July 5, 1904.—To the Honorable William Jennings Bryan.—Greeting from the Boer Nation.—Esteemed and Honored Friend: Having been informed of your presence at St. Louis, we deem it an opportune time to tender you and the liberty-loving Americans who were inspired by your eloquent pleading for our cause during those dark days when we were struggling for liberty, defending our country, home and hearth against an unjust attempt to exterminate the Boer race, our most undying and fervent gratitude.

Often when the odds against us seemed overwhelming, our ammunition, food and clothes exhausted, our women and children and thousands of burghers captives in the hands of the enemy, a word of sympathy from America came as balm to the wound, and inspired us with new courage.

During the life and death struggle at the battles of Colenso, Spionkop, Maggersfontein and Diamond Hill, and many other engagements, the banner of liberty was kept waving, through the knowledge that far away in the great republic of the west, the home of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Bryan, millions of American freemen and women were fervently praying for our success and aiding us financially.

Even though today we are exiles, and wanderers in a strange land through the fate of cruel war and overpowering numbers, the sweet memory of your sincere and honest advocacy of the burghers vibrates our heart chords with the sweetest melody.

During the campaign of 1900, when you were the candidate of a great party, your advocacy of the cause of the Boers was of immense advantage to us and a constant encouragement. Needless to say, were the Boer nation privileged to place you in the seat of Jefferson, our race would be unanimous in doing so as an expression of our gratitude.

The espousal of our cause by the leading journalists of America demonstrated that the foreign, greedy avarice which coveted and prompted the destruction of the Free State and Transvaal republics was not approved by the liberty-loving democracy of the United States, whose fire by night and cloud by day is the Declaration of Independence.

Many lion-hearted Englishmen voiced the sentiment of their great countryman, Lord Byron, who said: "Hereditary bondsmen know you not who would be free themselves must strike the blow."

Hoping that you will accept this our humble tribute, with heartfelt gratitude, we remain, sir, yours gratefully,

B. J. VILJOEN, General late Boer Forces, Transvaal.
P. A. CRONJE, General late Boer Forces, Transvaal.
J. BOSHOFF, Commandant.
G. M. VAN DAM, Commandant Transvaal Police.
P. D. MOLL, Commandant.
G. MARE, Commandant.
A. H. BLEKSLEY, Captain.
M. J. WOLMARANS, Lieut. Artillery.
J. H. SMIT, Field Cornet.
W. BOTHA, Field Cornet.
S. RAUBENHEIMER, Field Cornet.
P. J. DUPLESSIS, Field Cornet.
BEN COETZEE, Field Cornet.
L. BOSEL, Lieut. of Police, Transvaal.
E. THIEDEMAN, Field Cornet.
F. FISHER, Field Cornet.
R. D. YOUNG, Field Cornet.
B. P. MARAIS, Field Cornet.

And two hundred and forty-seven men, women and children at present in St. Louis at the Louisiana Exposition grounds.

MR BRYAN'S REPLY

General Viljoen, General Cronje and others: I do not know in what words to thank you for the honor you do me in presenting this address. I most sincerely appreciate the compliment. I did on many occasions express the hope that you would succeed in maintaining the independence of the Boer republics; I did do all in my power to arouse sympathy for your people in their wonderful struggle to retain self-government, but it was not because of personal acquaintance with your people or because of partiality for them as against others. It was rather because I believe that a blow struck for liberty anywhere strengthens liberty everywhere, and that the defeat of any people's aspirations for self-government is felt by liberty-loving people all over the world. Your burghers were fighting for all republics as well as for their own and they made England's war of conquest so expensive that all republics are now safer from attack from without. The bravery of your soldiers recalled the heroism of ancient times and your war, unsuccessful though it was, has given to history and to poetry names that will for centuries inspire the patriotic to devotion and self-sacrifice. I am proud that my feeble words were heard by your people and grateful that you who have attached your distinguished names to this address have so gen-

erously expressed your commendation of my efforts in behalf of the Boers. As a slight token of my appreciation of your kindness I shall be pleased to provide you, General Viljoen, and you, General Cronje, platform seats in the democratic national convention now in session in this city, that you may see the representatives of a party, which, had it been successful in 1900, would have thrown the moral influence of the nation on your side and thus assisted in the creation of a public opinion helpful to your cause. I again thank you for this compliment—it makes this day a day that will always be a bright one in my memory.

General Cronje, speaking through an interpreter, thanked Mr. Bryan for his cordial reception of himself and his comrades and Mr. Bryan added: "The fact that you, General Cronje, express yourself in a language with which we in America are not familiar proves that liberty has no chosen tongue but emanating from the heart finds utterance in every language and in every land."

FINDING SUCCESS IN FAILURE

If those who believe as the editor of *THE COMMONER* does had been successful in nominating the ticket at St. Louis, it would have been proper to consider the responsibilities of victory and to counsel that moderation that ought always to temper success, but as these were not successful in nominating the ticket, it may be useful to point out that even defeat and failure can be turned to advantage. We are so short-sighted that even the wisest of us can not see very far ahead. We do what we think is right and labor for the accomplishment of ends which we believe to be worthy, but we often find that other plans are better than our own and that a temporary defeat brings us nearer to the sought-for end than a temporary victory would have done. At least, when we have done our best it is the part of wisdom to make the most out of conditions that we find, and begin our new fight with the advantage of past experience.

William George Jordan, in a little book entitled "The Majesty of Calmness," published by Fleming H. Revel Co., New York, has a chapter entitled "Failure as a Success," and it

contains so much of consolation and encouragement that it is commended to those who enter the present campaign with less of enthusiasm than they hoped to feel. Mr. Jordan says:

“It oftentimes requires heroic courage to face fruitless effort, to take up the broken strands of a life-work, to look bravely toward the future, and proceed undaunted on our way. But what, to our eyes, may seem hopeless failure is often but the dawning of a greater success. It may contain in its debris the foundation material of a mighty purpose, or the revelation of new and higher possibilities.

“Some years ago it was proposed to send logs from Canada to New York, by a new method. The ingenious plan of Mr. Joggins was to bind great logs together by cables and iron girders and to tow the cargo as a raft. When the novel craft neared New York and success seemed assured, a terrible storm arose. In the fury of the tempest, the iron bands snapped like icicles and the angry waters scattered the logs far and wide. The chief of the hydrographic department at Washington heard of the failure of the experiment, and at once sent word to shipmasters the world over, urging them to watch carefully for these logs which he described; and to note the precise location of each in latitude and longitude and the time the observation was made. Hundreds of captains, sailing over the waters of the earth, noted the logs, in the Atlantic ocean, in the Mediterranean, in the south seas—for into all waters did these venturesome ones travel. Hundreds of reports were made, covering a period of weeks and months. These observations were then carefully collated, systematized and tabulated, and discoveries were made as to the course of ocean currents that otherwise would have been impossible. The loss of the Joggins raft was not a real failure, for it led to one of the great discoveries in modern marine geography and navigation.

“In our superior knowledge we are disposed to speak in a patronizing tone of the follies of the alchemists of old. But their failure to transmute the baser metals into gold resulted in the birth of chemistry. They did not succeed in what they attempted, but they brought into vogue the natural processes of sublimation, filtration, distillation, and crystallization; they invented the alembic, the retort, the sand-bath, the water-bath and other valuable instruments. To them is due the discovery of antimony, sulphuric ether and phosphorus, the cupellation of gold and silver, the determining of the properties of saltpetre and its use in gunpowder, and the discovery of the distillation of essential oils. This was the success of failure, a

wondrous process of nature for the highest growth—a mighty lesson of comfort, strength, and encouragement if man would only realize and accept it.

“Many of our failures sweep us to greater heights of success than we ever hoped for in our wildest dreams. Life is a successive unfolding of success from failure. In discovering America, Columbus failed absolutely. His ingenious reasoning and experiment led him to believe that by sailing westward he would reach India. Every redman in America carries in his name ‘Indian,’ the perpetuation of the memory of the failure of Columbus. The Genoese navigator did not reach India; the cargo of ‘souvenirs’ he took back to Spain to show to Ferdinand and Isabella as proofs of his success, really attested his failure. But the discovery of America was a greater success than was any finding of a ‘back-door’ to India.

“When David Livingstone had supplemented his theological education by a medical course, he was ready to enter the missionary field. For over three years he had studied tirelessly, with all energies concentrated on one aim—to spread the gospel in China. The hour came when he was ready to start out with noble enthusiasm for his chosen work, to consecrate himself and his life to his unselfish ambition. Then word came from China that the ‘opium war’ would make it folly to attempt to enter the country. Disappointment and failure did not long daunt him; he offered himself as a missionary to Africa—and he was accepted. His glorious failure to reach China opened a whole continent to light and truth. His study proved an ideal preparation for his labors as physician, explorer, teacher and evangel in the wilds of Africa.

“Business reverses and the failure of his partner threw upon the broad shoulders and the still broader honor and honesty of Sir Walter Scott a burden of responsibility that forced him to write. The failure spurred him to almost superhuman effort. The masterpieces of Scotch historic fiction that have thrilled, entertained and uplifted millions of his fellow-men are a glorious monument on the field of a seeming failure.

“When Millet, the painter of the ‘Angelus,’ worked on his almost divine canvas, in which the very air seems pulsing with the regenerating essence of spiritual reverence, he was antidoting sorrow, he was racing against death. His brush strokes, put on in the early morning hours before going to his menial duties as a railway porter, in the dusk like that perpetuated on his canvas—meant strength, food and medicine for the dying wife he adored. The art failure that cast him into the depths of poverty unified with marvellous intensity

all the finer elements of his nature. This rare spiritual unity, this purging of all the dross of triviality as he passed through the furnace of poverty, trial, and sorrow gave eloquence to his brush and enabled him to paint as never before—as no prosperity would have made possible.

“Failure is often the turning point, the pivot of circumstance that swings us to higher levels. It may not be financial success, it may not be fame; it may be new draughts of spiritual, moral or mental inspiration that will change us for all the later years of our life. Life is not really what comes to us, but what we get from it.

“Whether man has had wealth or poverty, failure or success, counts for little when it is past. There is but one question for him to answer, to face boldly and honestly as an individual alone with his conscience and his destiny:

“‘How will I let that poverty or wealth affect me? If that trial or deprivation has left me better, truer, nobler, then—poverty has been riches, failure has been a success. If wealth has come to me and has made me vain, arrogant, contemptuous, uncharitable, cynical, closing from me all the tenderness of life, all the channels of higher development, of possible good to my fellow-men, making me the mere custodian of a money-bag, then—wealth has lied to me, it has been failure, not success; it has not been riches, it has been dark, treacherous poverty that stole from me even myself.’ All things become for us then what we take from them.

“Failure is one of God’s educators. It is experience leading man to higher things; it is the revelation of a way, a path hitherto unknown to us. The best men in the world, those who have made the greatest real successes, look back with serene happiness on their failures. The turning of the face of Time shows all things in a wondrously illuminated and satisfying perspective.

“Many a man is thankful today that some petty success for which he once struggled, melted into thin air as his hand sought to clutch it. Failure is often the rock-bottom foundation of real success. If man, in a few instances of his life can say, ‘Those failures were the best things in the world that could have happened to me,’ should he not face new failures with undaunted courage and trust that the miraculous ministry of Nature may transform these new stumbling-blocks into new stepping-stones?

“Our highest hopes, are often destroyed to prepare us for better things. The failure of the caterpillar is the birth of the butterfly; the passing of the bud is the becoming of the rose;

the death or destruction of the seed is the prelude to its resurrection as wheat. It is at night, in the darkest hours, those preceding dawn, that plants grow best, that they most increase in size. May this not be one of Nature's gentle showings to man of the times when he grows best, of the darkness of failure that is evolving into the sunlight of success. Let us fear only the failure of not living the right as we see it, leaving the results to the guardianship of the Infinite.

"If we think of any supreme moment of our lives, any great success, anyone who is dear to us, and then consider how we reached that moment, that success, that friend, we will be surprised and strengthened by the revelation. As we trace each one back, step by step, through the genealogy of circumstances, we will see how logical has been the course of our joy and success, from sorrow and failure, and that what gives us most happiness today is inextricably connected with what once caused us sorrow. Many of the rivers of our greatest prosperity and growth have had their source and their trickling increase into volume among the dark, gloomy recesses of our failure.

"There is no honest and true work, carried along with constant and sincere purpose that ever really fails. If it sometimes seems to be wasted effort, it will prove to us a new lesson of 'how' to walk; the secret of our failures will prove to us the inspiration of possible successes. Man living with the highest aims, ever as best he can, in continuous harmony with them, is a success, no matter what statistics of failure a near-sighted and half-blind world of critics and commentators may lay at his door.

"High ideals, noble efforts will make seeming failures but trifles, they need not dishearten us; they should prove sources of new strength. The rocky way may prove safer than the slippery path of smoothness. Birds can not fly best with the wind but against it; ships do not progress in calm, when the sails flap idly against the unstrained masts.

"The alchemy of Nature, superior to that of the Paracelsians, constantly transmutes the baser metals of failure into the later pure gold of higher success, if the mind of the worker be kept true, constant and untiring in the service, and he have that sublime courage that defies fate to do its worst while he does his best."

JUDGE PARKER ON IMPERIALISM

In his speech accepting the democratic nomination for president, Judge Parker said: "The accident of war brought the Philippines into our possession, and we are not at liberty to disregard the responsibility which thus came to us, but that responsibility will be best subserved by preparing the islanders as rapidly as possible for self-government and giving to them the assurances that it will come as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it."

There has been some criticism of this speech based upon the fact that Judge Parker used the words "self-government," rather than the word "independence."

In the same speech Judge Parker referred to the democratic platform as an "admirable" platform, and it will be remembered that that platform, referring to the Filipinos, said: "We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now, and, upon the suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people upon their feet free and independent to work out their own destiny."

But there is no longer ground for criticising Judge Parker on this point.

Recently John G. Milburn of Buffalo, N. Y., addressed to Judge Parker the following letter:

"I have noticed in some quarters a disposition to criticise the words 'self-government,' used by you in connection with the future of the Philippine Islands, as meaning something less than independence; and I venture to ask you if I am not right in assuming that 'self-government,' as you used the phrase, is identical with independence, political and territorial?"

The following is a complete reply to this letter:

"Rosemount, Esopus, New York, August 22, 1904.—My Dear Milburn: You are entirely right in assuming that as I employed the phrase, 'self-government,' it was intended to be identical with independence, political and territorial. After noting the criticism referred to by you, I am still unable to

understand how it can be said that a people enjoy self-government, while another nation may in any degree whatever control their action. But to take away all possible opportunity for conjecture, it shall be made clear in the letter of acceptance that I am in hearty accord with that plank in the democratic platform which advocates treating the Filipinos precisely as we did the Cubans; and I also favor making the promise to them now to take such action as soon as it can prudently be done.

"Thanking you for your letter, and with best wishes for you always, I am, very sincerely yours,

"ALTON B. PARKER."

Judge Parker could not have made his statement any stronger than he did in the letter to Mr. Milburn. Even in advance of his formal letter of acceptance he stands thoroughly committed to the democratic doctrine of self-government, which, according to his explicit interpretation, means independence.

Judge Parker's position on the question of imperialism is directly in line with the Kansas City platform. That platform declared:

"We condemn and denounce the Philippine policy of the present administration. It has involved the republic in unnecessary war, sacrificed the lives of many of our noblest sons, and placed the United States, previously known and applauded throughout the world as the champion of freedom, in the false and un-American position of crushing with military force the efforts of our former allies to achieve liberty and self-government. The Filipinos can not become citizens without endangering our civilization; they can not become subjects without imperiling our form of government, and we are not willing to surrender our civilization or to convert the republic into an empire; we favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to give to the Filipinos first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and, third, protection from outside interference such as has been given for nearly a century to the republics of Central and South America."

In his speech of acceptance delivered at Indianapolis, the democratic nominee for president in 1900, said:

"If elected I should convene congress in extraordinary session as soon as I am inaugurated and recommend an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose:

"1. To establish a stable form of government in the Philippine islands, just as we are now establishing a stable form of government in the island of Cuba.

"2. To give independence to the Filipinos, just as we have promised to give independence to the Cubans.

"3. To protect the Filipinos from outside interference while they work out their destiny, just as we have protected the republics of Central and South America, and are, by the Monroe doctrine, pledged to protect Cuba.

"A European protectorate often results in the exploitation of the ward by the guardian. An American protectorate gives to the nation protected the advantage of our strength, without making it the victim of our greed. For three-quarters of a century the Monroe doctrine has been a shield to neighboring republics, and yet it has imposed no pecuniary burden upon us."

Those who imagine that the American people have grown indifferent to the evils of imperialism have not made thoughtful survey of the situation. Judge Parker's position on that question is thoroughly democratic and those who are opposed to the un-American doctrines that have been foisted upon the people by the republican party may cast their votes for Alton B. Parker, convinced that he will employ all of the executive's power and influence in the effort to make our national policies responsive to Abraham Lincoln's eloquent appeal: "Return to the fountain whose waters spring close by the blood of the Revolution."

RUSSIA'S AWAKENING

The czar has made the birth of his first son and heir the occasion for inaugurating a number of important reforms.

1. He grants a general amnesty in the case of all political offenders except those charged with murder.

2. He abolishes corporal punishment among rural classes and for the first offense for sea and land forces.

3. He remits arrears due the state for the purchase of land.

4. He grants amnesty to those Finlanders who have emigrated without authorization.

5. He remits the fines imposed on the rural and urban communes of Finland which refused to submit to military conscription in 1902 and 1903.

6. He sets apart one million and a half from the state funds for the purpose of forming an inalienable fund for the benefit of landless people of Finland.

7. He remits the fines imposed on Jewish communes whose inhabitants avoided military duty.

8. He provides for a general reduction in sentences for common law offenses.

It will be seen that the reforms announced are of vast importance. They point to radical change in policy and can not fail to effect a tremendous influence upon the country. It indicates an abandonment of the policy of exiling political offenders—a policy which has done much to arouse the criticism of civilized nations. The abandonment of flogging as a punishment for the peasants is a great step in advance and will be hailed with delight throughout the empire. The cancelling of the debts due for the land is equivalent to an enormous donation to the former serfs. The relief granted the Finns and the Jews is as important for what it promises as for what it does. Russia has her face toward the light and her czar and his infant son will share the blessings which will flow from the reforms just instituted. The benedictions which follow their announcement may draw forth other and more sweeping measures.

What Russia needs most, and will some day have, are constitutional government, free speech and a free press. It is strange that any ruler can be blind to the advantages of constitutional government. Certainly Nicholas must find the responsibility and the burden heavy enough to make him wish for assistance. Self-government is the panacea for discontent. The people will bear with patience evils for which they are themselves responsible, but will complain bitterly of evils of no greater magnitude when those evils are brought upon them by the arbitrary action of a monarch. Paradoxical as it may sound, a monarch increases his authority as he shares it with the people. The fear that the people may not be capable of participation is an ungrounded one. The very desire to participate indicates capacity and that capacity is still further developed by exercise.

A ruler is likewise short-sighted if he imagines that he can increase his own security by silencing criticism. Opposition expressed is less dangerous than opposition suppressed, just as powder is less harmful loose than when its pent-up force must break its way out. Then, too, an official needs the aid of his enemies. They point out mistakes and utter warnings against errors. An enemy is often more frank than the friend and therefore is often more useful. "O, that mine enemy would write a book!" is the greatest tribute ever paid to the value of free speech and it is at the same time a tribute to the wisdom and sincerity of the one who uttered the sentiment. The ruler usually has to pay his friends for their assistance but with free speech and a free press he secures the service of his enemies without compensation or promise of reward. Free government is impossible without freedom of speech and press; despotism is impossible when speech and press are unfettered. The czar has earned the gratitude of his countrymen and the respect of the world by the evidence which he has just given of his progressive spirit. Now, if he will permit the people to participate in the making of the laws and invite them to express themselves freely on public men and public measures, he will not only immortalize himself but still further endear to the masses the child whose birth has already brought benefactions to the nation.

STATE OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS

Commenting upon Mr. Bryan's statement that "it would be as easy to provide for interstate commerce over state railroads as it is now to provide for through freight and passenger rates over different routes," the *Sioux City (Iowa) Journal*, a republican paper, says:

"It would seem that one thing the distinguished and eloquent Nebraskan might study to advantage is the difference in the form of government existing in the German empire and in the republic of the United States. Under our constitution certain things are reserved to the general government, while rights not reserved to the general government inure to the states.

The right 'to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes,' is reserved to the general government. It is not with Germany Mr. Bryan has to do so much as with the constitution of the United States. Mr. Bryan at the outset spoke of a commission to act under the authority of the states. No commission to the end in view would be possible except as it had creation under authority from the general government."

The *Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph*, a democratic paper, suggests that one way to overcome the objection that a thing is unconstitutional is to amend the constitution. The *Telegraph* adds: "But this would not be necessary and Mr. Bryan did not have a constitutional amendment in mind. The federal government, under the powers conferred upon it by the constitution, regulates interstate traffic on railroads owned by private corporations. State ownership does not imply a denial of the federal government's right to regulate such commerce; the simple change in ownership would not involve any part of the federal constitution. As to the commissions to act under the authority of the states, the *Journal* is aware that we now have a commission—useless and ornamental and expensive, it is true—but we have it. Other states have like commissions. They are not unlawful organizations, nor would they be if the state owned the railroads. With the latter condition obtaining, we might transform them into serviceable bodies, make them supreme in the management of the railroads within the state's territory, yet keeping their powers purely within the state's rights. These commissions, getting together, could severally and jointly agree on such tariff or service arrangements as would not conflict with the power of the general government. And while they could not themselves usurp the authority of the general government, they could and would 'provide for interstate commerce.' "

THE COLORADO SITUATION

The political and industrial situation in Colorado at the present time is attracting much more than the average amount

of attention, and is in direct contrast to the situation in a majority of the states. The supporters of Governor Peabody claim to be the friends of law and order and assert that they are only doing what is necessary to suppress lawlessness. The *Denver News*, in a strong editorial, points out that instead of supporting law and promoting order they favor a continuance of the present situation which is really a reign of lawlessness.

Under Governor Peabody constitutional rights have been ignored and the militia turned over to private corporations to enforce their decrees against their employes. Men have been arrested without charges being filed against them and held in prison at the caprice of the governor and his military subordinates. Men have been taken from their homes and deported without trial and the writs of civil courts have been ignored. The people in whose interests Governor Peabody has made himself a czar are allowed to organize vigilance committees, condemn men as disturbers of the peace and execute their decrees without any regard for the processes of the law. Claiming to protect property the exponents of Peabodyism have disregarded the property rights as well as the natural and civil rights of laboring men and have been more harsh and arbitrary in dealing with labor, both union and non-union, than they ever accused the union men of being toward men outside of their organization. Having re-nominated Peabody the republicans ask for an endorsement of the governor's administration.

The democrats condemn the official lawlessness that has characterized Governor Peabody's administration and appeal to the people to substitute constitutional and orderly government for the present despotism. They insist that each individual shall be held accountable for his conduct and that punishments prescribed by law shall be inflicted according to law when the guilt of the accused has been established by the courts.

The situation in Colorado calls for patriotic and rational treatment. The root of the trouble is to be found in the lack of sympathy between employer and employes and no perma-

ment peace can come until they begin to deal with each other in a different spirit. The employers have arrayed themselves against the just demands of those who are engaged in manual labor and the feeling has become more and more unfriendly. As the controversy has grown out of the needs of the employes, it can not be settled by the substitution of other employes unless they have lower aspirations and fewer needs.

The miners' union has sprung into existence to secure for the laborers the reforms which they need for themselves and for their families. An entirely new set of laborers, if of equal intelligence and ambition, would have the same needs and would in a short time form a new union to enforce the same demands. The Peabody plan, then, must result not only in present injustice and disregard of civil rights, but it involves a constant repetition of the scenes which have been witnessed in Cripple Creek, with increasing tension between the classes.

The mine owners of Colorado can not work the mines themselves and if for their own temporary profit they are willing to fill their mines with less skillful, less competent and less ambitious workmen they will only aggravate conditions and invite new forms of trouble.

The democrats would substitute reason for force and instead of attempting to coerce the wage earners into the acceptance of unfair conditions would remove animosity and restore good will by a scrupulous recognition of the rights of both employer and employe. They favor remedial legislation which will insure justice as between man and man.

A democratic victory in Colorado this year will not only be a boon to that state but it will be a warning to employers in other states to observe the constitution and the laws in dealing with their employes.

JUDGE PARKER'S LETTER

In another column THE COMMONER reproduces in full Judge Parker's letter of acceptance.

On the question of imperialism, self-government and the encroachment of executive authority, Judge Parker makes himself very clear.

He maintains that "if we would maintain our liberties and constitutional rights unimpaired we can not permit or tolerate at any time or for any purpose the arrogation of unconstitutional powers by the executive branch of our government. We should be ever mindful of the words of Webster: 'Liberty is only to be preserved by maintaining constitutional restraints and a just division of political power.'"

On the question of imperialism Judge Parker says: "The issue of imperialism which has been thrust upon the country involves the decision whether the law of the land or the rule of individual caprice shall govern. The principle of imperialism may give rise to brilliant, startling, dashing results, but the principle of democracy holds in check the brilliant executive and subjects him to the sober, conservative control of the people."

On the question of self-government, as applied particularly to the Philippines, Judge Parker says: "In some quarters it has been assumed that in the discussion of the Philippine question in my response, the phrase 'self-government,' was intended to mean something less than independence. It was not intended that it should be understood to mean, nor do I think as used it does mean less than independence. However, to eliminate all possibility for conjecture, I now state that I am in hearty accord with that plank in our platform that favors doing for the Filipinos what we have already done for the Cubans; and I favor making the promise to them now that we shall take such action as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it. If independence, such as the Cubans enjoy, can not be prudently granted to the Filipinos at this time, the promise that it shall come the moment they are capable of receiving it will tend to stimulate rather than hinder their development. And this should be done, not only in justice to the Filipinos, but to preserve our own rights; for a free people can not withhold freedom from another people and themselves remain free. The toleration of tyranny over others will soon breed contempt for freedom and self-government, and weaken our power of resistance to insidious usurpation of our constitutional rights."

Other features of Judge Parker's letter will be treated in a subsequent issue.

NEVADA VS COLORADO

Nevada and Colorado, the former with a democratic governor and the latter with a republican governor, illustrate the difference between the orderly working out of reforms through law and the violent and lawless methods employed by the representatives of plutocracy. In Nevada John Sparks, a democrat, is governor. While he is a man of large means and interested in both mining and agriculture, he is in sympathy with the masses and anxious to improve the condition of the laboring men. The democratic and silver parties adopted platforms favoring an eight-hour day. They were successful, a fusion legislature passed the eight-hour law, the democratic governor signed the bill and the fusion supreme court declared the law constitutional. As a result Nevada has peace and progress. In Colorado the people demanded an eight-hour law and the law was passed, but the supreme court declared it unconstitutional. The people then proposed and adopted a constitutional amendment authorizing the enactment of an eight-hour law, but the republicans carried the state and while Senator Teller was elected by one majority on joint ballot the corporate influence was strong enough to prevent the passage of a law carrying out the constitution as amended. As a result of this disregard of the will of the people by the corporations Colorado is in a state bordering on anarchy and the republican officials are the ones who are ignoring the law. Peabodyism is the natural and legitimate outgrowth of that contempt for the rights and interests of the masses which is manifesting itself more and more among the plutocrats. Governor Peabody is the willing exponent of this element and his administration is giving the people a foretaste of what can be expected if organized wealth ever gets unquestioned control of the nation and carries out its purpose to employ the army for the subjugation of the wage-earners.

Democratic Nevada and republican Colorado present a striking contrast and make plain the difference between the democratic and the republican methods of dealing with the labor question.

THE PHILIPPINE ISSUE EMPHASIZED

Governor Luke E. Wright, the present head of the Philippine commission, under the guise of an official report, sends a letter to the president which is intended for campaign use, and the president, of course, gives an extract to the public. The letter is unique—to use the word employed by the president to describe his feat when he shot the fleeing Spaniard. It is intended to suppress the discussion of the Philippine question in the United States and it contains some specimens of logic and political philosophy that ought to be embalmed for the benefit of future generations. The following is the extract which the republican presidential candidate thought proper to furnish the press:

“The effect of the continued discussion of the capacity of the Filipino for self-government is having its effect here and makes our task more difficult than it otherwise would. The less a man is equipped with intelligence and those qualities which make him fit for good citizenship, more easily can he be persuaded that he is possessed of all these qualities.

“These people have their full share of ambition and vanity and they also have their full share of recklessness. There is a number of half formed characters who are ready for intrigue in any direction which promises them profit or power. It is this class which has largely given force and direction to the Aglipayan movement and has recruited its ranks from ignorant and dangerous elements.

“In this general connection I may say to you as a matter of information that the agitation in the United States for Filipino independence and the spoken and written utterances of the prominent men there who are urging it, are all brought here and published in the native newspapers and are being made text for editorials insisting that Philippine people are now ready to become independent.

“The effect of all this is distinctly injurious. Its tendency is to renew the influence of the old insurrection leaders and make them active in preaching old propoganda. This, in turn, has the effect of demoralizing and weakening the more conservative and thoughtful Filipinos who fear that if they speak out as they really think, they would be considered enemies of their people and lose their prestige with them. Those of more

prominence and best educated and who naturally have their ambitious are inclined to join in the general cry."

The purpose of the letter is evident—whether it was written at the suggestion of the president or was conceived by Governor Wright himself is a question upon which the public is not informed. In 1900, when the Filipinos were in arms against American rule the republican leaders charged that democratic speakers kept the war alive by holding out hope of independence. Now that there is "tranquility" in the islands democrats are accused of making "our task" (of governing the Filipinos against their will) more difficult. And why? Not because of the inborn love of liberty that always and everywhere resents an alien rule; oh, no; but because "These people have their full share of ambition and vanity," and because there are among the Filipinos a number of "half formed characters who are ready for intrigue in any direction which promises them profit or power." This is similar to the language employed in England and by colonial governors in 1776 to describe reckless and "half formed characters" like Patrick Henry, Samuel Adams and Thomas Jefferson, whose utterances demoralized and weakened the "more conservative and thoughtful" Americans who were holding office under the crown or who were made friendly to English rule by business relations with English houses. It seems, too, that in the Philippines today "The more prominent and best educated, who naturally have their ambitions, are inclined to join in the general cry" for independence, just as ambitious men like Washington and John Adams joined in the general cry for American independence. What a hard time we are going to have in the Philippines! The "prominent and best educated" are ambitious, the "conservative and thoughtful" are turned and easily scared while the "ignorant and dangerous elements" are ready for revolt! As the "prominent," the "best educated," the "conservative," the "thoughtful," the "ignorant" and the "dangerous" include pretty much the entire population, Governor Wright has nothing but the army to support the "tranquility," which prevails in the islands (among the office hold-

ers). What a gloomy picture he presents of our happy insular possessions! We have spent some six hundred millions to make our dear subjects contented, while we have sent them but sixteen millions of merchandise (largely food and drink for our soldiers) and yet the mere discussion of their capacity for self-government seven thousand miles away completely upsets them—what ungrateful wretches they must be.

But the second sentence is the political, philosophical and literary gem of the letter. Governor Wright, having carefully studied the brown people over whom he is at present extending his benevolent sway and having diligently examined the characteristics of other races, comes to the profound conclusion that "Unless a man is equipped with intelligence and those qualities which make him fit for good citizenship, more easily can he be persuaded that he is possessed of all these qualities." What logic, what learning, what insight into human nature, what knowledge of the science of government are combined and condensed into that sentence! If he had not already had greatness thrust upon him by an imperial commission that assinine proposition ought to crown him with an infamous notoriety. If people can be persuaded of their fitness for self-government just in proportion as they are unfit for it, then it follows that those best fitted for self-government are hardest to convince of their own capacity. Those perfectly fitted for self-government would, according to this logic, modestly refuse to believe themselves competent to govern themselves and would, therefore, insist upon being governed by others. If Governor Wright's reasoning is sound we will have to use the army to keep self-government away from the Filipinos while we deem them incapable of taking care of themselves and then we will have to use the army to force self-government upon them when we deem them fully qualified. Such are the inconsistencies to which the republicans are driven to excuse the inexcusable folly of colonialism—to defend the indefensible crime of imperialism!

When Governor Wright says that the "best educated" are "naturally ambitious" and that the least capable of self-gov-

ernment can most easily be convinced of their fitness he unconsciously corroborates the statement of Lincoln that God Himself, placed in every human heart the love of liberty, and all history proves that it is an unquenchable love. People differ in their average capacity for self-government, just as individuals differ in the self-restraint which they are accustomed to employ, but to say that we are in duty bound to govern the Filipinos because we are more advanced than they, is hypocritical pretense—as opposed to our religious principles as to our theory of government. But what is to be the end of the policy suggested in Governor Wright's letter? Four years ago the republicans insisted that we must not promise independence because it encouraged the Filipinos to continue armed resistance to American authority; now the "continued discussion of the capacity of the Filipinos for self-government" makes "our task more difficult." But suppose we cease discussing the capacity of the Filipino and confine ourselves to the discussion of the capacity of our own people for self-government, will not such discussions be carried across the ocean and be "published in the native newspapers" and "be made texts for editorials"? Surely, the "more prominent" and the "best educated" of the Filipinos will see the analogy and apply to themselves the arguments which we use in regard to ourselves. What is the remedy then? Plainly, to stop talking about self-government or civil liberty. In 1900 the republican leaders succeeded in silencing some of the opponents of imperialism by accusing them of encouraging the "insurrectionists." If they can win this election by scaring some more they will be bolder by the next election and will object to our talking of our own rights and capacities. Governor Taft, after a few years' training in the Orient, was placed at the head of the war department where, in case of labor troubles, he can use his acquaintance with the arbitrary methods of imperial power, and it is only fair to assume that Governor Wright is, by his super-serviceable zeal, in the present campaign, laying the foundation for a cabinet position, but his successor, stimulated by his example, may feel justified in reporting, "as a matter of information," that the celebration of the Fourth of July in the

United States and the praise of those who fought and died for independence "are all brought here and published in the native newspapers and are being made the text for editorials insisting that the Philippine people are now ready to become independent."

There is but one settlement of the Philippine question which accords with American principles and that is the settlement proposed in the democratic platform and endorsed by Judge Parker. Independence, promised now and given as soon as a stable native government can be formed—this will settle the Philippine question as the Cuban question was settled and will convert into friends, admirers and imitators the Filipinos who are now enemies—whether they be "prominent," "educated," "conservative," "thoughtful," "ignorant" or "dangerous."

"OTHERS"

Occasionally some well-disposed person, speaking of some worthy cause—a college, a hospital or a reform—says: "If I only had a million I would enjoy helping." But not having a million he gives nothing.

Giving ought not to be confined to the rich; it is as necessary to moral growth as exercise is to the body. Selfishness leads one to spend money on himself—stinginess leads one to refuse to spend even for himself, while generosity leads one to share his means with benevolences which appeal to him. There are few who do not know the pleasure to be derived from giving to members of the family and to friends; the satisfaction is scarcely less when the gift is to unknown recipients who come within the influence of some educational or charitable institution. Every heart should attach itself in some definite way to the world's needs, and without waiting for great wealth or for death set aside a part of each year's income for the happiness and help of those less fortunate. "Others" is the word that is sometimes carved upon the hospitable hearth; it is also the word that marks the crossing of the boundaries of selfishness and man's entrance unto fellowship with the outer world.

SILVER DEMOCRATS VINDICATED

While the money question is not an issue in the present campaign, both Parker and Roosevelt being for gold, the silver democrats can insist that their position has been vindicated and that the question has decreased in importance only because an unexpected increase in the volume of money has raised prices and brought in part what bimetallism would have brought in a larger measure. The present situation can be illustrated as follows: Suppose the democrats of a city believing the water supply to be insufficient, pointed to a lake nearby, called Silver lake, and proposed that an additional supply be brought from that source. Suppose the republicans objected on the ground that the water supply was sufficient and carried the election. Then suppose a spring burst forth in the center of the city supplying half as much water as the city used before; and suppose that all the people rejoiced in the additional supply and profited by it—who would say that the republicans were vindicated? To be consistent republicans would have to favor plugging up the spring and returning to the quantity in use before the spring appeared.

This describes what has happened in the financial world. The democrats contended that more money was needed and pointed to the silver reservoir as the only available source from which to draw money. The republicans insisted that we had money enough but soon after the election new gold mines were found and from that and other sources the volume of money has been increased until we now have about 50 per cent more than we had in 1896 and everybody is glad. Who have been vindicated, those who said we needed more money or those who said we had enough and now boast of the unexpected increase? To be consistent the republicans ought to propose to retire the increase and go back to the amount we had in 1896. The money question will again receive attention when the demand for money overtakes the supply, but the quantitative theory has triumphed.

DINNER PAIL-COFFEE POT

When I passed through Indiana four years ago I saw everywhere pictures of the full dinner pail, which was at that time the republican emblem of prosperity. These pictures could be seen on the sides of barns and fences, on billboards and on trees—that is, on large trees, for it took a large tree. I have been in the state now seven days, and I haven't seen the picture of the dinner pail in all that time. What is the matter? Couldn't the dinner pail last four years? If they can not show a big dinner pail, they might at least exhibit a small one, as a reminder of old times. If they haven't any full dinner pails, they might, at least, show an empty one as a souvenir. No, the full dinner pail has gone. And what is the emblem this year? Senator Beveridge has suggested one. It is the coffee-pot. He says that we use three times as much coffee in the United States as we did under a democratic administration and that the coffee-pot is the test of the laboring man's prosperity. Farewell dinner-pail! Hail coffee-pot! Whenever a new medicine is put upon the market, the proprietor generally collects testimonials to prove its merits to others. I suppose that Senator Beveridge has already received a number of letters from persons who have tried both the dinner pail and the coffee-pot and who are satisfied of the superiority of the latter. I have not had a chance to look over the senator's mail, and therefore I can not speak positively as to the endorsement his new emblem may have received, but I have here a letter which might, with propriety be written to him by one of his admiring and loyal constituents. It is as follows:

“Hardscrabble, Ind., Oct. 19, 1904.—Hon. Albert J. Beveridge, Indianapolis, Ind.—My Dear Senator: I write to say that I have been trying your coffee-pot substitute for a full dinner-pail for several months and that the results are as good as could be expected. Now that the proportion of water in my food is about the same as it is in the stock of the corporation for which I work, I feel that I am rising in importance. I used to weigh about 180 pounds and often suffered with a feeling of fullness just after meals. That feeling has entirely disappeared, and I only weigh 79 pounds with my overcoat and

heavy shoes on. Work is a little slack here just now, but it seems almost providential, for I am not strong enough to do heavy work. Coffee is so much cheaper than food that we could save a good deal, but for the fact that my income has decreased more rapidly than my living expenses. I am telling the boys to remember you at the polls, and they say 'you bet we will.' But I don't like the way they say it. Some of them seem discontented. Have you any literature showing that the Chinese are quiet and contented workmen and live on much less than we do? If so send some of it here. It may do some good. But many of the workmen here are very unreasonable, and a few are impudent enough to say that the republican party does not own the whole earth. But I must close for this time. Yours for a full coffee-pot,

E. Z. MARK.

"P. S. I forgot to say that there is another advantage in coffee. My clothes got too big for me and my wife—you remember you sent her some flower seeds—took out the surplus and made a suit for little Albert Beveridge Mark. He lives on coffee, too.

E. Z."

Now, mind you, the senator has not received this letter yet but I think he is likely to before the campaign is over. And you all agree with me that he could not complain if he was flooded with such testimonials. I am afraid that the coffee-pot will not prove an acceptable symbol, and the republicans may get so discouraged that they will give up the use of emblems entirely before they take the next step from the coffee-pot to the water pitcher.

(Extract from speech by Mr. Bryan at Vincennes, Indiana.)

MENACE OF MILITARISM

The American people sooner or later will be required to give serious attention to the menace of militarism. The republican party has increased the army from 25,000, until the minimum is now 60,000, with a maximum of 100,000, to which the president can raise it without further authority. Who thought eight years ago at this time we would be discussing the size of the army? A small army had been the policy of this nation in the past. We had boasted that we didn't need a large mili-

tary establishment, and people have come from every nation in Europe, drawn to this country not only by its principles of government but by the fact that there was no army burden upon the people. Eight years ago we had 25,000 soldiers and who will say that the number was not sufficient? What has now made more soldiers necessary? If we have prosperity, if we have happiness, if we have contentment, why do we need 60,000 bayonets to point out these blessings to the American people?

Do we need a larger army to deal with the labor troubles? It depends entirely on the manner in which you deal with labor troubles. If you deal with labor troubles through the department of justice an army of 25,000 is enough. If you deal with the laboring man through the war department, then of course the war office must make the estimate, because if we are to have a government of force, those who are charged with employing the forces are perhaps in a good position to estimate the amount of assistance they will need. The labor question is one that we can not long put off and one of the indictments against the republican party is that instead of doing justice to the man who earns his bread in the sweat of his brow, it wants to widen the breach between the employer and employe and substitute hatred for good-will between the superintendents and those who do the work.

The question we must meet is whether the laboring man is to be treated as a citizen or as an enemy of the country, to be driven to his toil by military force. That is the question involved in this large army. No republican speaker in this campaign has attempted to go into detail to show the need of 60,000 professional soldiers. The expense of the war department was \$34,000,000 in 1886 and \$115,000,000 last year. Why this increase? When the soldiers are called out in labor troubles, in whose interest are they called out? In the interest of the great corporations that are fast becoming monopolies, and after these monopolies have robbed the American people of hundreds of millions of dollars, they now insolently demand that the people shall be burdened with taxation to furnish them

soldiers to drive their employes down to the bare starvation point.

If the republicans deny that one of the purposes of the increase is to deal with the laboring man under military authority, why is it that they used to erect forts upon the frontier to protect the pioneers from the savage tribes, while now, they build the forts near our large cities? It is a very serious thing when any man gets so much money that he is willing to deny that the man who toils with his hands was made in the image of the same God in whose image he was made, and that is the trouble today. It is a lack of sympathy between man and man; and instead of dealing with these laboring men as brothers, the republican party raises the army, and would deal with them as enemies to be met at the mouth of the gun.

Democrats object to raising the army for this purpose. But to escape that will they say that we have to have the increased army for an imperial policy? If they say that we need 60,000 soldiers to carry on an empire when we only needed 25,000 for a republic, let them show why the American people should adopt a policy that requires that expenditure of the people's money. Not only did we spend a hundred and fifteen millions on the war department last year, but we spent enough on the navy to make the total appropriation for both departments more than \$200,000,000. That is thirty times as much as we spent on the agricultural department. What do you think of a great agricultural nation spending \$30 preparing to kill people for every dollar spent preparing to feed people? What do you think of the policy? And if we are to have an increasing navy, as the republicans now propose, and if we are not to decrease the army—and they do not propose to decrease it—it means that every year we will have a larger and larger appropriation for the war and navy departments.

INDEPENDENCE NOT A "SCUTTLE" POLICY

The republicans, failing in their effort to bolster up the republican policy of imperialism, have rushed to the use of

epithets. Even "Uncle Joe" Cannon has been driven to such desperation that he speaks of the democratic policy of independence for the Philippines as a "scuttle policy." "Uncle Joe" knows better than this, if he were not too excited to think or too scared to reason. The democrats want to do in the Philippines exactly what the republicans helped to do in Cuba. Did we adopt a "scuttle policy" in Cuba? If so, then President Roosevelt was a ring-leader among the "scuttlers." We promised independence to Cuba just as the democrats want to promise independence to the Philippines. We kept our pledge to the Cubans, just as the democrats intend to keep the pledge that they want made to the Filipinos. The republicans helped to haul down the American flag in Cuba, just as the democrats want to haul it down in the Philippines. The republicans did not object to the raising of the flag of the Cuban republic; they ought not to object to the raising of the flag of the Philippine republic. Cuba, being near us, would be much more desirable as a part of our nation than the Philippine Islands. Cuba would be a source of strength, while the Philippines are a source of weakness; and yet when the Spanish war began, our nation was so anxious to avoid the appearance of a desire to exploit the Cubans, that it promised independence in advance. But the Cubans were entitled to independence, not because we promised it, but because of their own inherent right to it. Our promise granted the Cubans no new rights; it simply recognized their pre-existing rights. A promise of independence to the Filipinos would not confer new rights upon the Filipinos. It would simply assure them of our intention to recognize their inalienable rights. The republicans ought to meet the Philippine question in an open and honest way. The talk about "scuttling" is not only wilful misrepresentation of the democratic position, but it betrays a desire to substitute hard names for logic—an evidence that the republicans are working up more heat than enthusiasm.

INSULTING THE FLAG

We have been trying to point out to republicans the fact that President Roosevelt is changing the ideals of the nation

and substituting the "big stick" for the light of liberty, but many have refused to believe. Now, an appointee of this administration has come to our aid and declared this change in language so plain and forcible that no republican can longer doubt it. Reference is made to the article written by John Barrett, United States minister to Panama, and published in the *Chicago Tribune*. It is a campaign document contributed by the president's appointee and spread broadcast as an argument in favor of Roosevelt's election. Attention is called particularly to a paragraph which reads as follows:

"If they who today are stumping the land against President Roosevelt could have gone to foreign ports in the old days when the flag stood for nothing, when American merchants and travelers were everywhere snubbed, when our army and navy were the laughing stock of the world, when we had no influence in the councils of the nations; and if, then again, they could have journeyed around the world now, when the flag means more than the standard of any other nation, when our merchants have access to all markets, when our navy is respected in every port, and when our advice is sought in every conclave of the powers they would in sheer sense of stricken conscience renounce their present attitude and pray for the success of the party which has accomplished this mighty change and of a leader whose name is honored in the most remote portions of the earth."

Republicans, what do you think of this? Did the flag "stand for nothing" in "the old days?" Washington held that flag in his hand; did it stand for nothing then? Did it stand for nothing when our revolutionary fathers followed it from Bunker Hill to Yorktown? Did it stand for nothing when it was in the hands of Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence? Did it stand for nothing when it was held aloft by the older and younger Adams? Did it stand for nothing when Madison held it or when it was held by Monroe, who has given his name to the Monroe doctrine? Did it stand for nothing in the hands of Jackson at New Orleans and in Washington? Did it stand for nothing in the hands of Hayes and Garfield

and Harrison? What say you, republicans? And you veterans of the civil war? Did it stand for nothing when you followed it through four years of war and upon bloody battle-fields?

Did it stand for nothing until it became the emblem of an empire and the companion of the president's "big stick?" Did it begin to stand for something only when it waved over Filipino subjects bought in a job-lot at \$2.50 apiece? Did it begin to mean something only when it was carried against men who were fighting for the doctrines for which our revolutionary sires were willing to fight and die? Republicans, what do you think of this new doctrine of your party, proclaimed by the president's appointee? Do you endorse this doctrine or will you put it aside and say it is merely the flattery of an office-holder who kneels before this new built throne and eulogizes the man from whose hand he receives his daily bread? Barrett is a true and faithful exponent of the policy of our present president. He speaks with brutal frankness of the new policy that the nation is to pursue if imperialism is endorsed. You must forget all that you have ever known of the patriotism and principles of government before you can throw your hats in the air and cheer for Roosevelt and his colonial policy. Surely there must be a multitude of republicans who will refuse to apologize for a century of glorious history as they must do if they indorse the doctrine of Barrett and the doctrine of Roosevelt. The names of our illustrious Americans who have stood for the flag in the "old days" are too dear to the hearts of our people to be forgotten now merely that the name of Roosevelt may be exalted.

MISTAKEN FRIENDS

A few democrats, claiming to be interested in Mr. Bryan's future, are making the argument that Roosevelt's election would help Mr. Bryan. Whether this argument is sincere or not is immaterial. With some it may be; with others it is not.

But whether the argument is made from sincerity, or under the pretense of sincerity, the person who makes it is guilty of gross and inexcusable error. No good can come to Mr. Bryan, or to any democratic principle, by the election of President Roosevelt; for that is what the defeat of Parker would mean. No democrat who is interested in Mr. Bryan personally, or in Mr. Bryan politically, or in the reform for which Mr. Bryan has been fighting, can afford to assume responsibility for four years more of Rooseveltism. We can not afford to deny the people the relief within reach because we can not secure all the relief that we desire. What confidence would the people have in us four years from now, even though we gain control of the party, if at this time we are unwilling to work for a reduction of the army, for the overthrow of the doctrine of imperialism, and for the other things which the election of Parker and Davis will secure? The radical democrats must prove themselves willing to secure any measure of relief that is within reach. To refuse to do so would cast suspicion upon our sincerity, when we plead for an opportunity to bring still further relief. The democrats who do not vote for Parker help Roosevelt, and when we see what the republican party has done in the last eight years, we can form some estimate of the possibilities of danger involved in four years more of republican rule.

DEMOCRACY VS. PLUTOCRACY—THE ELECTION'S LESSON

The democratic party has met with an overwhelming defeat in the national election. As yet the returns are not sufficiently complete to permit analysis, and it is impossible to say whether the result is due to an actual increase in the number of republican votes or to a falling off in the democratic vote. This phase of the subject will be dealt with next week when the returns are all in. The questions for consideration at this time are, what lesson does the election teach? and, what of the

future? The defeat of Judge Parker should not be considered a personal one. He did as well as he could under the circumstances; he was the victim of unfavorable conditions and of a mistaken party policy. He grew in popularity as the campaign progressed, and expressed himself more and more strongly upon the trust question but could not overcome the heavy odds against him. The so-called conservative democrats charged the defeats of 1896 and 1900 to the party's position on the money question and insisted that a victory could be won by dropping the coinage question entirely. The convention accepted this theory, and the platform made no reference to the money question, but Judge Parker felt that it was his duty to announce his personal adherence to the gold standard. His gold telegram, as it was called, while embarrassing to the democrats of the west and south, was applauded by the eastern press. He had the cordial endorsement of Mr. Cleveland, who certified that the party had returned to "safety and sanity;" he had the support of the democratic papers which bolted in 1896, and he also had the aid of nearly all of those who were prominent in the campaigns of 1896 and 1900, and yet his defeat is apparently greater than the party suffered in either of those years.

It is unquestionable also that Judge Parker's defeat was not local but general—the returns from the eastern states being as disappointing as the returns from the west. The reorganizers were in complete control of the party; they planned the campaign and carried it on according to their own views, and the verdict against their plan is a unanimous one. Surely silver can not be blamed for this defeat, for the campaign was run on a gold basis; neither can the defeat be charged to emphatic condemnation of the trusts, for the trusts were not assailed as vigorously this year as they were four years ago. It is evident that the campaign did not turn upon the question of imperialism, and it is not fair to consider the result as a personal victory for the president, although his administration was the subject of criticism. The result was due to the fact that the democratic party attempted to be conservative in the

presence of conditions which demand radical remedies. It sounded a partial retreat when it should have ordered a charge all along the line. In 1896 the line was drawn, for the first time during the present generation, between plutocracy and democracy, and the party's stand on the side of democracy alienated a large number of plutocratic democrats who, in the nature of things, can not be expected to return, and it drew to itself a large number of earnest advocates of reform whose attachment to these reforms is much stronger than attachment to any party name. The republican party occupies the conservative position. That is, it defends those who, having secured unfair advantages through class legislation, insist that they shall not be disturbed no matter how oppressive their exactions may become. The democratic party can not hope to compete successfully with the republican party for this support. To win the support of the plutocratic element of the country the party would have to become more plutocratic than the republican party and it could not do this without losing several times as many voters as that course would win. The democratic party has nothing to gain by catering to organized and predatory wealth. It must not only do without such support but it can strengthen itself by inviting the open and emphatic opposition of these elements. The campaign just closed shows that it is as inexpedient from the standpoint of policy as it is wrong from the standpoint of principle to attempt any conciliation of the industrial and financial despots who are gradually getting control of all the avenues of wealth. The democratic party, if it hopes to win success, must take the side of the plain, common people. THE COMMONER has for two years pointed out the futility of any attempt to compromise with wrong or to patch up a peace with the great corporations which are now exploiting the public, but the southern democrats were so alarmed by the race issue that they listened, rather reluctantly be it said to their credit, to the promises of success held out by those who had contributed to the defeat of the party in the two preceding campaigns. The experiment has been a costly one, and it is not likely to be re-

peated during the present generation. The eastern democrats were also deceived. They were led to believe that the magnates and monopolists who coerced the voters in 1896 and supplied an enormous campaign fund in both 1896 and 1900 would help the democratic party if our party would only be less radical. The corporation press aided in this deception, and even the republican papers professed an unselfish desire to help build up the democratic party. The election has opened the eyes of the hundreds of thousands of honest and well-meaning democrats who a few months ago favored the reorganization of the party. These men now see that they must either go into the republican party or join with the democrats of the west and south in making the democratic party a positive, aggressive and progressive reform organization. There is no middle ground.

Mr. Bryan did what he could to prevent the reorganization of the democratic party; when he failed in this he did what he could to aid Parker and Davis in order to secure such reforms—and there were some vital ones—promised by their election. Now that the campaign is over he will both through THE COMMONER and by personal effort assist those who desire to put the democratic army once more upon a fighting basis; he will assist in organizing for the campaign of 1908. It does not matter so much who the nominee may be. During the next three years circumstances may bring into the arena some man especially fitted to carry the standard. It will be time enough to discuss a candidate when we are near enough to the campaign to measure the relative availability of those worthy to be considered, but we ought to begin now to lay our plans for the next national campaign and to form the line of battle.

The party must continue to protest against a large army and against a large navy, and to stand for the independence of the Filipinos, for imperialism adds the menace of militarism to the corrupting influence of commercialism, and yet experience shows that however righteous the party's position on this subject, the issue does not arouse the people as they are aroused by a question which touches them immediately and

individually. The injustice done to the Filipinos is not resented as it should be or as we resent a wrong to ourselves, and the costliness of imperialism is hidden by the statistics and by our indirect system of taxation. While the party must maintain its position on this subject, it can not present this as the only issue.

The party must also maintain its position on the tariff question. No answer has been made to the democratic indictment against the high tariff, and yet, here too, the burden of the tariff system is concealed by the method in which the tax is collected. It can not be made the sole issue in a campaign.

The party must renew its demand for an income tax, to be secured through a constitutional amendment, in order that wealth may be made to pay its share of the expenses of the government. Today we are collecting practically all of our federal revenue from taxes upon consumption, and these bear heaviest upon the poor and light upon the rich.

The party must maintain its position in favor of bimetallism. It can not surrender its demand for the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, but the question must remain in abeyance until conditions so change as to bring the public again face to face with falling prices and a rising dollar. This, therefore, can not be made the controlling issue of the contest upon which we are entering.

The trust question presents the most acute phase of the contest between democracy and plutocracy, so far as economic issues are concerned. The president virtually admits that the trusts contributed to his campaign fund, but he denies that they received any promises of aid or immunity. No well-informed person doubts that the large corporations have furnished the republican campaign fund during the campaigns of 1896 and 1900 and 1904, and no one can answer the logic of Judge Parker's arraignment of trust contributions. The trusts are run on business principles. They do not subscribe millions of dollars to campaigns unless they are paying for favors already granted or purchasing favors for future delivery. The weakness of Judge Parker's position was that the charge was

made at the close of the campaign when it was neutralized by a counter charge. The trusts can not be fought successfully by any party that depends upon trust funds to win the election. The democratic party must make its attack upon the trusts so vehement that no one will suspect it of secret aid from them. It will be to its advantage if it will begin the next campaign with an announcement that no trust contributions will be accepted and then prove its sincerity by giving the public access to its contribution list. In public enterprises the names of contributors are generally made public in order to denote the character and purpose of the work.

President Roosevelt has four years in which to make good his declaration that no obligations were incurred by the acceptance of trust funds. He will disappoint either the contributors or the voters. If he disappoints the contributors, the trust question may be put in the process of settlement. If he disappoints the people, they will have a chance to settle with his party four years hence. "Death to every private monopoly," must be the slogan of our party on this question; any other position is a surrender. The platforms of 1900 and 1904 declare that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable, and this declaration presents the issue upon the trust question.

The party must continue its defense of the interests of the wage-earners; it must protect them from the encroachments of capital. The fact that the laboring men have not always shown their appreciation of the party's position ought not to deter the party from doing its duty in regard to them. The labor question is not one that concerns employers and employes alone; it concerns the entire community, and the people at large have an interest in the just settlement of labor controversies; for that reason they must insist upon remedial legislation in regard to hours and arbitration, and they must so limit the authority of the courts in contempt cases as to overthrow what is known as government by injunction.

The party must continue its opposition to national banks of issue and must insist upon divorcing the treasury department from Wall street.

The party must continue its fight for the popular election of senators and for direct legislation wherever the principle can be applied. It must not only maintain its position on old issues, but it must advance to the consideration of new questions as they arise.

It takes time to direct attention to an evil and still more time to consolidate sentiment in favor of a remedy, and Mr. Bryan is not sanguine enough to believe that all the reforms that he favors will at once be endorsed by any party platform, but THE COMMONER will proceed to point out the reforms which he believes to be needed. Among these may be mentioned the postal telegraph system, state ownership of railroads, the election of federal judges for fixed terms, and the election of postmasters by the people of their respective communities. Instead of having the government controlled by corporations through officers chosen by the corporations, we must have a government of the people, by the people and for the people—a government administered according to the Jeffersonian maxim of “equal rights to all and special privileges to none.” Hope and duty point the way. To doubt the success of our cause is to doubt the triumph of the right, for ours is and must be the cause of the masses. “With malice toward none and charity for all,” let us begin the campaign of 1908; let us appeal to the moral sentiment of the country and arraign the policies of the republican party before the bar of the public conscience.

SELF-GOVERNMENT

THE COMMONER has heretofore referred to an epigram coined by a clergyman in the course of a sermon, viz.: “Self-government is preferable to good government.” The phrase was used in defending the wisdom of the plan whereby man was made a free moral agent and left to choose between good and evil, rather than created as a perfect being or placed in an environment which made sin impossible. There is no doubt that a

Creator capable of making a world could have made man perfect and could have relieved him of all temptation, but instead of that He placed man in a world full of temptation and made him responsible for his conduct. Instead of being placed under the arbitrary power of some one who would care for and protect him, he was left to govern himself and made to suffer if he failed to govern himself well. We do not find fault with this arrangement of Providence nor do we question the wisdom of the plan.

There is a very evident analogy between the self government of the individual and the doctrine of self-government in nations. As the individual has a right to make mistakes, the penalty being suffering, so people who govern themselves have a right to make mistakes, paying the penalty for lack of wisdom. In no other way can people be taught to take an active and intelligent interest in public affairs, and only by taking an interest in public affairs can they perfect themselves in the art of self-government. The people of the United States govern themselves and yet it is evident that they make frequent mistakes. The republicans asserted in 1896 that the people would make a mistake if they elected the ticket nominated by the Chicago convention, and they further insisted that a terrible punishment would follow the mistake. The democrats, on the other hand, asserted that the people would make a mistake if they elected the republican ticket. They assert now that the people are suffering from the mistake. The reign of trusts is a direct consequence of the republican victory of 1896 and so is the imperialistic policy which has plunged this nation into enormous expenditure and led it to appropriate forty times as much for the army and navy as it expends on the department of agriculture.

The republicans are constantly asserting that the election of a democratic president in 1892 brought hard times and filled the country with soup houses. A majority of democrats are willing to admit that the election resulted in mistakes but they insist that the mistakes of the democrats were made in the adoption of republican policies rather than in the carrying out

of democratic theories of government. But these instances are cited only to show that we recognize the liability of people to make mistakes, even when so far advanced in civilization as the American people are. Who would be willing to accept foreign domination even if assured that such alien government would be absolutely free from error?

Why not apply to the Filipinos the same logic that we apply to ourselves? Why not recognize that they have a right to self-government even if they are liable to make mistakes? Why not recognize that the punishment which comes from those mistakes is in itself an educating influence? Why not recognize that self-government with all its imperfections will be better for the Filipinos than any outside government which could be forced upon them against their will?

Not only is "self-government preferable to good government," but among mortals with their selfishness and short-sightedness, self-government is likely to be better than any irresponsible government, for no nation can be selfish enough to desire colonies and yet unselfish enough to govern them wisely.

ROOSEVELT'S GREAT OPPORTUNITY

President Roosevelt has now an opportunity such as comes to but few men in a generation. His nomination for the vice-presidency was due to his enemies as much as to his friends. The New York leaders thought that he could give them less trouble as president of the senate than as governor of the state. He himself was reported as hesitating about accepting the position. He was in doubt—so the correspondents said—whether it would aid him in his ambition to reach the presidency. He accepted and by the act of an assassin the responsibilities of the presidency were suddenly imposed upon him.

Then he began to plan to succeed himself. No candidate for the presidency ever used the power of the office more openly or notoriously to secure a presidential nomination. His

altered position on the trust question could not be construed otherwise than as a surrender to the trusts, and from the time he ceased to urge anti-trust legislation he had the support of the great trusts. He and the members of his cabinet have virtually admitted the receipt of trust contributions; they have simply denied with emphasis that these contributions were received upon either an express or an implied promise of partiality toward the trusts.

In the election just past the president received an unprecedented plurality. It will require an analysis of the complete returns to determine just to what extent it was a personal victory and to what extent he profited by the resentment felt by democrats toward the leaders at present in control of their party organization. But whether the president's great victory was due to admiration for his own qualities or to dissatisfaction among democrats, he now has an opportunity that will not return. He has announced that he will not be a candidate for re-election and this announcement not only relieves him of anxiety, but it removes from him the blinding influence of selfish ambition. Unless he is restrained by obligations consciously or unconsciously incurred he can devote himself to the duties of his office with an eye single to his position in history.

He is too much of a student of public affairs not to be aware of the growing issue between democracy on the one side and plutocracy on the other—between the masses, interested in good government and in equal opportunity, and the privileged classes, fattening upon governmental favoritism. Being aware of this struggle he must take his stand upon one side or the other. He must contribute to the triumph that must ultimately come to the people or stand as the champion of organized wealth. The settlement of this issue will have a large bearing upon the future of the country. Except insofar as he is influenced by gratitude or by a desire to repay those who have contributed to his campaign fund, his conduct will be determined by his sympathies. If his sympathies are with the struggling masses he will view every question from their standpoint and use the influence of the executive to further

their interests. If his sympathies are with the "well-to-do" and the "thrifty" he will naturally look at questions from their standpoint and throw the influence of the administration upon their side. His writings have raised the suspicion that he is Hamiltonian rather than Jeffersonian in his ideas and bias. Hamilton believed that the well-born were born to rule and that the not too well-born were born to be ruled—that the well-born must conduct the government in their own interest and also, of course, in the interest of those born to be governed. He also believed that the government ought to be strong and centralized. Hamilton had a great deal more faith in the wisdom and patriotism of the wealthy than in the wisdom and patriotism of the poorer classes. Jefferson, on the other hand, believed in the people, trusted the people and defended the people. He did not object to a man's having wealth, but he insisted that a man must be measured not by his worldly goods but by his character, and that his influence in government should depend upon his inalienable rights and not upon the number of dollars that he had accumulated.

Men seldom change their sympathies. Opinions may change, but sympathies are more permanent and when one's sympathies do change the change is usually—though not always—due to a change in his financial condition. For instance, a poor man may become rich, and when he becomes rich he may view questions from the standpoint of the rich rather than from the standpoint of the poor, and this is especially true if he acquires his wealth by questionable means. The man who has grown rich by floating fictitious capital or by watering stock is likely to manifest a violent dislike for the people who object to the exploitation of the public. The man who has grown rich by usurious interest and by the methods of the Shylock is not apt to have a good opinion of those who would limit interest rates and protect the needy from imposition and injustice. On the other hand, those who have been made aristocratic by wealth are sometimes made democratic by adversity. Sometimes, however, men cross the line through thought and reflection rather than because of prosperity or financial loss. Insofar as his executive acts fur-

nish an indication as to his sympathies, President Roosevelt seems to incline toward the plutocratic side of the controversy. His refusal to enforce the criminal law against the trust magnates shows that the large criminal who plunders on a gigantic scale does not seem to him so heinous an offender as the small criminal, for in no other way can his inaction be explained, unless his friends say that it was due to fear of the political influence of the trusts. If the law providing a penalty for conspiracies in restraint of trade is an unjust one it ought to be repealed; if it is a just law it ought to be enforced. Will he enforce it now when he is no longer terrorized by the fear of what the trusts may do? Or has he compromised himself by accepting their financial support? If he is free to act and his sympathies are on the side of the people we may expect a vigorous prosecution of the private monopolies which are now preying upon the people."

Will he recommend more strict regulation of the railroads?

No one can doubt that he is a believer in the gold standard, but does he carry his reverence for the opinions of the financiers and his desire to favor them to the point of continuing the enormous advantage which the government has been granting to the banks? Will he continue to use the treasury department as if it were a business asset of the Wall street financiers, or will he administer it in behalf of the people?

Labor is demanding remedial legislation. Will he become the champion of the wage-earners to the extent of recommending legislation to which they are entitled? He demonstrated the value of arbitration when he arbitrated the anthracite coal strike; will he now insist upon legislation creating a permanent arbitration board which can be called into activity whenever there is a difference between the interstate employers and their employes? Will he recommend legislation which will remove from the courts the power to employ the writ of injunction as they have been using it in the interest of employers in their contests with labor? Will he insist upon the enforcement of the eight-hour day on public works? The republican national platform was silent upon these questions

while the democratic platform spoke out upon them. What will the president do, now that he has a chance to act unembarrassed by a desire for re-election? He refused to make any promise or outline any plan in regard to the Philippine question. Will he direct his efforts toward the establishment of self-government there, or will he yield to the commercial demands for a colonial policy? Will he make his administration memorable by establishing a republic in the Orient, or will he sow the seeds of imperialism on American soil? If he is not willing to encourage the doctrine of self-government among the Filipinos, is he willing to help bring our own government nearer to the people? Will he use the influence of his office to secure the election of senators by the people and thus make the senate responsive to the will of the people? Here is one reform which alone would add more fame to his name than a whole life-time spent in the service of predatory wealth.

He owes his first elevation to the presidency to an unexpected event—the murder of a president. He owes his recent great victory largely to the error of democratic leaders. Others have therefore given him the opportunity which he coveted; how will he employ it? His place in history will depend not upon what others have done for him but upon what he does for the country. Let him read again the history of his country and note the difference between those presidents who have befriended the masses and those who have espoused the cause of the privileged few.

The financiers and monopolists can make things pleasant for him while he is in office but they can not save him from the verdict which history will pronounce against him if he allows to pass unimproved the splendid opportunity which he now has to render a real and permanent service to his country.

SHARING THE PUNISHMENT

The members of a party stand or fall together. As the rain descends upon the just and the unjust alike; as a cyclone

visits the homes of the righteous as well as the homes of the unrighteous; so political calamities bear with equal severity upon all members of the party organization. If a party does wrong the punishment that follows is not confined to those who are guilty of the wrong but is visited upon all who represent the party.

Eight years ago the democratic party put its hand to the plow and began the work of reform. Defeat dampened the ardor of some in 1900, but still the party continued to cultivate the seed sown in 1896. Again the season was unpropitious and by 1904 there were enough who were discouraged to turn the party organization over to those who had not been in full sympathy with the party's purpose. This partial abandonment of the cause of reform aroused a widespread resentment—a resentment more extended than was generally suspected. Even the republicans with their perfect organization and their repeated polls underestimated the protest that was in preparation. The storm which, unnoticed by editors and public speakers, was constantly gathering force, broke on election day and created havoc everywhere. It was not directed against the reorganizers alone, but it hit promiscuously all who were identified with the party in an official way. Those who had tried to prevent the reorganization of the party went down in the general wreck with those who were conspicuous in leading the party astray. In nearly all—if not in all—the states the state ticket ran ahead of the national ticket. To this extent there was a discrimination against the national leaders and in favor of the party in the state, but this discrimination was only shown to a limited extent. Alva Adams succeeded in defeating Governor Peabody in Colorado, and Governor Toole escaped defeat in Montana. But Governor Sparks of Nevada failed to win the senatorship to which his services had clearly entitled him and which at any other time he could have secured without an effort. In like manner Bartine of Nevada was slaughtered in the house of his friends, and Cockrell was overwhelmed in Missouri. The defeat of Senator Cockrell is an excellent illustration of the manner in which the innocent are made to suffer with the guilty. On every

question that has come before the senate during his service he has been the champion of the people. He has the confidence of all democrats and the respect of republicans everywhere. The democratic party in Missouri was unyielding in its devotion to democratic principles and it loved Cockrell and yet so great was the apathy caused by the party's action at St. Louis and so deep was the indignation felt by the rank and file of the party that Senator Cockrell fell with the national ticket and received the shaft that was aimed at the reorganizers. If the Missouri democrats who neglected to vote had thought the senator in danger they would have been present at the polls, but they did not carry the process of reasoning far enough to estimate the full effect of their course.

Folk of Missouri had lead enough to escape but his majority is woefully short of what it should have been, and he, too, would have suffered defeat but for the number of votes which he drew from the republican party.

There is a lesson, however, to be drawn from the indiscriminate suffering which a grave party mistake causes. It teaches the necessity of active and earnest work on the part of those who would make the democratic party deserving of success. If the penalty fell only upon the guilty there would be less care taken to put the party right and keep it right. But when the whole party must bear the blame for the action of those who obtain control, the members of the party who desire to make the organization effective in behalf of reform, are forced to be ever upon the alert.

Let the experience of 1904 be a warning for the future. Let the work of organization begin today in order that the party may regain at the first opportunity the ground that has been lost. The house of representatives can be changed two years from now, and the first steps can then be taken toward winning the senate. Without crimination or recrimination, let the members of the party begin at once the work of making the party a positive reform force in the country. A great reverse has been suffered by the party—the worst since the war—let it be turned to advantage, as far as may be, by utilizing the lessons which it teaches.

THE STAY-AT-HOME VOTE

As the returns come in it becomes evident that the result was due not so much to an increasing confidence in the republican position as to dissatisfaction among democrats with the position taken by the democratic party. While in some cases this dissatisfaction led democrats to vote the republican ticket, yet in more cases it led them to stay at home or to refuse to vote on the national ticket. For instance, in Illinois Mr. Roosevelt's vote is only about 33,000 in excess of Mr. McKinley's vote four years ago, while Judge Parker's vote is about 170,000 less than the democratic vote in 1900. Thirty-three thousand democratic votes cast for Mr. Roosevelt would account for the republican increase, if it is not accounted for by the natural increase in population, while if that number of democrats did actually vote for Roosevelt it would still leave more than 140,000 votes unaccounted for. The socialist vote and the populist vote are not yet obtainable, but it is evident that in Illinois the democratic party is much stronger than the returns would indicate, and it only requires a straightforward, honest fight for reform to bring out that vote and put the party in fighting condition again in that state.

In the state of Indiana eighty-two out of ninety-two counties gave Roosevelt some eleven thousand votes less than McKinley had four years ago, while the same counties gave Parker some 75,000 less votes than the democratic candidate had in 1900. Here again it is evident that the republican strength has not been largely increased but that the democratic vote did not come out.

In Iowa the total vote this year is not as large as it was four years ago. The republicans have gained about 22,000 and the democrats have lost about 40,000. If the entire republican increase was made up from democratic votes, it would still leave about 20,000 votes unaccounted for.

In Missouri the indications point in the same direction. At the time of the writing of this editorial it is impossible to obtain the figures from all of the states, but if the situation in other states is as it is in the states already reported, the presi-

dent can not regard the result as a personal vindication.

If the loss in the democratic vote is not offset by a corresponding gain in the republican vote, the result can not be considered as an endorsement of republican policies but rather as a condemnation of the democratic plan of campaign.

This matter will be considered more at length when the results are all in, but attention is called to the figures given above as indicating something of the situation in the nation. And in this situation there is encouragement to the party. It is much easier to so shape the policy of the party as to bring back dissatisfied democrats than it would be to convert republicans. There is every promise, therefore, of our party recovering in 1908 what it has lost this year, and as the exactions of the great corporations become heavier and heavier we can expect an increasing revolt among republicans.

Now is the time to plan for 1908! Let every democrat buckle on his armor. Various means may be employed for spreading democratic doctrine but one of the best ways is for each democrat to pick out a republican among his acquaintances and supply him with literature. It is much easier to make an impression upon the voters between elections than it is during the campaign. After a national ticket has been nominated party lines are drawn and conversions are more difficult. Let the democrats begin now to do their campaign work. When a democrat reads a good book upon economic questions let him loan it to his republican neighbor. When a good speech is made along democratic lines, let each democrat secure a copy for his republican neighbor. Good work can be done also by circulating democratic newspapers—the newspaper being the least expensive form of literature.

Do not delay. Begin at once.

THE INDIVIDUAL'S PART

In the heat of a campaign speakers and writers emphasize the government's part in shaping the destiny of the country, and this is proper, for the form of government and the ad-

ministration of the government are matters of vital concern to the people. Self-government is immensely superior to government by a few, first, because it is more just, and second, because it has an educational influence upon those who participate in the government. Self-government offers the greatest stimulus to individual effort and gives the maximum of development. Just government for the same reason produces better results than unjust government. Unjust government discourages the citizen against whom it discriminates while it is apt to demoralize the citizen whom it favors. Injustice in government is everywhere an evil influence and it may be manifested in the failure to enforce good laws as well as in the enactment of bad laws.

Government should not only be fair to all in the affirmative good that it brings, but it should be fair as well in what it prohibits. It is well that the citizen should understand how largely the country may be influenced for good by government and how seriously it can be affected by bad government. The campaign furnishes an opportunity to bring this question to the attention of the voters, and it would be better still if the voters were always sufficiently alert to keep the matter in mind.

But after the government has done all that it can do, the citizen to a large extent holds his destiny in his own hands. No government can be so bad but what the wise may escape some of its severity; no government can be so good but what the foolish may waste some of its advantages.

In the lull that follows the excitement of a campaign we may, therefore, profitably consider the means by which the individual may secure at least a partial protection from the errors of his government and profit by its virtues. The aim of the government ought to be to secure to each citizen a reward commensurate with his contribution to the welfare of society; if the government fails to do this the individual instead of being discouraged should apply himself more diligently to his work.

The individual should learn self-denial. A self-denial voluntarily practiced is quite different from a self-denial forced

upon one by unjust laws or by an unjust administration of the government. If the trusts are permitted to extort a higher price than they should; if the railroads are allowed to collect dividends on watered stock and upon fictitious capitalization; if manufacturers are invited to enrich themselves by prohibitive duties on imports; if the expenses of the government are constantly increased because the tax-eater has more influence than the tax-payer—the individual, while waiting for a chance to correct these evils, can to some extent fortify himself against them. He can cut off unnecessary expenditures and so arrange his work as to give it the maximum of productivity.

Young men, especially, can with profit cultivate economy. Take for instance the amount of money spent for liquor and tobacco. These expenditures are not only not necessary for health or happiness, but they are apt to invite disease. The habits grow and too often not only dissipate one's income but sap the strength and lessen his productive power. The young man who spends his money treating his friends does not treat them as well as he would if he set them an example of temperance and self-restraint. Many young men spend on tobacco leaves money which if put into the leaves of books would not only give them better health but would supply a fund of information that would contribute both to their happiness and their usefulness.

Young men often spend in society money that they can ill afford to spare. It is much better that a young man should be frank with his associates—whether they be male or female—and let them know that he is not only determined to live within his income but to put aside something each year and lay the foundation for a competency. The young man who spends all his spare money in having a good time with the boys does not make friends worth having, and the young man who spends all his money on the girls with whom he keeps company does not inspire the respect that he would if by his conduct he gave the promise of being able to furnish a home and supply the needs of a family.

It is no disgrace to be poor; in fact, the boy who has to

make his own way has, as a rule, an advantage over the boy who is content to spend what some one else earned, but it is a reproach to a young man to squander even a small income on things that bring no substantial advantage. One of the first lessons that the young man must learn is to deny himself today in order that he may have more of the comforts of life tomorrow. He who lives up his earnings from day to day will be an object of charity when his strength fails.

No governmental reforms can bring prosperity to the idler or security to the spendthrift. The individual has his part to play; he can not shift the responsibility or blame the government if he fails to make the most of his opportunities.

REV. HILLIS ATTACKS PLUTOCRACY

Rev. Newel Dwight Hillis, who occupies the pulpit of the late Mr. Beecher's church at Brooklyn, N. Y., recently administered a stinging rebuke to the idle and luxurious rich of that great metropolis. He contrasts the city life with country life, and points out the advantage that the boys of the west enjoy. He says: "The boy who is nourished in the city, who all his life has breathed only the tainted air of the city and has been cramped by his surroundings, has no chance. It is the boy who has been reared far from the complexity of city life that does things. Here a man loses his individuality. The men who will make themselves known forty years hence are now husking corn in Nebraska."

This is not only a recognition of the broadening and educating influence of country life, but it is complimentary to the state of Nebraska that it should have been selected as a typical place for this best development of young men. Dr. Hillis goes on to contrast his work with the work of western preachers, and he does this to the advantage of the west. He says:

"The real preachers are those whose work is done in the west. I am a man who spends his time mixing tonics to try to get up an appetite in you who are gorged to the point of gluttony."

What an indictment of his congregation; what a compliment to the freer and larger field in the west. It is a pity that more ministers have not the courage to speak out against the demoralizing influence of what is called "high life," and to warn the people who are rushing headlong down-grade and carrying their families and their communities with them.

The following is another extract:

"Here you are eating many kinds of foods, pouring wines down your throats, saturating yourselves with all kinds of ease and luxury, and then preparing to die out of life, when God has put you here for something better. You are not happy, but in seven days I could make you happy. Organize the resources of life in the interest of the poor and weak, and for misery you will have happiness, for selfishness that corrodes, you will have a blade that flashes more and more, and then you will know real luxury—the luxury of service."

A Daniel come to judgment! He is talking to the men who stand at the apex of our commercial system. Instead of recognizing life as an opportunity for doing good, too many of them look upon life only as a means of accumulating—not what they need for happiness and comfort, but an amount that makes them weary to carry it. Their expenditures expand with their income, and those expenditures are generally selfish and destructive of real enjoyment. They ruin their stomachs with excessive food; they sap their strength with dissipation and they wear themselves out trying to clutch that illusive thing called happiness, which, while it can not be overtaken by those who pursue it, comes silently and unbidden to those who forget themselves in the discharge of duty and in the service of their fellows.

Dr. Hillis' sermon is but another evidence of a moral awakening that is destined to substitute the sentiment of brotherhood for the sensual and soul-destroying ideas that have followed in the wake of material prosperity.

THE PASS EVIL

More and more the people are coming to realize the enormity of the pass evil. A number of bills have been introduced

at various sessions of the Nebraska legislature intending to prohibit the giving of railroad passes, but these measures were not adopted. One of these bills provided that any justice or judge who used transportation in any form should be ineligible to sit in a railroad case. Another bill made similar provisions as to jurors. Judge Munger of the United States district court, for the district of Nebraska, has held it cause for challenge in a suit to which a railroad was a party that a juror who was drawn and summoned asked and received from such railroad a pass. The principles embodied in the bills referred to and the rule laid down by Judge Munger are undoubtedly sound. That a pass has a pecuniary value is recognized by both the donor and the donee, and that a pass may have an influence upon the mind and decision of a juror or judge is understood by the railroad if not by the recipient of the pass. Corporations do not give away things of value without expecting a return in some form, and they would not continue to give passes unless they felt that this expectation had been realized in the past.

The parties to a suit are entitled to a fair and impartial trial, and a trial can not be fair or impartial if the judge or juror is under pecuniary obligations to one of the parties to the suit. As long as men can be influenced by "zeal born of benefits received and fostered by the hope of favors yet to come," as Mr. Cleveland once felicitously expressed it, they will be tempted to lean toward the side from which the benefit comes. It can not be stated as a universal or invariable rule that a pass is a bribe, nor can it be said that it always influences the person who receives it, but until a passometer is invented which will measure the influence of free transportation upon the judicial mind, the only safe plan is to prohibit the use of passes by those who are to decide controversies to which a railroad is a party. If a judge is required to travel in the discharge of official duties his expenses are provided for; if he has occasion to travel on private business he can better afford to buy a ticket than the average man. If any one will observe he will find that those who need free transportation most are unable to secure it, and that those best able to pay their fare are the ones who have the influence necessary to secure passes.

DEMOCRACY MUST ADVANCE

A democrat of prominence in the nation who openly and earnestly opposed the ticket in 1896 writes as follows:

"I have read your article on the election and I believe you are nearly right. If there is a lesson to be drawn from this last election it is that the people want something radical and something that they can rely upon. There is no chance for a conservative democratic party. We have forgotten the traditions of Jefferson and Jackson—they were positive and pushing, we are slow and apologetic. This country has got to have a better system of taxation or there will be trouble—and taxation to my mind includes the tariff question as well as an income tax, which I am heartily in favor of. We must not give up, either, the question of the Philippines. If something is not done there the country is lost."

This is a sample of the letters that have been received since the election. The writer of the above letter is now convinced that the democratic party can not hope to win the confidence of the masses unless it goes forward and takes up the questions in which the people are interested.

At St. Louis every member of the resolutions committee except one expressed himself in favor of the income tax, but it was omitted from the platform because those who controlled the convention did not want to offend the moneyed element. It was pointed out in the committee by those who favored the tax that even upon the low plane of expediency the party could not afford to ignore the injustice that our present tax systems bring to the masses.

The income tax is a just tax. If the rank and file of the people were as alert to protect their interests as the corporations are to protect their interests, the sentiment in favor of the income tax would be overwhelming, but enough understand the situation to make it folly for the democratic party to dodge or evade the issue.

The late campaign lacked life and enthusiasm, and these were lacking because the voters did not feel that there was as much difference as there ought to be between the republican and democratic parties.

The democratic party can not hope to be popular with or-

ganized wealth unless it is willing to surrender itself completely to the dictation of organized wealth, and even then it could not hope to win the monopolists away from the republican party. If, however, the democratic party will convince the masses that it is going to stand for their interests, guard their rights and promote their welfare it can become a powerful and effective influence in politics.

The fact that many who opposed the party in 1896 now realize the necessity for an active and progressive democracy, is one of the crumbs of comfort to be gathered from the late lamentable defeat.

THE "REAL POLITICIANS"

Matthew Arnold says: "Because those things—right and wrong—are really what do govern politics and save or destroy states, therefore the few philosophers who alone keep insisting on the good of righteousness and the unprofitableness of iniquity are the only real politicians."

The sentiment so well expressed in the lines just quoted is commended to the democracy of the country. It is a common belief that the politician is a shifty sort of an individual who is successful in laying cunningly contrived plans to catch the unwary voter. He is called a practical politician because he is working for immediate advantage and because he prides himself on not being bothered by theories. He is usually represented as having no compunctions of conscience to interfere with his plans for success. Late Speaker Reed defined a statesman as "a successful politician who is dead." There is more wit than truth in the definition. While it is true that death often compels a recognition that opponents deny in life, yet it is not safe to form an opinion of men from post-mortem eulogies, for they often magnify virtues and throw the mantle of charity over short-comings. The statesman is to be judged by his work and his work is not always appreciated during his life or immediately after his death. Neither can we estimate the influence that a statesman exerts by examining contem-

poraneous criticism or praise. The fame of really great men grows with the years and the influence of their lives increases in ever widening circles. No house can stand long unless the foundation is good, and so no lasting reputation can be built except upon the solid rock of principle. Those who "keep insisting on the good of righteousness and the unprofitableness of iniquity" are the only "real politicians," because they build upon a sure foundation and their work endures.

The principle applies to parties as well as to men. The party that keeps insisting upon "the good of righteousness and the unprofitableness of iniquity" is building for the future; to insure success it has only to keep along with the procession of events and apply its moral precepts to each new question as it arises. The party that lightly prizes "the good of righteousness" or is tempted from the right course by the seeming profitableness of iniquity meets at last the fate that overtakes the criminal.

THE "IMPRUDENT BENEFACTORS"

"What world-wide benefactors," some one has said, "these imprudent men are. How prudently most men creep into nameless graves while now and then one or two forget themselves into immortality."

Prudence is a good word and it describes an excellent virtue, and yet when it is used to characterize one's care for himself when he ought to be willing to forget himself in an effort to advance some cause more important than self it describes a vice rather than a virtue. In this sense it may be used to describe the man who is too much absorbed in looking after his own business to give any attention to public affairs, and with equal propriety it can be used to describe those politicians—for they can not be called statesmen—who always consider the effect of a policy upon themselves. The great men of the world have not been prudent in the opinion of the selfish and the short-sighted; they have constantly done im-

prudent things and have always been warned that they were hurting themselves and injuring their own interests. They have, however, established the fact—and it is a fact—that no one can obtain a clear view of a subject if he looks at it through himself. If he would win immortality he must forget himself and devote all his energies toward the advancement of the reforms which he believes to be needed. The man whose first thought and last thought are of himself has little time to consider higher and more important subjects.

But this lesson is not for the great and conspicuous alone. The rule applies to all, whether in exalted or humble position. To every one, whether he acts in a small or in a large sphere, this question comes, and these two courses are open. He can forget himself and remember only his country or he can forget his country and remember only himself. If his thoughts are of himself, he is selfish; if his thoughts are upon his country and upon his country's good, he is patriotic.

The same rule applies to parties. The prudent party that considers only the chance to win is not nearly so apt to win as the party that devotes itself to a great cause and is willing to suffer if by suffering it can promote the public good. If a man can forget himself into immortality, a party can likewise forget itself into immortality. It is time for the democratic party to do a little forgetting; it is time for it to put aside, as a controlling purpose, the thought of getting hold of the offices and dividing the patronage. It is time for it to espouse the cause of the people and devote itself to this cause without stopping to ask what the effect will be on the election. In pursuing such a course it can never meet with dishonorable defeat; and such a course is the most likely to lead it to a real victory.

THE MEADOW LARK

On another page will be found an article descriptive of the meadowlark and its service to the farmer. The article is writ-

ten by Mr. William Dutcher, chairman of the American Ornithologists' Union, and appeared recently in the *Nebraska Farmer*. Space is given to it not only because it gives needed information in regard to this valuable little bird, but also because the meadowlark is Mr. Bryan's favorite songster. It is to be found everywhere. He first saw it in southern Illinois when a boy; he has found it as far south as the gulf coast of Texas and as far north as northern Idaho, and it is the bird most seen about his home in Nebraska.

The meadowlark comes early in the spring, sings a strong, sweet song, and seems to delight in giving forth its notes of good cheer. It has not the variety of the mocking bird—that bewitching aristocrat of the feathered tribe—but what the meadowlark lacks in repertoire and compass it makes up in the number of songsters, in the constancy of its singers and in the hearty good-will that it throws into its work. If the mocking bird is a soloist of high repute, the meadowlarks form a chorus that can be heard throughout the summer from ocean to ocean. They are the common people—so to speak—of the singing birds, and even the bright yellow shield which each lark carries upon its little breast will not keep the editor of *THE COMMONER* from liking them and longing for their return when winter days drive them into temporary retirement.

Mr. Dutcher's article shows that the meadowlark is a double standard bird, being as useful as it is agreeable. May its tribe increase!

MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma Territory, bought out the private water works plant about three years ago by a bond issue, paying some \$72,000 for the plant. It has lowered the water rates about 25 per cent and has made enough profit to spend about \$30,000 in additions to the plant. Last year there was a balance of \$13,000 left over for the year after paying running expenses.

Municipal ownership is a success and the readers of THE COMMONER who live in cities ought to see to it that an agitation is begun for the taking over of all municipal franchises in their respective towns. There is no possible excuse for private water works or lighting plants, and the sentiment in favor of the municipal ownership of the street railways is a growing one. It is impossible to have private ownership of municipal franchises without corruption as well as extortion—the two go together. The managers of such plants, in order to make dividends upon fictitious capital, must subsidize the city officials. The first step toward purifying city government is to put the city in charge of all natural monopolies within its borders.

BOOKER WASHINGTON'S ADVICE

Professor Booker T. Washington in an address at Birmingham, Alabama, on November 13, gave some excellent advice to the people of his race. He said:

“Not a few have predicted that on account of the recent election many members of our race would lose their heads, would become unduly pompous, self-assertive and generally offensive. With all the earnestness that I can command I want to urge our people in every part of the country to disappoint those who have made such predictions by leading a life of increased usefulness, soberness and simplicity, remembering that in the long run it is to certain fundamental ideas of growth in property, intelligence and high Christian character, of the cultivation of friendly relations with our neighbors of all races that we must look for our ultimate success.

“The masses of our people are to dwell for all time here in the south and here it is that our destiny must be worked out and we can only succeed when we have the confidence and co-operation of those about us.”

The advice is timely, and coming from so high a source it ought to make an impression upon the more thoughtful members of the colored race. It is greatly to Professor Washington's credit that he should take an early occasion to thus warn

his people against rash and foolish action. The race issue having been brought into the campaign by President Roosevelt, some of the colored men might thoughtlessly construe the election as a triumph for the doctrine of social equality. To do so would not only be a great mistake, but it would be a real injustice to the colored man.

Professor Washington, without saying anything to offend the feelings of his people, points out the necessity of confidence and co-operation between the two races in the south and confidence and co-operation are impossible if the question of social equality is raised.

THE VALUE OF CONSTANCY

The *Baltimore News* in a post-election issue has the following to say in regard to Mr. Bryan's consistency :

“The comprehensive statement made by Mr. Bryan of his position, and of his views as to the proper course for the democratic party to take in the future, is marked by the strength and clearness that have usually characterized his leading utterances. It is marked, also, by that quality of cast-iron immobility which evidently forms an ineradicable part of his code of political conduct. Whatever his motive, whatever the calculation or absence of calculation that may be at the bottom of this characteristic of Mr. Bryan's political record, it is one that is distinctive of the man and that differentiates him, we believe, from any other notable political leader, either in American or in English history. Mr. Bryan may add new principles or purposes to his repertory, but the process of subtraction does not exist for him. Once an advocate of a given course always an advocate of it—this would seem to be a fundamental maxim with the Nebraska leader. Whatever may happen to other men, to parties, to the nation, to the world, as regards the status of silver, in William Jennings Bryan there must be no variation, neither shadow of turning. He was for silver in 1896, he was for it in 1900, he was for it in 1904, and he will be for it, he tells us once more now, to the end of the chapter. And as it is with silver so it is with banks, so it is with the newly acquired doctrine of state ownership of railroads, so it is with everything.

“There are two ways, and, so far as we can see, two ways only, of accounting for this most remarkable phenomenon. Against other political leaders, from Gladstone down, inconsistency is the most familiar of charges; in the case of Mr. Bryan alone is there occasion for the accusation of consistency carried to a point so extreme as to amount to something abnormal, something offensive to a wholesome political instinct. Of this singular circumstance, there are, as we have said, two possible explanations. One is that Mr. Bryan is a man of such austere virtue as absolutely to ignore practical considerations which the most high-minded of his contemporaries and of his predecessors have recognized as entitled to determinative weight in the shaping of their political course. The other is that Mr. Bryan, whether altogether deliberately and consciously or not, has acted from the outset upon the feeling that his hold on his following is bound up with his reputation for inflexible adherence to the cause his championship of which first made him a national figure and to which, in his first campaign, he vowed undying allegiance. That it takes remarkable firmness to adhere to such a position, even if it be one adopted in large measure upon an intuitive calculation of its strength, must be admitted; but it is not a kind of firmness which calls for unalloyed admiration, or which is adapted to the making of the kind of party leader or the kind of statesman that is needed by the country.”

Why should Mr. Bryan change his position upon the questions which he has discussed? There is an old saying that “wise men change their minds, but fools never.” This is always quoted to justify a change of opinion, but it is a mistake to infer that wise men are the only ones who change their minds, or that a change of mind is necessarily an indication of wisdom. Motion is defined as change of place; it may mean an advance or a retreat. If a man makes a mistake it is creditable to him to change his mind, but if he espouses a righteous cause why should he recant? Why should he change his position simply to gain popularity?

When Mr. Bryan was elected to congress in 1890, he ran upon a platform which he wrote himself. It contained a plank denouncing the tariff policy of the republican party as “contrary to the spirit of our constitution, inimical to the best interests of our country and especially unjust and

unfair to the people of the great northwest." That was fourteen years ago. Two years afterwards the democratic national platform denounced a tariff levied for the purpose of protection as unconstitutional, and the candidate who ran upon that platform carried the country by a large electoral vote and by a large popular vote. Mr. Bryan has not changed his opinion on the tariff question, but is even more firmly convinced than he was in 1890 that protection for protection's sake is merely robbery under the form of the law. The tariff is given in the ostensible interest of the wage-earners, but it is given to the manufacturer and the manufacturer is not compelled to share its advantages with the employes. Very few republicans would be willing to leave their estates to one child and trust the one child to deal fairly with the rest of the children, and yet for thirty years they have voted hundreds of millions of dollars into the pockets of manufacturers whom they have never seen and have trusted the manufacturers to deal fairly with their employes.

When the money question became paramount the tariff question was pushed into the background, and again when imperialism became paramount the tariff question was not much discussed, but the principles that underlie a revenue tariff have not changed and there is no reason why Mr. Bryan should surrender his belief in the correctness of those principles merely because the republican party has been successful in three campaigns.

Mr. Bryan's platform of 1890 condemned the giving of subsidies and bounties of every kind, and added: "Our merchant marine can best be restored by a repeal of the laws which have caused its decline." He still opposes subsidies and bounties of every kind, and believes them to be a perversion of the taxing power. Why should he change his views on this subject?

His platform also contained the following plank: "We favor an amendment of the federal constitution which will take the election of United States senators from the state legislatures and place it in the hands of the people, where it belongs." He still believes in this doctrine. When that plank was writ-

ten the house of representatives had never passed a resolution proposing the necessary amendment, but since that time the house has four times passed such a resolution—twice with a democratic majority and twice with a republican majority. But each time the senate has blocked the way to the submission of the amendment. More than two-thirds of the states of the union have adopted resolutions favoring this reform. The democratic national platforms, both in 1900 and in 1904 endorsed this doctrine. Is there any reason why Mr. Bryan should change his position on this subject?

His platform of 1890 also favored "The Australian or some similar system of balloting which will insure to every citizen the right to cast his vote according to his own judgment, free from corruption and intimidation." Since that plank was written the Australian ballot has been adopted in a large number of states and has been of great service to the country. Is there any reason why he should change his views upon this subject?

His platform also contained the following plank: "We are opposed to the trust in all its forms, and favor vigorous measures for its prevention and suppression." This plank was written in the beginning of the anti-trust fight, the very year that the Sherman anti-trust law was enacted, and Mr. Bryan has seen no reason to change his position. He is still opposed to the trust in all its forms, and was instrumental in having inserted in the national platforms of 1896 and 1900 the declaration that "a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable." Every year adds to his conviction that the principle of private monopoly must be eradicated. It is as absurd to permit them to flourish and then try to restrain them from harming the public as it would be to keep a lot of rattlesnakes in one's house and expect to protect the members of the family from their poison. God never made a man good enough to stand at the head of a private monopoly, and the effort which the republicans promise to make to regulate monopolies will prove a futile effort. Private monopolies must be destroyed, not merely controlled.

His platform in 1890 also denounced the force bill as "an encroachment upon the rights of the citizens and an attempt to perpetuate the republican party in power by overruling the election laws of the states;" and it also condemned the republican congressman from the Lincoln district for the support of that measure. Is there any reason why Mr. Bryan should change his views upon this subject?

His platform of 1890 said "the public domain should be preserved for the actual settlers, and we demand the enactment of a law prohibiting the holding of lands by non-resident aliens." He has seen no reason to change his views upon this question.

His platform of 1890 denounced Speaker Reed's rules as "having the intent and operation not only of overruling the rights of the minority but also of enabling an actual minority, it being a majority of the party in power, to enact legislation at the dictation of the secret caucus without deliberation or debate, thus enormously increasing the influence of a corrupt lobby." Mr. Bryan has not seen any reason for changing his views on this subject. The purpose of the Reed rule was not to enable a majority to govern, because it was not necessary to count a quorum when there were present enough in favor of the bill to constitute a majority of the entire house. A rule to prevent filibustering is a very different rule from the one providing for the counting of a quorum. In most of the states the constitutions provide for a roll-call on the final passage of a measure and require the concurrence of a majority of the members to be made a matter of record. There is no such provision in the federal constitution, although there should be. By refusing to vote a minority could compel the concurrence of a majority in legislation and the intent and effect of the counting of a quorum was to deprive the minority of this privilege, or rather right. Since the adoption of the rule many measures of importance have been passed by less than a majority, enough of the minority being counted to show that a majority of the members were present at the time. According to the new rule, one more than one-fourth of the entire house can pass a law if another fourth is present and not voting, the two-fourths, plus

one, making a majority of the house. Since the adoption of the Reed rules the house has ceased to be a deliberate body, and measures are often put through without discussion and without debate, and the majority has thus been able to avoid being put on record on amendments where a record vote might be embarrassing. Mr. Bryan still adheres to his opposition to the principles involved in the rule for the counting of a quorum.

Besides containing the planks above referred to, Mr. Bryan's platform of 1890 contained a pension plank and the following plank on the silver question: "We demand the free coinage of silver on equal terms with gold, and denounce the efforts of the republican party to serve the interests of Wall street as against the rights of the people." Just before the adoption of this plank about nine-tenths of the democrats of the house of representatives had voted to recommit the Sherman silver bill with instructions to report a free coinage bill.

In 1892, two years after the adoption of this congressional platform, the democratic national platform contained a plank in favor of the use of "both gold and silver as the standard money of the country," and in favor of the "coinage of both gold and silver, without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage." The principle of bimetallism was thus stated, but the plank of 1892 contained a postscript which was unfairly construed to nullify the declaration in favor of the double standard. Prior to 1890 the democratic party in the house and senate had voted almost unanimously in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of sixteen-to-one, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation, and the plank in Mr. Bryan's platform was in entire harmony with the uniform policy of the party. Bimetallism is not a new thing. This nation had the double standard without interruption from the year 1792 to the year 1873. During all that period there never was a day when the holder of silver bullion could not have his silver coined into full legal tender money at a fixed ratio with gold. From 1782 to 1834 the ratio was fifteen to one, from 1834 to 1873 it was sixteen to one, but the change in the ratio did not interfere with the full

operation of the bimetallic system. At one time the coinage of silver dollars was suspended, but the free coinage of silver into coins of less than a dollar was continued, and these coins were at that time a full legal tender. A change was made in the fineness of our coins in 1837 and later subsidiary coin was made a limited legal tender, but the principle of bimetallism was never interfered with. Not only were the principles of bimetallism understood in this country, but they were understood in other countries, the subject having been discussed at international conferences attended by the most prominent men of Europe and America. The principles of monetary science are well settled and they do not change with the seasons. While an increased production of gold has for the time being made the money question less acute, it has in no way affected the arguments that lie at the foundation of the subject.

There are two advantages in bimetallism—one theoretical and the other practical. If the world could have as much of either metal as it now has of both metals a single standard of either metal while supplying the same quantity of money would lack the advantage which the world has derived from the use of both metals, namely, the advantage of greater stability in the purchasing power of the monetary unit. In the history of the world there have been several periods of increase in the gold product and several periods of increase in the silver product, but never a period when there has been a large increase in the production of both metals at the same time. These alternating increases have, therefore, had less effect upon the world's volume of metallic money and less effect upon the purchasing power of the unit than they would have had had both metals increased in production at the same time. The practical advantage of bimetallism is that gold and silver together furnish more money than gold alone, and the world today is using some \$4,000,000,000 of silver along with about an equal amount of gold, and besides using more than \$8,000,000,000 of gold and silver together it is also using a large amount of uncovered paper and bank notes. Mr. John G. Carlyle, then a congressman from Kentucky, said in 1878 that the world would be fortunate indeed if the supply of gold and

silver together kept pace with the demand for money. There would be no difficulty today in using all of the increased production of gold in the retirement of uncovered paper, without retiring a single dollar of silver.

When Mr. Bryan admits that the increased production of gold has been an advantage to the world, when he admits that by gift of Providence—if it is attributed to Providence—or by act of the miners—if they deserve the credit—the country is now in less urgent need of bimetallism than it was eight years ago, he has admitted all that the facts require. There is no reason why he should favor the acceptance of the gold standard as a finality, and there is certainly no reason why he should be in favor of putting the government in the hands of those who denied the quantitative theory of money in 1896 and who now look at the money question as if it concerned only the financiers and not the public at large.

Those who believe that the volume of money should keep pace with the demand for money, and who insist that we shall not by legislation bring upon the country the injustice of an appreciating standard of money—these can more safely be trusted with the financial policy of the country than those who would run the treasury department as an asset of the Wall street financiers, and then collect campaign funds in return for the favoritism shown by the government.

Mr. Bryan has referred to his platform of 1890 to show that in the fourteen years that have passed since that time he has not had reason to change his attitude on public questions. Since 1890 he has added the income tax to the list of reforms, and he still believes that it presents a just principle of taxation. The income tax increases with the income and the taxpayers' burden is, therefore, in proportion to his ability to pay, as well as in proportion to the advantages which he enjoys under the protection of the government.

Since 1890 the labor question has become an issue, and the same general principles that lead Mr. Bryan to oppose a tariff which taxes all the people for the benefit of a few of the people and to oppose the trusts that prey upon the public; the same general principles that lead him to oppose a financial system

that bleeds the public for the benefit of the money changer and the owner of fixed investments; the same general principles lead him to favor legislation which will protect the laboring man in the enjoyment of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The question of imperialism has also been brought into the arena of politics and he applies to this question the same general principles that he has applied to others. Imperialism taxes the people of this country to maintain a colonial system while a few syndicates exploit the islands. Without imperialism the republican party would not have dared to raise a standing army. The increase in the army alone makes an annual addition of more than \$50,000,000 to the taxes that the people must pay. Without imperialism the republicans could not defend the increase that they have made and which they proposed to make in the size of the navy. This increase already adds another \$50,000,000 or more to the burdens of the people. It is not an exaggeration to say that imperialism is now costing us \$100,000,000 a year, or some \$6 for each family. The only return we get from this outlay is the shame of an abandonment of the doctrine of self-government, the danger that those principles will be applied to us and the reaction upon our own national character.

The *Baltimore News* says that Mr. Bryan's consistency is "carried to a point so extreme as to amount to something abnormal, something offensive to a wholesome political instinct." Is there anything abnormal in the application of a well-settled principle to public questions? Jefferson's maxim "equal rights to all and special privileges to none" is of universal application. Why should we apply it to some questions and ignore it in our consideration of others? Lincoln's doctrine of a government "of the people, by the people and for the people" was of universal application. Why should we consider it in the consideration of some questions and disregard it in the consideration of others? The commandment, "Thou shalt not steal" is no less universal. It ought not to seem strange to any one that a citizen, whether in public life or in private life, should maintain a consistent course and refuse to deviate from

it no matter how tempting the temporary advantage promised. Good character in the individual is nothing more than habitual righteousness. No man can establish a character worth having if he is guided in each business transaction solely by the amount that he can make. He must be guided by rules that compel him to deal justly with his fellows.

And so with party, good character is habitual righteousness. A party suffers whenever it departs from its principles in the hope of winning a temporary success. The result usually is that it not only fails to win the success—the winning of which it puts above all other things—but that it loses time that ought to have been employed in the work of education. A man must be consistent, and the necessity of consistency in a party is no less imperative. If this year the democratic party had earnestly and courageously continued its fight for reform it would have made a better showing than it did. If the democratic men and democratic newspapers which since 1896 have been denouncing the party's reform program had joined in and presented the arguments that can be made in behalf of these reforms our party today would be very much stronger than it is, if not in actual possession of the government. If, however, the experiences through which we have passed have been necessary to convince our eastern democrats of the wisdom of a positive and consistent course, the uses of adversity may, after all, prove sweet and we may now without bitterness or upbraiding, undertake the great work that lies before us.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The president's message contains a number of encouraging recommendations. The most important in a political way is the recommendation of a law which will punish the giving and receiving of bribes and also provide "for the publication not only of the expenditures for nominations and elections of all candidates but also of all contributions received and expendi-

tures made by political committees." In an editorial entitled the "Reforms Within Reach" an argument was presented in favor of just such a law. After the article was in type the president's message arrived and the editor of THE COMMONER was gratified to know that the president had cast the great influence of the executive on the side of such legislation. This ought to make certain the passage of the law immediately, and it will be a long step toward the purifying of elections and toward the reducing of the power that aggregated wealth now exerts over our federal elections. The law should provide for the publication of the contributors before the election.

The student of sociology will cordially approve of the president's recommendations in regard to the improvement of the industrial and sanitary conditions which surround the laboring classes. He suggests that Washington, the nation's capital, should be made an ideal city in this respect, an example to other cities. The spirit which pervades his discussion of this subject is presented in the following paragraph:

"No Christian and civilized community can afford to show a happy-go-lucky lack of concern for the youth of today; for, if so, the community will have to pay a terrible penalty of financial burden and social degradation in the tomorrow. There should be severe child-labor and factory-inspection laws. It is very desirable that married women should not work in factories. The prime duty of the man is to work, to be the breadwinner; the prime duty of the woman is to be the mother, the housewife. All questions of tariff and finance sink into utter insignificance when compared with the tremendous, the vital importance of trying to shape conditions so that these two duties of the man and of the woman can be fulfilled under reasonably favorable circumstances. If a race does not have plenty of children, or if the children do not grow up, or if when they grow up they are unhealthy in body and stunted or vicious in mind, then that race is decadent, and no heaping up of wealth, no splendor of momentary material prosperity, can avail in any degree as offsets."

Nothing that the president has said in his message will give more encouragement than the above sentiment to those who are anxious to lay broad and deep the foundations of our national greatness. His words are a rebuke to such as measure

a nation by the wealth and refinement of the few rather than the health, strength, intelligence and virtue of the masses. If the president will only carry into all the work of the administration the same high motive that is manifested in the words above quoted he will leave a record which will do more to distinguish him than the large popular plurality which he received on election day.

In speaking of the labor question he has made some good suggestions and has clearly recognized the right of the laboring men to organize for their own protection. He has also correctly stated the limitations that should be placed upon their organized activity. No one can justify the use of force either by employer or employe, but the president does not point out the remedy. He does not advocate arbitration as a means of preventing the increasing conflicts between labor and capital. He speaks of a "gradual growth of a feeling of responsibility and forbearance among capitalists and wage-workers alike; a feeling of respect on the part of each man for the rights of others;" but this is not sufficient. Even if the growth were more pronounced than it is, the organization recently formed among employers for the express purpose of combatting the measures desired by the labor organizations is not an encouraging sign. Nothing will stimulate the growth of the feeling of forbearance more than the establishment of a board of arbitration before which either side of the controversy can bring the other when agreement can not be reached by personal conference. It is also to be regretted that the president does not recommend a restriction upon the employment of the writ of injunction—the writ upon which corporate employers now rely for the forcing of terms upon their employes

He calls attention to the need of a stringent employer's liability law, and also suggests additional legislation for the protection of railroad men both as to their hours of work and as to the appliances for the protection of their lives.

In dealing with the trust question he does not hold out any promise of relief. He cautions congress against dealing with the subject "in an intemperate, destructive or demagogic spirit," and asks that the subject be met with the "quiet de-

termination to proceed step by step, without halt and without hurry, in eliminating or at least minimizing whatever of mischief or of evil there is to interstate commerce in the conduct of great corporations." He says the beef industry will be investigated but he does not point out any specific remedy.

It is evident from a reading of this part of his message that he does not regard a private monopoly as wrong in itself, and it is quite certain that he does not view the trust as a great menace either to the prosperity of the nation or to the rights of the individual. He says:

"Great corporations are necessary and only men of singular mental power can manage such corporations successfully, and such men must have great rewards." The sentence which follows: "But these corporations should be managed with due regard to the interest of the public as a whole," is a very weak statement with which to offset such unstinted praise of the mental superiority of the monopolists. He does not admit that the contributions which the trusts made to his campaign funds will purchase them immunity, but there is nothing in his message to scare them or to make them regret the assistance which they gave to the president's campaign."

His recommendation in regard to bringing insurance companies under the supervision of the bureau of corporations is a wise one. While most of the states have enacted legislation for the protection of the policyholders within their borders, the work of investigating the methods and the standing of these great moneyed institutions is certainly within the scope of interstate commerce.

The president's recommendations in regard to the amendment of the interstate commerce law indicate that he has become somewhat alarmed at the growth of the sentiment in favor of the government ownership of national highways. He says:

"The government must in increasing degree supervise and regulate the workings of the railways engaged in interstate commerce; and such increased supervision is the only alternative to an increase of the present evils on the one hand or a still more radical policy on the other."

The "still more radical policy" is, of course, the taking of the railroads out of the hands of private corporations. The

president is right in his conclusion that a failure of the government to protect the public against the evils of private ownership of railroads will make the people look in increasing numbers to government ownership. Remedies are always the outgrowth of abuses. The abuse brings public attention to the subject and the remedy follows as the result of intelligent investigation.

The president's request that additional authority be given the interstate commerce commission is in the right direction; we shall now see whether the railroads, so ably represented in the United States senate, will heed the president's warning or by standing out against it contribute to the movement that is now going on in favor of a policy which will put the people themselves in control of these arteries of trade.

The work of the agricultural department is presented with some elaboration. While the amount appropriated for this department is insignificant when compared with the amount appropriated for preparations for war, its work is of inestimable value to the country. As the president says, "nearly half of the people of this country devote their energies to growing things from the soil." It is a reflection upon the administration that it recommends about six millions of dollars annually (that being the amount appropriated last year) to the carrying on of this work, and some two hundred millions of dollars for the army and the navy.

Considerable attention is given to the preservation of the forests and a less amount to irrigation, but what he says on both subjects will meet with general acceptance.

His discussion of the postal service is disappointing. He recommends the curtailing of the abuses of the second-class mailing privilege, but does not recommend a reduction in the amount paid to the railroads for the carrying of mails and he suggests no improvements in the rural service.

The currency question is dealt with briefly, but the language employed shows that he permits the financiers to do his thinking and direct his course upon this question. He says:

"The attention of the congress should be especially given to the currency question, and that the standing committees

on the matter in the two houses charged with the duty, take up the matter of our currency and see whether it is not possible to secure an agreement in the business world for bettering the system; the committees should consider the question of the retirement of the greenbacks and the problem of securing in our currency such elasticity as is consistent with safety. Every silver dollar should be made by law redeemable in gold at the option of the holder."

The proposition to make the silver dollar redeemable in gold at the option of the holder is simply a proposition to establish a new "endless chain" for the drawing of gold out of the treasury and it is preliminary to the proposition which will follow, if this one is carried out—namely, to retire silver dollars in order to protect the treasury. It will be noted that he also recommends the retiring of the greenbacks and favors securing "in our currency such elasticity as is consistent with safety." This is a veiled recommendation of the asset currency. It will be remembered that the republican party did not in its platform demand a law making the silver dollar redeemable in gold; it did not promise an asset currency. Those who favor the financial measures recommended by the president never outline their plans in advance; they never take the public into their confidence. They always wait until the election is over and then they rush in and do things that they would not dare to do before an election. Those who think that the money question is dead will learn their error if they will just keep their eyes upon congress, for congress is always dealing with the money question and there are just two sides to it—the side of the financiers who desire to run the treasury department in their own interest and for their own profit, and the side of the people who want not only good money but enough of it to maintain the level of prices.

The president's caution against extravagance is a guarded one. He justifies large expenditures on the ground that the country is prosperous, and his recommendations are in the line of enlarged expenditures rather than retrenchment.

The subjects of immigration and naturalization are considered at length. After pointing out the desirability of immigration of the right kind he calls attention to the danger to

our wage-earners of admitting "masses of men whose standard of living and whose personal customs and habits are such that they tend to lower the level of the American wage-worker." He calls attention to fraudulent naturalization, to forged certificates and to perjury in the securing of papers. He also asks for legislation specifically defining the rights of American citizens residing abroad and the rights of those who have declared their intention of becoming American citizens but have not taken upon themselves the full responsibilities of citizenship. The subject is one which deserves the attention of congress. A clear statement of the nation's policy upon this subject will protect the country against foreign complications.

The "big stick" policy is presented in the message with considerable elaboration. He attempts to back up his position with arguments in favor of a large navy, and yet all the time protesting that the navy is intended to promote peace. He speaks of "the peace of justice." There is no doubt that justice is the only basis upon which peace can be built. The question is whether justice will be promoted or thwarted by a large naval establishment.

Leaving out of consideration for the present the tendency of our action to increase the navies of other countries, necessitating another increase in our own navy, followed by another increase in other navies, etc., etc., until the people of all countries would be crushed beneath the weight of preparations for war—leaving this question out of consideration it is pertinent to ask whether such a policy as the president proposes is not likely to disturb peace rather than to promote it. The same spirit that leads a nation to adopt the "big stick" policy will lead it to use a "big stick" on slight provocation, just as the spirit that prompts one to carry a revolver prompts him to use it unnecessarily. When the president says "If the great civilized nations of the present day should completely disarm, the result would mean immediate recrudescence of barbarism in one form or another," he aligns himself with those who lack faith in the omnipotence of right. He thus discloses his reliance upon the brute force doctrine even though he speaks approvingly of international arbitration. Total disarmament

is not the alternative presented to the large navy policy; it does not necessarily follow that we must have as large a navy as the president desires or none at all. It is possible to have sufficient war vessels for the training of our navy officers and for the proper protection of our country without attempting to rival the land-grabbing nations in the number and size of our fleet. The position taken by the president is not only untenable but it involves a very dangerous error, namely, that a nation must be warlike in order to save it from barbarism and decay. It is the doctrine of the strenuous life as interpreted by the president. His theory is entirely at variance with the life and teaching of the Founder of the Christian religion. The president totally ignores the power and influence of a righteous example.

It is not surprising that with his views upon this subject he should endorse the colonial policies of European empires. He says: "There are points of resemblance in our work and the work which is being done by the British in India and Egypt, by the French in Algiers, by the Dutch in Java, by the Russians in Turkestan, by the Japanese in Formosa." He adds that we "more distinctively than any of these powers are endeavoring to develop the natives themselves so that they shall take an ever increasing share in their own government and as far as is prudent we are admitting their representatives to governmental equality with our own."

He speaks of our problems as being akin to the problems "presented to other great civilized powers which have possessions in the orient." The problem of taking possession of inferior people and utilizing them for the benefit of the conquering nations is not a new one. It is always defended on the ground of benevolence, but the trust is always administered for the benefit of the governing nation rather than for the benefit of the subject. While the president earnestly hopes that the Filipinos will in the end be able to stand "if not entirely alone, yet with some such relation to the United States as Cuba now stands" he declares that they are now "utterly incapable of exercising independence at all or of building up a civilization of their own." This theory that a civilization can

be built around them or plastered over them is entirely at variance with our theory of government and we can not hold this theory without abandoning the great work that our nation has endeavored to perform for more than a century. As long as we are administering a colonial policy after the example of monarchies—after the example, even, of a despotism like Russia; while we are patterning our administration in our “possessions” after the empires of the old world, we can not hold before the oppressed of other lands the light of self-government and civil liberty. In 1898 we said to the people of Cuba that they were “and of right ought to be free and independent” and they are now governing themselves. The president now says that the Filipinos are not only utterly incapable of governing themselves, but that they are utterly incapable of “building up a civilization of their own.” If the president is right in the position that he takes on the Philippine question then there is no such thing as an inalienable right as described in our Declaration of Independence. If the president is correct in the position he has taken, then these things which we have been in the habit of calling “rights” are merely privileges accorded by more powerful people to less powerful ones.

The president’s imperial policy strikes at the foundation of our government, and the hopes which he expresses for the future of the Filipinos will not atone for his apostacy from American principles. The large navy and the colonial policy go hand in hand. If we are going to adopt the brute force principle which underlies the empire, we shall most assuredly need a large navy and we shall need a large army also, but it will result as it has resulted elsewhere in increasing the wealth of the exploiters and the burdens of the masses.

On the whole the president’s message is a queer compound of good and bad. His recommendations are not consistently good; they are not consistently bad. They indicate a conflict between his better impulses and his Hamiltonian theories. Let us hope that in his future messages there may be more evidence of the triumph of his better impulses.

REFORMS WITHIN REACH

The national victory scored by the republican party delays reforms of a national character. The republican party did not recognize during the campaign the necessity for any change in existing conditions or laws. It boasted that it had been in power almost uninterruptedly for forty-four years, and it would not admit the desirability of any reform. While it is barely possible that it may undertake new legislation, it is not probable. There are, however, a few reforms that the democrats in congress might push with some prospect of success.

Reform in the tariff schedules is apparently out of the question for the present and no effective legislation is likely against the trusts. If the republicans attempt anything on the money question it will be injurious rather than helpful, because it will be in the interest of the national banks and financiers. The democrats ought to present their measures and with their speeches focus attention upon them, even though on the main questions the democratic work will have to be educational in its character.

It might be possible for the democrats to urge successfully some changes in postal matters. With the rural delivery there has come a demand for an extension of the postal note. The government ought to issue postal notes in small denominations—notes which can be purchased and used at any time by the agricultural population as well as by those in the cities who desire to make small remittances.

There is an urgent need for a local parcel delivery. The country merchant is complaining because the farmer, being able to order by mail and receive his goods from a distance, is spending his money with the large mail order houses instead of with his home merchants. It is natural—more than that, it is inevitable—that trade should follow the lines of cheapness and convenience. It would be possible to assist both the farmers and the local merchants by providing a cheap rate for the delivery of parcels by carriers, where such parcels are deposited at the postoffice from which the carrier starts. The

government has to pay a high rate for mail and package carried by rail; because of the influence exerted over the postal department and over congress this rate is very much higher than the rate paid by express companies for similar service. Where the article of merchandise is deposited in the local postoffice and carried out on the rural free delivery route the government can afford to carry it at a much lower rate than it can merchandise that is shipped across the country. This discrimination in favor of the local merchant rests upon justice and will benefit both the customer and the country merchant. It will then be possible for the merchant to publish a catalogue of the articles in which he deals and furnish to his patrons in the country. With the extension of the telephone system it is possible for the farmer or his wife to order anything needed in town, and have it brought out that day or the next day by the rural delivery. Every argument that can be made in favor of a parcel rate when the parcels are sent from one end of the country to the other can be made in favor of a lower rate for the delivery of local parcels. If the democrats will take up this proposition they will find that the country merchants and the farmers will bring the necessary pressure to bear upon their representatives. Why would it not be a good plan for the readers of THE COMMONER who favor this plan to clip out this editorial and mail it to their congressmen? Representatives are quite ready to listen to the suggestions of their constituents unless those suggestions run contrary to some fixed prejudice or opinion.

There ought also to be an additional protection to bank depositors. The present regulations are not adequate for the protection of the public. We always assume that a bank is good until it fails, but when it fails the depositors then realize how insufficient for his protection the laws are. The sentiment in favor of the postal savings bank is a growing one and it grows most rapidly where there has been a bank failure, for it is still true that many will learn from calamity who refuse to learn from argument, however logical. When Mr. Bryan was in congress he tried to secure the passage of a law protecting the depositors in national banks. The bill proposed

by him provided for the raising of a guaranty fund by a small tax on deposits, the tax to be suspended as soon as the fund reached a sufficient amount. The bill provided that the comptroller, upon the failure of a bank, should immediately pay all depositors in full out of the guaranty fund and then proceed to collect the assets of the bank and reimburse the fund. The bill was opposed by the larger national banks which insisted that if all banks were safe the big banks would have no advantage over the little banks. If necessary to secure the passage of a bill the provision might be made voluntary rather than compulsory—that is, banks might be permitted to accept the provisions and secure to their patrons the protection of the law, or refuse to accept the provisions and deny to their patrons the protection of the law. The patrons could then consult their own judgment in regard to places of deposit. There ought to be some place where the people, especially the poorer people, could deposit their money with absolute security, and the banks do not now provide that security. It would not only be justice to the people to provide this protection, but it would be an encouragement to saving and economy. It is rather discouraging to one to save for several years only to find his money swallowed up by the unwise or criminal act of some bank official.

The above things are suggested as measures of relief that may be within reach. Of course the democrats of the house and senate ought to push the amendment providing for the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people. That ought to be brought forward in every congress until the senate yields and the people secure the direct election of senators.

The democrats in congress might present a measure for the purifications of politics. In some of the states congressmen are compelled to file a signed and itemized account of their campaign expenditures, but this should be made a national requirement, and the law should be so stringent as to require the filing of the statement whether the money was spent by the candidate himself, by the officers of his committee or by anyone else with his knowledge or the knowledge of the commit-

tee. The law ought also to apply to the election of senators, for senatorial contests have sometimes involved the spending of enormous sums. And it is even more necessary that the law should apply to presidential contests. The president has a veto power, which, in addition to the influence that his office naturally exerts and in addition to the interest exerted through patronage, enables him to block the passage of a measure until two-thirds of both houses support it. It is a well-known fact that the great corporate interests rely upon the president and the senate to protect them from hostile legislation, and it is also a fact that they often contribute large sums to influence the election. The republican campaign fund of 1896 and 1900 were greater than the country had ever known before and in the recent campaign the president and the members of the cabinet virtually admitted that the trusts had contributed to the republican campaign fund. Their only defense was that the contributions were made without any promise expressed or implied. Of course such a defense was merely a subterfuge. Everybody knows that the corporations do not contribute money except for business purposes, and when a corporation contributes money as a matter of business it means that it is either paying for some favor already received or purchasing a favor for future delivery.

The best way to purify national politics is to begin with the campaign fund. Votes can not be bought unless there is money with which to buy them, and money will not be subscribed to buy votes if it must be subscribed in the open and the corporation's interest in the result be known to the public. What argument can be made against the publication in advance of the election of the money subscribed for the campaign? What right has a party which appeals to the public to conceal from the public the purpose of its victory? And how can the purpose of a victory be better determined than by an examination of the campaign contributions? If it is thought unnecessary to publish a list of the small contributions, provision might be made for the publication of contributions over a certain amount, one hundred dollars, five hundred or a thousand dollars being fixed as a minimum. Does any one doubt

that the publication of the large contributions made in 1896, 1900 or 1904 would have had an influence upon the result of the election? Not only ought the larger contributions to be made public before the election for the information of the public, but it would be well to require a publication of the principal expenditures of the committees. The use of enormous campaign funds collected from the trusts can not be continued without danger to the country. Is it not time to put a stop to it? Since the president has seen fit to deny the charge that he was forcing contributions from the trusts, his friends in congress could not consistently oppose such a measure. Let the democrats frame such a measure and secure its passage or put upon the republicans the responsibility of defeating it.

While there is need of much remedial legislation which can only be secured from congress, there is a great deal in the way of reform that might come through state legislatures, and as a large majority of the states have legislative sessions in January it would be well for the democrats in the various legislatures to bring forward measures providing for such state reforms as may be necessary. Some of these will be mentioned below:

The ballot law should be so amended as to permit what is known in New Zealand as the postal vote—that is, a person necessarily absent from home ought to be permitted to mail his vote on election day and have it counted, or he might be permitted to deposit it with the proper official within a few days before the election if he must leave home just before election. The provision can be so drawn as to protect the secrecy of the ballot and provide against fraud. At present students, traveling men and railroad men are often put to great expense if not practically denied suffrage. Then, too, the party which can secure passes or furnish transportation has a great advantage over the party which can not thus bring out its full vote.

The postal vote is democratic. It puts the man whose business calls him away from home at election time upon the same footing as the man whose business is such that it is con-

venient for him to go to the polls. The arguments in favor of the postal vote are so strong and conclusive that there ought to be no difficulty in passing this law in most of the states.

Every state ought to adopt a resolution in favor of the election of senators by direct vote of the people. No matter if the state has passed such a law, it ought to be adopted year after year until the reform is secured. And what will be even more effective, the state legislature should pledge the senator to be elected to support a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of senators. No candidate for senator is likely to oppose this reform prior to his election, but the influence of the corporations is such that if a senator goes to Washington unpledged upon the subject he may be led to oppose the consideration of the question. It would even be well for the state to pass a resolution calling for a constitutional convention to submit this amendment in case the senate continues to refuse. Before two-thirds of the house could adopt such a resolution the senate would, however, yield, but it is just as well to make a provision for a convention in the event that the senate does refuse.

It is possible for the states also to provide for the protection of depositors in the banks. If the large bankers will not permit congress to make the national bank absolutely safe there is no reason why the various states should not protect their own people by making state banks safe. The plan proposed for the establishment of a security fund for the protection of depositors in national banks could be applied to state banks. When this was attempted in Nebraska a few years ago the national banks lobbied against the bill because they feared that deposits would be drawn from the national banks if the state banks were made absolutely secure. If a law is passed by the state applicable to state banks it could be so drawn as to permit national banks to take advantage of its provisions by voluntarily putting themselves within the terms of the law. Every argument that can be made in favor of national legislation looking to greater security to bank depositors can be made in favor of state legislation looking to the same end, and an

example set by a state would ultimately be followed by the nation.

In states where the cities have not full power to establish and operate water and lighting plants the power should be given, and in all states the power of the cities to grant franchises should be so restricted that no such franchise could be disposed of without the consent of a majority of the voters. Even then the term of the franchise should be a short one and the charter should provide for the taking over of the plant by the city at any time upon the payment of a sum equal to the value of the property exclusive of the franchise. No state ought to either sell a franchise or give it away under conditions that will make it necessary to pay for the franchise if the city afterwards desires to embark upon the ownership and operation of the plant. The value of a franchise is due to the increase in the population, and the city ought not to be compelled to pay for an increase that does not represent brain or labor expended or capital invested by the corporation.

Public sentiment is ripe for the municipal ownership of water works and lighting plants. While the sentiment is not so strong in favor of the municipal ownership of street car lines, it is only a question of time when this will also be considered within the scope of the city's activity.

Another question is likely to receive increasing attention, namely, the telephone question. The same struggle through which the people have gone in the attempt to regulate water plants and lighting plants is to be repeated in the case of telephones. The telephone is necessarily a monopoly. There can be no effective competition between telephone companies. Not only is it expensive to operate separate telephone plants but it is a nuisance to the city to have two sets of wires and it is an inconvenience to the people to have two systems of telephones. No one who has ever lived in a city where an attempt has been made to regulate telephone charges by competition need be told of the bother of having two companies. In case the city has one private telephone company and attempts to regulate the charges by ordinance it encounters the same corrupting influence that has so often thwarted the effort to lower

water rates or charges for light. The sooner the cities take over their own telephone systems and operate them at cost for the benefit of the people, the sooner will this question be permanently settled. The county can in the same way and for the same reason take charge of the telephones outside of the city exchanges. Where the cities and counties are not now empowered to take charge of the telephones they should be at the earliest possible moment.

The subject of old age annuities is one that may well receive consideration. In Germany the old age pensions have been established as a concession to the laboring classes, but there is no reason why the entire community should not be interested in the matter. The main incentive one has to save his money is his desire for the protection of himself and family against sickness and old age, and the main drawback is that there is no absolutely safe place for the investment of the money that is intended for emergencies or for the days when the breadwinner can no longer work. The insurance companies sometimes furnish annuities but they furnish them at a price considerably in excess of the actual cost of the annuity and there is no positive assurance that the company may not fail just at the time when the annuity is needed. If the state would establish a bureau which would furnish this absolute protection to the citizen at actual cost, it would be an inestimable boon. If, for instance, a laboring man by making a certain annual deposit with the state could not only provide a sum for his family in case of death, but an annual payment to himself after he had reached a certain age, he could look forward to the future with more confidence, and would therefore labor with more cheerfulness and hope. If the business man could purchase an annuity for himself and for his wife, his care and anxiety would be greatly relieved. If the father could make such provision for the education of his children and for the care of such as were incapable of self-support, it would be a great relief to him. The death rate is so well known and the expectancy at a given age so easily figured that it would be possible for the state to conduct such a bureau with absolute security to the citizen and absolute protection to the state.

It will be objected that the proposition for old age annuities is socialistic, but every co-operative effort of the government is open to that objection. The postoffice might be objected to for the same reason, and yet we not only have the postoffice but the city mail carrier and the rural mail route. Who will propose the abandonment of any of them? The government pensions soldiers and their dependents, and it is done on the theory that the soldier by putting his life in the government's keeping has earned an annual stipend for himself and those who depend upon him. If, instead of laying the foundation for a pension with one's life, the foundation is laid by the deposit of money, is there any insuperable objection to it or any danger in it? Certainly no one who is willing to use the government for the upbuilding of manufactures or for the subsidy of ships—enterprises which are supported by the many and profitable to a few—certainly no one who favors these things can object to the employment of the functions of government for the protection of the public when those who were protected pay the entire expense. Objections are not likely to come from the democrats, for they are interested in every legitimate effort to improve the condition of the masses; and who can doubt that conditions would be improved by a law which would enable the head of the family to make suitable provision for those whom he loves?

CHRISTMAS—LOVE'S FESTIVAL

Christmas is love's festival. Set apart for the commemoration of God's gift of His Son it has grown into a great holiday which is observed throughout Christendom by rich and poor alike. Even those who refuse to take upon themselves the vows of any church are constrained to join in the beautiful custom which makes both parents and children look forward to this day with pleasant anticipations. For weeks before December 25th busy hands are at work, tiny savings banks are gathering in their sacred store and eager expectancy is written upon the faces of the young. To the boys and girls Santa Claus is a sort of composite donor who monopolizes the

distribution of presents and who, reading the minds of his little friends, rewards the good (and all are good just before Christmas) with the very toys that they themselves have selected, while the older ones learn by experience that it is more blessed to give than to receive. Back of Christmas and the Christmas present is love, and the broad, brotherly love taught and exemplified by the Nazarene is not content with the remembrances which are exchanged as tokens of affection between members of the family and between intimate friends; it is compelling a widening of the circle to include the poor and the needy though not of kith or kin.

What an instructor love is! How it develops the one of whom it takes possession! It is the mightiest influence known among men. When once it is awakened it dissolves all opposition. Dr. Parkhurst, the New York clergyman, in illustrating the difference between force and love said (quoted from memory) that force is the hammer which can break a block of ice into a thousand pieces but leaves each piece still ice, while love is the ray of sunlight which, though acting more slowly and silently, melts the ice.

At this season of the year our thoughts turn to the contemplation of the new degree of love revealed to the world by Jesus. To love between members of the family and love between friends He added an all-pervading love that includes every member of the human race. Even enemies are not beyond the bounds of this love. Man's puny arms are not strong enough to break the bonds that unite each son of God to all his brethren. "Love is not stupid," says Tolstoy. It makes known to us our duty to our fellows and it will some day rule the world. Force is the weapon of the animal in us; after it comes money which the intellect employs, sometimes for good, sometimes for harm. But greater than all is love, the weapon of the heart. It is a sword that never rusts, neither does it break, and the wounds that it leaves are life-saving, not life-destroying. No armor can withstand it and no antagonist can resist it. But why try to define this love or to measure its scope? Paul, the apostle, in his first epistle to the Corinthians describes it in language to which nothing can be

added and from which nothing can be taken. Let his words suffice :

“If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass or clanging cymbal. And if I have the gift of prophecy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge; and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. And if I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and if I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profiteth me nothing. Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not provoked, taketh not account of evil; rejoiceth not in unrighteousness, but rejoiceth with the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Love never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall be done away; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall be done away with. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child; now that I am become a man I have put away with childish things. For now we see in a mirror, darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part; then shall I know even as also I have been known. But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love.”

THAT “UNPRECEDENTED” VICTORY

As the smoke of battle clears away and the returns are analyzed the republican victory gives to the members of that party less and less cause for rejoicing. At first it was declared to be “the greatest victory ever won by a presidential candidate,” but the *Democratic Watchman* of Bellefonte, Pa., points out that in magnitude it is really the ninth victory rather than the first.

President Roosevelt will have 345 electoral votes and Judge Parker will have 141. While the president secures more than two-thirds of the electoral college he does not secure anything like two-thirds of the popular vote, and seven former presidents have had a larger proportionate vote in the electoral college than President Roosevelt will receive.

Jefferson in his second election received 162 votes to 14 cast for Mr. Pinckney, and yet President Roosevelt in his books speaks very disparagingly of Jefferson.

In 1820 Monroe at his second election received 231 electoral votes, while only a single one was cast for his only opponent, John Quincy Adams. Jackson in his second race had 219 votes to 49 for Clay. In 1840 Harrison defeated Van Buren by a vote of 234 to 60 in the electoral college. In 1852 Pierce carried every state in the union but four, and received 254 to 42 cast for General Scott. Lincoln in 1864 received 212 votes to 21 cast for McClellan, while Grant in 1868 received 214 electoral votes to 80 cast for Seymour. In 1872 Grant had 268; Greeley had but 42.

Thus it will be seen that Jefferson, Monroe, Jackson, Harrison, Pierce, Lincoln and Grant all secured a larger proportion of the electoral votes than Roosevelt, Grant having won such a victory twice.

An analysis of the popular vote does not increase republican confidence. While President Roosevelt received about 500,000 more votes than McKinley received in 1900, his gain is not half so great as the democratic loss. If the election had been caused by a turning of democrats to the republican party it would give the republicans more hope for the future, but while Parker's vote is something like 1,500,000 less than the democratic vote of four years ago, it is evident that more than half of the 1,500,000 either stayed at home or voted for some other than Roosevelt.

In 1892 the total democratic vote was 5,556,533, the republican vote 5,175,577, the populist vote 1,040,902, the prohibition vote 264,060, and the socialist labor vote 21,164, making a total of about 12,000,000.

In 1896 the republican vote was 7,106,779, or nearly two millions more than in 1892. The democratic vote was 6,502,925, an increase of nearly a million over the democratic vote in 1892, but it must be remembered that this included the populist vote—the populists having endorsed the democratic candidate. The Palmer and Buckner ticket received 133,424, the prohibitionists 132,009, the socialist labor ticket 36,274 and

the nationalist ticket 13,969. This made a total vote of about 13,900,000. This phenomenal increase has never been satisfactorily explained.

In 1900 the republican ticket polled 7,208,244—an increase of about 100,000 over the republican vote of 1896. The democratic ticket received 6,358,789—a loss of about 150,000; the prohibitionists polled 209,936, the socialist labor candidate 49,699, the middle of the road populists 50,378, and the socialist democratic ticket 85,971. The total vote in 1900 was 13,969,700, which was practically the same as the total vote four years before.

While the republican gain this year is in the neighborhood of 500,000, the democratic loss, nearly 1,500,000, is so great that it will probably more than offset any increase in the vote given to other candidates, so that the total vote this year may be less than it was four years ago. At any rate it will not be materially greater. The total vote is thus about what it was eight years ago, notwithstanding the increase in population. The total vote of the two leading parties combined is some 650,000 less than it was four years ago, while the socialist vote may reach 600,000. The populist vote will be greater than it was four years ago but not nearly so large as was expected.

The returns show that there is no strong trend of sentiment toward the republican party. The increase in the republican vote, while more than it was four years ago, is not to be compared with the increase between 1892 and 1896. A considerable percentage of the recent increase can be traced to the natural increase in the population and a still larger percentage is made up of votes that can not be called republican but which, like many of the votes cast for the republican ticket, were a protest against the democratic party rather than an endorsement of the republican party.

The rapid growth of the socialist party is conclusive proof that the democratic party has been too conservative to satisfy the reform element of the country. When in 1896 the democratic party took a strong stand in favor of remedial legislation it largely increased its vote, while the populist party,

then the leading radical party, cast practically all of its vote with the democrats.

In 1900, when economic reforms were not so prominent a part of the democratic platform, the democratic vote fell off a little, and the falling off was just about equal to the combined vote of the socialist democratic party and the middle of the road populists. This year, when the democratic party became conservative and failed to meet the demand for reform, the party's vote fell off about 1,500,000 while the increase in the vote of the socialist democrats and the populists will amount to six or seven hundred thousand.

The lesson to be drawn from the returns is both obvious and emphatic. In proportion as the democratic party espouses the cause of the masses it is strong; in proportion as it is timid and hesitating it is weak. It is not necessary that the democratic party should advocate all of the measures advocated by other parties, but it is necessary that it shall take a positive and emphatic stand against the plutocratic tendencies of the times, and it must fearlessly defend the rights and interests of the common people.

One more campaign on so-called "conservative" lines would still further demoralize the party, but there is no danger that it will make again soon the mistake that it made this year. The heart of the democratic party is sound. The political conditions which prevailed just prior to the democratic convention were abnormal and unusual. A great many honest democrats, anxious to make all the progress possible, believed it wise to attempt the conciliation of the so-called "business interests," but more properly described as the interests of the large corporations. The attempt was made; it proved unsuccessful; it will not be repeated. The democrats who favor reform will be put in control of the democratic organization as soon as the conventions meet, and democrats who sympathize with plutocracy will of their own accord withdraw from the party and become republicans. The republicans who favor reform will be crowded out of their party by the "stand-patters" and corporation bosses. The re-alignment is going on now and by 1908 the democratic party will be the outspoken

champion of all the reforms which are consistent with the democratic principle, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

THE RELIGIOUS ARGUMENT

The *Pentecostal Herald*, of Louisville, Ky., reprints an editorial on the Philippine question written by Doctor Winston, editor of the *Nashville Christian Herald*. It ably presents the "religious" argument used by the imperialists.

The text of Doctor Winston's editorial is to be found in the sentence: "But should not the meaning of the present situation be sought not in what we need but rather in what they need?"

This puts the United States in the attitude of a benevolent parent dealing with a child and generously considering the interest of the child rather than the interest of the parent. Before this position is accepted as the true one, it is well to remember that it is the attitude of all who have engaged in persecution. Every individual or group of individuals guilty of forcing any form of religion upon non-Christians or upon Christians holding to a different creed has done it under the firm conviction that the persons persecuted were being benefitted. Persecution has always been defended, when defended at all, on the ground that the tortures employed were really employed for the spiritual welfare of the persons tortured. If the victim died before his reformation was complete it did not alter the theory or disturb the complacency of those who were putting the theory into practice. Those who believe that they can beat blessings into their fellows are never disturbed by so trivial a thing as the death of the person to be benefitted, because could not the person escape death by accepting the blessings offered or by adopting the opinion suggested?

Not only has Doctor Winston's theory been employed by those who have persecuted in the name of the Almighty, but it has been employed by those who have claimed to rule by divine right. Every king, czar or emperor who has forced

arbitrary government upon his subjects or upon colonies against their will has done it on the theory that he was regarding the good of his subjects rather than the good of himself. The annals of despotism are full of protestations of unselfishness and benevolence made by rulers who were forcing unsought blessings on their suffering subjects—and exacting a high price therefor.

To come down to our own country, every argument made in behalf of slavery was based upon the theory that slavery was for the good of the slave, and no one acquainted with the slave-holder or with the history of slave-holding can doubt that in most, if not in all cases the slave-holder conscientiously believed that the system of slavery was best for the slave. The Bible was quoted in support of slavery as an institution, and Lincoln complained bitterly that he had the support of so few of the ministers of his own city in his efforts to prevent the extension of slavery.

Reference is made to persecution, to monarchy and to slavery only to show that the position which Doctor Winston takes is not a new one, but has been the position occupied by those who have attempted to force their opinions or their guardianship upon others. If any one points to the fact that nations made formally Christian by the sword have afterwards become devout supporters of that religion, or to the fact that kings have sometimes benefitted their subjects, or to the fact that slavery brought much of good to people carried away from Africa by force, it is a sufficient answer to say that a different test must be applied. The question is not whether some good may not have followed a wrong course, but whether greater good might not have followed a better course. It is a mistake commonly made to credit a bad system with good that may follow, whereas we should rather consider the greater good that might have followed wiser action. To say that a cruel and unkind parent may confer some benefit upon his child may be true, and yet a wise and kind parent might confer a far greater benefit.

Doctor Winston quotes some one (name not given) as saying "I went to the Philippine Islands convinced that our re-

tention of them was an international crime. I left them convinced that any other course than that we are pursuing would be a breach of international humanity, comparable to leaving a helpless infant to perish in the storm. When they will be ready for self-government is an interesting question, but at present it is academic. It is a fact that they are not ready or capable for it."

This is the opinion of one individual, name unknown; but even if his name were known and it were a name familiar to all, it would still be the opinion of one man. The fact that he changed his opinion after visiting the Philippines does not add greatly to the weight of his testimony. If Doctor Winston desired to prove that the American people are incapable of self-government he would find men in this country who would take the stand and testify to their belief that free government is a failure, but such testimony ought not to have any weight with those who believe in free institutions.

The moment we assert that some people are capable of self-government and some people incapable, that moment we not only destroy the foundation upon which free government rests, but we question the wisdom and benevolence of the Creator. Henry Clay, fifty years ago, in discussing the rights of the people of South America, said:

"It is not, therefore, true, that the imputed ignorance exists; but if it do, I repeat, I dispute the inference. It is the doctrine of thrones, that man is too ignorant to govern himself. Their partisans assert his incapacity, in reference to all nations; if they can not command universal assent to the proposition, it is then demanded as to particular nations; and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us. I contend, that it is to arraign the dispositions of Providence himself, to suppose that he has created beings incapable of governing themselves, and to be trampled on by kings. Self-government is the natural government of man."

And so it may be said today, that it would be a reflection upon the Almighty to say that he made Filipinos and left them for thousands of years incapable of self-government—that is to say, helpless—until Spain found them, governed

them against their will for three centuries and then sold us the privilege of continuing an alien government.

The doctrine that Doctor Winston presents is bad enough where there is no admixture of selfish interest. A man who conscientiously believes that it is his Christian duty to force his authority upon another is dangerous enough when he is actuated solely by conscience, but he is still more dangerous if there is added a pecuniary motive. The president in his letter of acceptance dwelt upon our duty to the Filipinos but he also intimated that we would find it advantageous to ourselves to hold the Philippine islands. Senator Lodge four years ago in his speech as chairman of the republican national convention, assured the country that we were not forgetting ourselves entirely. Where money and morals are mixed it is difficult, if not impossible, to tell where greed leaves off and conscience begins.

It must also be remembered that a large majority of the Filipinos belong to one branch of the Christian church and if we are to defend a colonial policy on religious grounds we are apt to find some clashing between the denominations. The missionary spirit has been appealed to to some extent, and some have convinced themselves that a colonial system in the Philippines is in the interest of Protestantism. Words need not be multiplied to convince the readers of *THE COMMONER* that a governmental policy intended to help one branch of the Christian church as against another branch, or to help the Christian church as a whole against another religious faith is entirely inconsistent with our theory of government as well as with the spirit of our religion.

If, as Doctor Winston suggests, the only question is whether a colonial policy administered by us would be best for the Filipinos, *THE COMMONER* would answer in the negative. This country can help the Filipinos more by setting them an example than it can by sending them carpet-bag officials. It can help them infinitely more, and do it at far less expense, by educating their young men and young women and sending them back to spread the light of our civilization and the blessings of our institutions. The Filipinos will naturally trust

the people of their own race more than they will trust foreigners. The American colonists, in order to secure their independence, were willing to fight members of their own race, communicants of their own church and those who spoke their own language. Can anyone doubt that the Filipinos will resent as bitterly our attempt to govern them, differing as we do from them in both language and race?

It is safe to say that a colonial policy in the Philippines will cost the American people at least a hundred millions a year, if we take into consideration the increase in the army and the navy—an increase defended on the ground of our colonial policy. Ten per cent of that money spent in the education of Filipinos in American colleges would in a few generations bring more benefit to the Filipinos than we could bring in a thousand years by a colonial system.

Doctor Winston overlooks entirely the enlightening influence of self-government and the degrading and demoralizing influence of an alien government such as we are now administering, but the question which Doctor Winston puts is not the controlling question in this matter. Our country has a great work to do and it could not afford to give up that work, even if it could be shown that by so doing we would help the Filipinos. Our nation has been for a hundred years the exponent of the doctrine of self-government. It has brought untold good to the world by presenting a new national ideal to mankind. So long as this nation administers a colonial policy it is impotent to help the cause of human liberty. If our nation endorses the doctrine set forth by Doctor Winston's unnamed visitor—namely, that the Filipinos are incapable of self-government—it denies the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence and places a limitation upon the truths given to the world in 1776. The moment this country announces to the world that it has amended the Declaration of Independence, the moment that it declares that governments can in some instances derive their just powers from some other source than the consent of the governed, it ceases to be the champion of the doctrine of self-government and the injury that would be done to the world by a modification of its posi-

tion must be weighed against any good, real or imaginary, that we could confer upon the Filipinos.

Not only must we calculate the harm which we would do the world by abandoning our position as to the basis of just government, but we must consider what the effect of the new position would be upon the American people. The formal and deliberate adoption of a permanent colonial system could not but affect our home government, for no matter what may be said to the contrary, governments are administered according to a theory, just as lives are governed according to certain fixed principles. The abandonment of the theory of self-government in dealing with the Filipinos would necessarily be followed by the weakening of the doctrine of self-government in this country. Walpole declared that the English people could not defend the English position during the revolutionary war without asserting principles which, if carried out, would destroy English liberty as well as American liberty. It can be said with equal truth that the people of this country can not defend an imperial policy in dealing with the Filipinos without asserting principles which, if carried out, will ultimately destroy American liberty as well as Philippine liberty. Doctor Winston's position, therefore, is erroneous. First, because a colonial policy is not necessary for the advancement of the welfare of the Filipinos; and second, because we could not afford to help the Filipinos at such tremendous cost to ourselves and to the rest of the world.

Doctor Winston's position, however, is the more dangerous because it is conscientiously held by a man of high repute. If he had said that we should hold the Philippine islands in order to make money out of them, his argument would have had little weight, but when he puts the retention of the islands on the ground of duty he makes an appeal to conscience, and it should be considered in that light. It will help Doctor Winston to see the error of his position if he will ask himself the following questions:

First—If the Filipinos are now incapable of self-government, how will he explain the action of the Creator in leaving

them so long without a benevolent guardian (to govern them against their will, and to tax them without representation)?

Second—As nations differ in their capacity for self-government, just as individuals differ in their ability to restrain themselves, and as he predicates our obligations to govern them on the ground that we are more capable than they are, how does he expect the gulf between the capacity of the Filipinos and our capacity to be narrowed unless the Filipinos without self-government make more progress than we do?

Third—Those who oppose imperialism point to the text “So live that others seeing your good works will be constrained to glorify your Father,”—a text that emphasizes the influence of example. Upon what Bible text do imperialists rely for authority to purchase from a defeated king the title to his subjects or to give to the Filipinos the choice between accepting our rule or dying at the hands of our soldiers?

Fourth—How can this nation continue to hold out before the world the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence and at the same time deny the force of that doctrine when dealing with the Filipinos?

These questions are not presented in a controversial spirit, but because the editor of *THE COMMONER* believes that the editor of the *Christian Advocate* has inadvertently fallen into a grievous error hurtful alike to himself and to those whom his arguments may lead astray.

MEMORY

The closing days of December bring retrospection. It is the season when the fire burns most brightly on memory's altar. Lost opportunities, gone never to return; mistakes that can not be corrected; uncharitable words, if not deeds wrong in themselves—all these are recalled, mingled with pleasant memories, as the winter's winds sing a sad requiem over the dying year.

It is the accounting period, and if the life is what it ought to be each expiring year should show a larger balance on the

credit side of the ledger than the year before. But reformation does not entirely obliterate the marks of sin. Children learn the story of the boy whose father gave him a hammer and some nails and told him to drive a nail into one of the gate posts every time he did anything wrong and to withdraw a nail whenever he did a good deed. For awhile the nails increased but the very number of them finally brought reflection and the boy began to withdraw nails. One day the father found him standing before the post—all the nails withdrawn but the boy was in tears. The father, delighted with his son's improvement, asked why he was sad and the boy replied: "The scars are still there." Yes, the scars remain, but they may serve a useful purpose if they restrain us from future transgression.

While repentance may change the course of a life it is not always possible to make complete restitution when an injury has been done to another. If, for instance, one takes a human life no amount of repentance can call back the spirit that has flown. Nor is the taking of a life the only sin for which full compensation can not be made. The wrong done by a false witness is largely irremedial. It is told of a priest that one of his flock came to confess to wilful slander. The priest directed him to scatter a handful of thistle down upon the wind and when he had done so he was directed to go forth and gather up the scattered seed. When he replied that it was impossible to do so his spiritual adviser reminded him it was likewise impossible to entirely undo the wrong done by a false accusation.

Memory does not always smile upon us but when she does chide us it is for our good and while she sobers us with the contemplation of time wasted, hours misspent and moments which we may wish to forget, still she enables us to live over the joyous days of the past, preserves for us the faces and voices of friends and gives us sweet communion with the absent and the dead. Memory is the wireless telegraphy which indissolubly connects us with every experience through which we have passed and the messages move most freely between youth and age. By a kindly provision the Creator

has made memory most active when the other powers are failing and when planning for the morrow loses its charm. In fact it is one of the signs that the sun has crossed the meridian, the time given to memory increases. The young talk not of the past. With strong step they press forward; with firm hand they lay hold of the work before them; with steady eye they look into the future. But as age creeps on the pace slackens, the grasp is loosened and the eyes grow dim. Then the currents of life flow backward and the early days return, bringing with them a period that resembles childhood, just as the gilded clouds above setting sun recalls the glowing colors of the dawn. Happy are we if the evening of life brings the satisfaction which crowns a well spent day and finds us waiting with triumphant faith the hour when "man goeth to his long home."

As in the closing years of life, so in the closing days of the year, memory holds sway and we yield ourselves to her consolations and admonitions.

THE COMPLETE RETURNS

Editorial reference has been made to the returns from particular states and to the estimated total vote. But it seems that the estimates were not accurate. For instance the total vote cast this year seems to be 460,078 less than the total vote in 1900, while the estimates based upon partial returns did not indicate so large a falling off. The republican gain is only 409,822 which is nearly a hundred thousand less than the estimate generally received.

Judge Parker falls 1,277,772 behind the democratic vote of four years ago. These figures are only a little more than the estimate made from the incomplete returns.

The total populist vote is only 114,637, which is considerably less than the estimate based upon earlier returns. The total populist vote is only a little more than twice what it was four years ago, although four years ago the regular populist

party fused with the democrats, and the vote of that year was the vote cast for the middle of the road populist ticket, as it was called.

The socialist vote is 397,587, which is considerably less than the estimate made earlier upon partial returns. Some thought that the socialist vote would run as high as 600,000 but even the present increase is doubtless gratifying to the socialists, as it is the largest relative gain made this year. The prohibition vote is 260,303, a gain of about 25 per cent. The fact that the democratic loss was nearly half a million greater than the total gain of all the other parties indicates that the election was a rebuke to the plan of campaign adopted by the democrats rather than a victory for President Roosevelt or for his party. The gain in the socialist vote, taken in connection with the democratic loss, shows that those who oppose the republican party demand more radical legislation rather than the conservative policy proposed last summer by the eastern democrats.

The socialist vote is small in the south and largest in Illinois, New York, Ohio, California and Wisconsin. To what extent the socialist vote has been swelled by democrats who voted that ticket as a rebuke to the conservative democrats can not be known. Future elections may throw light upon this subject.

An inspection of election returns is always interesting, and ought to be of value in determining the drift of public sentiment. Such inspection also shows how impossible it is to base predictions upon the statements issued by campaign committees just before the election.

HOPE

Hope presides over the year's birth and bids us be of good cheer. "Old things are passed away; behold all things are become new"—is a greeting which contains infinite encouragement. The page is clean; we can write what we will upon it.

Memory whispers, Make it a brighter page than the last one, and Hope answers, I will. Hope is the beginning of reform; and who has passed beyond its need? None so good that they may not improve; none so bad that they might not be worse; none so young but that some false steps have already been taken; none so old but that the remnant of life is worth still further refining.

Tolstoy illustrates both the turning over of a new leaf and growth in righteousness. He was 48 years old when he exchanged the rewards of literature for the delights of moral philosophy, and for twenty-nine years his voice, more and more distinct above the hum of business, the discord of politics, and the clash of arms, has been repeating to the uttermost parts of the earth: "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself."

Hope stands next to love in the influence which it exerts. With it man's possible helpfulness defies fixed limitations; without it, his power for evil is almost boundless. Victor Hugo has defined the mob as "the human race in misery," and misery might be defined as hopeless suffering. Hope enables us to bear our trials with patience. Might is but the beginning of the day to one who awaits the dawn and the day itself is dark to one to whom the sun is hidden.

We owe it to others as well as to ourselves to make the most of our opportunities, for "no one liveth unto himself." Our lives are so interwoven with the lives about us that no one can fall without hurting his comrades and no one can resist temptation without strengthening his fellows. Through hope we fix our eyes upon the ideal and then we endeavor to make our lives one long ascent toward the realization of that ideal.

No conception of life is a worthy one that is not broad enough to include both the mortal and the immortal and no ideal is a noble one that does not lead to the harmonious development of body, head and heart. The body can not be neglected for it is the earthly tenement of the mind and the soul. It must be strong to do its master's work. The food, the drink, the apparel, the exercise and the recreation that fit the

body for the maximum of usefulness are desirable—this is the test. Any less is insufficient, any more would be harmful. All habits of body or mind that contribute to one's usefulness—and all habits either help or hinder—are good habits; any habit which impedes one's progress is indefensible and should be abandoned.

If to "a sound mind in a sound body" we add a sound heart we have a basis upon which to build the highest type of manhood and womanhood. Every consideration of self, of family, of nation and of church impels us to dedicate each new year to greater endeavor and to larger service.

DEMOCRATIC PLAN ENDORSED

It will interest the readers of *THE COMMONER* to know that Commissioner Garfield of the bureau of corporations has endorsed the democratic plan for dealing with the trust question. Whether his recommendation will be adopted remains to be seen, but it certainly ought to have the support of all the democratic members of congress.

Commissioner Garfield suggests that corporations engaged in interstate commerce be compelled to take out a federal license, the license to be granted upon terms that will compel the corporations to do legitimate business and prevent the injuries which have resulted from monopoly or attempted monopoly. The states are to be left to charter such corporations as they please and to tax and control such corporations, but when a corporation desires to engage in interstate commerce it must submit to regulations necessary for the protection of the general public. This remedy for the trusts is entirely feasible and is in keeping with the democratic platform of 1900—the plank being partially reiterated in the platform of 1904. The plank of 1900 reads as follows:

"We pledge the democratic party to an unceasing warfare in nation, state and city against private monopoly in every form. Existing laws against trusts must be enforced, and more stringent ones must be enacted providing for publicity as to

the affairs of corporations engaged in interstate commerce, requiring all corporations to show, before doing business outside the state of their origin, that they have not attempted, and are not attempting, to monopolize any branch of business or the production of any articles of merchandise, and the whole constitutional power of congress over interstate commerce, the mails and all modes of interstate communication shall be exercised by the enactment of comprehensive laws upon the subject of trusts.”

This plan has several advantages. First, it is easily enforced. By requiring a corporation to take out license in advance it saves the necessity of hunting up evidence to support a prosecution. By withholding the use of the mails, telegraph lines and railroads until license is secured, the government has it in its power to completely prevent an interstate monopoly. By reserving the right to suspend or cancel a license the government is able to retain control of interstate commerce corporations in such an effective way as to entirely protect the public.

Second, That plan does not interfere with the right of the state to charter such corporations as it thinks best and to control them according to its own interests. The rights of the state and the rights of the federal government are both preserved under this plan.

Third, This plan accomplishes the desired purpose with the least injury. A legitimate corporation will find it no trouble to comply with the law, while it will find its greatest protection in the passage of such a law. It might be wise to make the law applicable to corporations having a certain capital or doing a certain amount of business. Or, better still, the law might be based on the proportion of business done rather than upon the actual amount, for a monopoly is only possible where a single corporation controls a large proportion of the business in that line. If, for instance, the law only applied to corporations controlling one-tenth of the product or sale of the article handled, all harmless corporations would be relieved of annoyance. If the law provided that a license should be refused to all corporations controlling more than 50 per cent of the total product a complete monopoly would be prevented.

The license board could be given discretion in regard to the licensing of corporations controlling between ten and fifty per cent of the total product.

No corporation can justly complain because it is not allowed to control more than one-half the supply of any given article. To sell to some forty millions of people ought to be sufficient to gratify any reasonable commercial ambition. If to sell to even a less proportion jeopardizes the interests of the public, the licensing board would be justified in refusing permission. Corporations are created by law and it must be presumed that they are created for the public good. There can be no justification for any departure from the purpose of their creation.

The democrats in congress ought to see to it that the licensing of these interstate commerce corporations does not confer upon such corporations any powers in derogation of the rights of the states. The proposed license should be an added restriction upon the corporations, not a grant of authority or privilege.

The law should draw the line between the natural individual and fictitious persons called corporations. National persons having the same needs, the same aspirations and being within a reasonable degree equal in their general capabilities, there is no reason why one state should be permitted to protect its citizens against the natural persons of another state, but corporations may vary so greatly in authority conferred upon them, in restrictions imposed upon them and in capital stock that a state is under no moral obligation and ought to be under no legal obligation to permit corporations created in other states to do business within its borders.

Experience has shown that some states have entirely disregarded the rights of other states and have for their own pecuniary advantages chartered corporations, well knowing that the corporations chartered intended to forage upon the rest of the country.

The purpose of this editorial, however, is to call attention to the fact that the democratic party was the pathfinder in the matter of effective anti-trust legislation, but the administra-

tion is not only welcome to adopt the democratic method but is to be congratulated if it has the courage to do so.

STATE INSURANCE

Recent disclosures in regard to the large insurance companies tend to confirm the opinions of those who favor state insurance. Mr. Beardsly of the *Era* has presented some startling facts in regard to the management of the "Big Three," the New York Life, the Mutual and the Equitable. He shows how the expenses have increased, how the dividends to policy holders have fallen off and how the millions held in trust for the policy holders are used by the managers for speculative purposes. Mr. Lawson has also presented in *Everybody's Magazine* an arraignment of these same companies and has included the Prudential company. The abuse of power by the heads of the great insurance organizations has become so open and notorious that the president has recommended that they be put under the control of the interstate commerce commission.

It is not strange that these abuses should occur; human nature is too frail to be entrusted with such power as attaches to the handling of so much money. One who can control the deposit of millions and the investment of hundreds of millions can enrich himself beyond the dreams of avarice without violating the letter of the law. A certain amount of discretion is always vested in the manager of a large corporation and this discretion is too often exercised on the side of personal profit. These enormous accumulations are a menace to the country. It would be well to provide a maximum limit to the business that can be done. While this would prevent a few companies from becoming too large it would encourage a larger number and competition among them would be helpful.

But in addition to such regulations provision should be made for state insurance. Each state should establish a bureau and issue a policy that will enable a man to provide an

annuity for those dependant upon him. Such an insurance would encourage thrift in the poor and it would enable the successful business man to retire at an earlier age and devote himself to public affairs.

REDUCING SOUTHERN REPRESENTATION

The opposition of Booker Washington and T. Thomas Fortune, two of the most influential colored men in the country, to the reduction of southern representation is likely to put an end to the partisan scheme to increase the relative strength of the northern republican districts at the expense of the black men of the south, but the southern democrats might show up the selfish and hypocritical character of the measure by proposing a substitute. The republican plan abandons the southern negro but provides for enlarging the influence of northern republican districts—districts in which negroes are graciously permitted to vote for white republicans but are not allowed to hold any important offices themselves. The ostensible purpose of those back of the plan is to force the southern states to repeal their suffrage amendments, but suppose the southern people are willing to submit to a reduction in congressional representation in order to secure protection from black domination, then what? The negroes of the south would still be without a vote and the northern republicans would be the only gainers by the plan, and it would be to their political advantage not to pay any more attention to the southern blacks, for any enfranchisement of the blacks in the south would increase southern congressional strength and to that extent decrease the relative influence of the republican districts of the north. If the reduction measure is pushed the democrats might meet it by proposing the colonization, in the republican districts of the north, of any colored men who are displeased with the southern franchise amendments. For instance, the law could provide that any disfranchised negro might on application to some designated authority sell his property at an appraised

value to the federal government and with the proceeds remove his family to some northern republican district, preferably to the city in which a republican congressman resides. This plan would be of real political value to the colored man because every black man going north would to that extent increase the representation of the north—the real object of the republicans—and at the same time secure to himself the privilege of voting—a privilege that the republican plan does not guarantee. The proposed substitute would distribute the race problem and enable the republicans of the north to understand the question. The republican plan not only leaves the southern negro voteless but it leaves the southern whites to educate the blacks and to bear the burden of their development, and while the southern whites carry this burden alone the partisan republicans would reduce their representation in congress in order to make republican national success more certain. The proposed substitute would give a vote to any disfranchised negro who wanted to move north and at the same time would make the party which is to be benefitted by his vote share the burden of his development.

It is not at all likely that the republicans would accept the substitute but their refusal to accept it would expose the shallowness of the pretensions of friendship made by republican politicians. There are not many republican congressmen who would favor establishing a colored colony in their districts. Their friendship does not go that far. If colored laborers were removed from the south to the north their places would soon be filled by white laborers and this would still further tend to lessen the acuteness of the race question in the south.

The discussion of the proposition to reduce the southern representation will serve a useful purpose. It will not only demonstrate the partisanship of some of the republican leaders but it will also show that many republicans, as well as the democrats, in the north recognize the work which the south has been doing and appreciate the difficulties under which she labors. The negroes of the south have made great progress during the last forty years, and they have made that progress

not by the aid of republican politicians but by the aid of their former masters.

A LESSON IN IMPERIALISM

Russia is furnishing the world a lesson in imperialism that ought not to be lost on the American advocates of the doctrine of "benevolent assimilation." The czar in defending his refusal to permit the Russian people to have a voice in their own government says:

"In accordance with the revered will of our crowned predecessor and thinking unceasingly of the welfare of the realm intrusted to us by God, we regard it as our duty and the government's duty in conjunction with undeviating maintenance of the immutability of the fundamental laws of the empire to have untiring care for the country's needs, distinguishing all that is really in the interests of the Russian people from tendencies not seldom mistaken and influenced by transitory circumstances.

"When the need of this or that change is proved ripe, then we consider it necessary to meet it, even though the transformation to which this leads involves the introduction of essential innovations in explanation. We do not doubt that the realization of such an undertaking will meet with the sympathy of the well disposed section of our subjects, who see the true prosperity of the future in the support of civil tranquility and the uninterrupted satisfaction of the daily needs of the people."

Here we have the doctrine clearly stated, the government is to do the thinking and graciously looks after the welfare of the people and the "well-disposed" subjects will be content if there is an "uninterrupted satisfaction" of their daily needs. The "stand pat" or "let well enough alone" argument is also called into use. If one will compare an argument in favor of colonialism with the czar's decree he will be astonished to see how similar they are.

Who would have thought ten years ago that American citizens would ever be defending a national policy with the logic of despots? And yet this is the necessary result of imperial-

ism. There are but two sources of government—the people and force. A government resting upon the consent of the governed being the natural government can be defended by fair and honest argument, but a government resting on force can not be defended among civilized people without resort to the subterfuge of “Divine Rights.” Every argument (not mercenary in its character) advanced in support of colonialism will be found to rest upon a supposed duty and yet those who voluntarily assume the performance of this kind of a duty always place such a high estimate upon their services that they pay themselves well at the expense of those whom they serve. For illustration compare the luxury of the czar’s household with the privations of the Russian peasant—or the comfort of the Philippine governor general with the frugal fare of the average Filipino. The “five per cent” can not be separated from this sort of philanthropy—in fact it is the foundation while “Divine Right” is the gaudy superstructure.

WHEN SHOULD CONGRESS CONVENE

The Federal Constitution provides that “Congress shall assemble at least once in every year” and that “such meetings shall be on the first Monday in December unless they shall by law appoint a different day.” Experience has shown that the post-election session of congress is largely an irresponsible session. Many congressmen go out at the end of each term and the lobbyist can have more influence with one who is going out of congress or with one who has not the restraint of an election immediately before him than with a man who has his own record and his party’s record to answer for at an early election.

There is an objection, too, to having the first session of congress convene so long after the election. According to the existing law some thirteen months elapse after a congressional election before congress convenes. An extraordinary session is necessary to give immediate effect to the decision of the people on an important question. As congress has power to

fix the date for its convening it might wisely employ that power by fixing a day that would enable a new congress to begin its legislative work soon after the election, say by March 4. A recess might be taken during the summer months, but the second session should be adjourned at least ten days before the election so that the party in power could go to the country on a completed record. A special session could be convened a few days before the fourth of March following each presidential election to canvass the returns.

This is a reform within reach and there ought to be no delay in securing it.

REFERENCE INDEX

- Adams, Alva, 403.
 Adams, John, 250, 378, 388.
 Adams, Samuel, 348, 378.
 Advertiser, Montgomery, 31, 58.
 Afraid of Their Record, 131.
 Aldrich Bill, 55, 57, 156, 181, 184.
 Aldrich, Senator, 162, 184.
 Allen, Senator W. V., 11, 121, 122.
 Allison, Senator W. B., 118.
 Alschuler, Samuel, 309.
 Amendment Withdrawn, 306.
 American Milling Co., 95.
 American, Nashville, 13, 36, 37, 38, 163, 168, 352.
 Answer to Criticism, 342.
 Anxious to Fight, 359.
 Appalling Showing, An, 94.
 Arbitration, 72, 73.
 Archibald, Mr., 340, 341.
 Are We to Have a Yellow Scare? 326.
 Arnold, Matthew, 413.
 Asphalt Company, General, 95.
 Asset Currency, 278.
 As to Bolting, 172.
 As to Patents, 99.
 Attempting to Retire Silver, 101.
 Babcock, Congressman, 221.
 Bailey, Senator J. W., 259, 282.
 Balfour, Arthur, 213, 214.
 Ball, T. A., 308.
 Banner, Nashville, 30, 46, 81.
 Barkworth, Mr., 282.
 Barrett, John, 388.
 Bartine, Congressman, 403.
 Beardsley, Mr., 464.
 Beckham, Governor, 282.
 Beef Trust, 5.
 Beef Trust's Work, The, 65.
 Belmont, August, 97, 98, 140, 151, 153, 154, 215.
 Bell Telephone Co., 95.
 Benedict, E. C., 140.
 Bennett, Philo S., 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111.
 Benton, Thomas H., 204.
 Bennett Will, The, 352.
 Berquist, John, 144.
 Beveridge, Senator A. J., 383, 384.
 Biddle, Nicholas, 56, 69.
 Bimetallism, 54, 57, 63, 133, 220, 223, 224, 225, 226, 326, 328, 329, 335, 382, 423, 424, 425.
 Blackburn, Senator J. S. C., 308.
 Black, Governor, Eulogy of War, 288, 343.
 Black, Governor, 290.
 Blythe, Mr., 35.
 Boer Address and Reply by Bryan, 359.
 Bolters, 172.
 Bolter, Bryan as a, 9, 10, 11, 12.
 Bondaref, 198, 199, 200.
 Boyd, Gov. James E., 10, 14, 185, 186.
 Bread Labor, 198.
 Brewer, Justice David J., 79, 80, 123.
 Bryan's Speech of Acceptance, 1900, 368, 369.
 Bryan's Speech Before Nebraska Convention, 332.
 Bryan's Speeches During Closing Hours of Convention, 296.
 Bryan's St. Louis Convention Speech, 287.
 Bryan, W. J., 2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 36, 42, 48, 49, 90, 103, 111, 112, 136, 137, 158, 160, 161, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175, 185, 188, 191, 193, 194, 244, 245, 246, 247, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 280, 282, 283, 284, 303, 307, 308, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 342, 347, 349, 352, 359, 360, 361, 362, 371, 372, 389, 390, 393, 396, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426.
 Buckholz, Wm., 308.
 Buckle, Historian, 232.
 Buckner, Palmer and, 29, 33, 49, 130, 316.
 Burns, John, 49.
 Burglarious Methods, 176.
 Business League, National, 195, 348.
 Butcher, Mr., 282.
 By Their Works, 206.

- Cable, Ben T., 256, 257, 309, 314.
 Campaign Funds, 439.
 Canadians Attack Tobacco Trust, 339.
 Canal, Isthmian, 8.
 Cannon's Complacent Philosophy, 237.
 Cannon, Joseph, 237, 238, 239, 387.
 Capital and Labor, 283, 385, 386.
 Carlisle, John G., 11, 150, 151, 152.
 Carlyle, Thomas, 17, 228, 230.
 Carmack, Senator, 243, 247, 282, 302, 303, 306.
 Casper, Charles D., 308.
 Cassatt, A. J., 35.
 Cato, 72.
 Central America, 21.
 Chicago Carriagemakers' Union, 144.
 Chicago Platform, 24, 89, 90, 100, 101, 131, 158, 159, 163, 167, 202.
 China, 64.
 Chronicle, St. Louis, 179.
 Christmas Love's Festival, 444.
 Christianity, 93.
 Chronicle, Chicago, 10, 12, 13, 147, 148, 149, 163, 168, 169, 210, 281, 282, 283, 284, 355, 356.
 Church, Commercialism In, 91.
 Church, Rochester, 103.
 Church Sets Example, 208.
 Church, Southern Methodist, Hobart, O. T., 208.
 Civil Service, 8.
 Clark, Senator, 27, 282.
 Clay, Henry, 226, 452.
 Cleveland Bond Deals, The, 149.
 Cleveland, Grover, 10, 13, 28, 31, 62, 63, 68, 69, 70, 81, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 98, 113, 129, 130, 132, 139, 140, 141, 142, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 174, 185, 194, 217, 218, 279, 303, 347, 411.
 Coal Trust, 93.
 Cockran, Bourke, 131.
 Cockrell, Senator F. M., 243, 244, 287, 294, 403, 404.
 Coler, Bird S., 194.
 Collier's Weekly, 171, 172.
 Colorado Situation, The, 207, 372.
 Colorado Strikers, 184.
 Commercial-Appeal, Memphis, 13, 31, 32, 58.
 Commercialism and Mr. Bryan, 103, 111.
 Commercial Cable Co., 95.
 Commercialism in the Church, 91.
 Commercial, New York, 211, 212.
 Commoner, The, 10, 12, 36, 42, 64, 136, 169, 185, 195, 205, 210, 222, 223, 228, 236, 282, 284, 336, 349, 352, 393, 396, 416.
 Complete Returns, The, 458.
 Congressional Sessions, 468, 469.
 Connecticut, 49.
 Conscience as a Prosecutor, 204.
 Conscience Campaign, A, 1.
 Consolidated Gas Co., 175.
 Consolidated Lake Superior Co., 95.
 Consolidated Rubber Tire Co., 95.
 Consolidated Telephone Co., 95.
 Contempt of Court, 284.
 Convention's Dramatic Close, The (1904), 241.
 Cook, Silas, 309.
 Copper Trust, 95.
 Corey, W. E., 6.
 Corporations, Capitalization of, 3.
 Cost of Imperialism, 67.
 Cotton King Sully Fails, 82.
 Cotton Yarn Co., 95.
 Courier-Journal, Louisville, 13.
 Courier, Lincoln, 350.
 Criminal Clause, The, 5, 40, 42, 67, 71, 72, 75, 76, 89, 160, 187, 188, 349, 350.
 Criminals, Treatment of, 177, 178, 179.
 Criminal Law, Enforcing the, 41.
 Cronje, Gen., 360.
 Crolius, Mayor, 210, 314.
 Cuba, 133, 387.
 Daniels, Senator John W., 246, 256, 257, 259, 261, 262, 265, 267, 304.
 Davis on Labor, 350.
 Davis, Senator Cushman K., 122.
 Davis, Henry G., 240, 241, 256, 257, 350, 351.
 Death of Paul Kruger, 280.
 Declaration of Independence, 8, 17, 213, 214, 280, 360, 388.
 Delaware, 47.
 Democracy and Socialism, 163.
 Democracy Must Advance, 412.
 Democracy Must Move Forward, 267.
 Democratic Opportunity in Wisconsin, 173.
 Democratic Opportunity, The, 221.
 Democratic Prayer, A, 2.
 Democratic Platform, The (1904), 236, 247.
 Democratic Plan Endorsed, 461.
 Democratic Success, 162.
 Democratic Ticket, The, 233.

- Democratic Watchman, Bellefonte, 446.
- Dictator, A, 28.
- Dinner Pail-Coffee Pot, 383.
- Dingley, Governor, 351.
- Dingley, Tariff Law, 158, 159, 351.
- Doane, Bishop Wm. C., 210, 211.
- Doctrine of Thrones, The, 226.
- Dollar and Man, 124.
- Dolliver, Senator J. P., 351.
- Dominick, J. R., 180.
- Donald, J. M., 179.
- Drawing the Fangs, 39.
- Dubois, Senator, 256, 257, 282.
- Dunbar, James, 335.
- Dunne, Edward F., 309.
- Dutcher, William, 416.
- Duty of Democrats, The, 70.
- Eagle, Brooklyn, 13, 31, 33, 58.
- Eight Hour Law, 130, 207, 376.
- Electing Postmasters, 321.
- Election of Senators, 325, 441.
- Elections, 194, 196, 397, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 436, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 458, 459.
- Election's Lesson, The, Democracy vs. Plutocracy, 390.
- Eligibility of Presidents, 195, 196, 197.
- Elkins Bill, The, 349, 350.
- Embezzlement, 126.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 17.
- Employer and Employe, 72.
- Employers' Association, 72, 73.
- Enforce the Law, 5.
- Enforcing the Criminal Law, 40.
- Enquirer, Cincinnati, 12, 60, 61.
- Equality, 213.
- Equipping a Country Home, 160.
- Evasion and Surrender, 142.
- Fairbanks, Charles W., 221.
- Faith With Works, 212.
- Farmer, Nebraska, 416.
- Farmer, Long Island, 206.
- Federal Telephone Co., 95.
- Filipinos, 86, 91, 398, 402.
- Finding Success in Failure, 362.
- Fitch, Mr., 282.
- Fitzgerald, J. J., 308.
- Fleming, Mr., 282.
- Flower, Roswell P., 352, 353.
- Folk, Joseph W., 404.
- Foraker Bill, 75, 76, 80.
- Force Bill, 306.
- Fortune, T. Thomas, 465.
- Forrest, J. W., 245.
- Forward, March! 82.
- Fowler, Congressman, 101.
- Free Pass, The, 355.
- Free Press, Detroit, 68, 69, 70.
- Frenzied Finance, 284, 353.
- Frick, Henry C., 215.
- Fuller, Chief Justice, 81, 123, 124.
- Gage's Defense of Wealth, 145.
- Gage, Lyman J., 122, 145, 146, 147.
- Gambling, 82.
- Gambling in Futures, 63.
- Garfield, Commissioner, 461.
- Garfield, James A., 388.
- Garvin, Gov. Lucius, F. C., 162.
- George III., 91.
- Get Rich Quick, 103.
- Glenn, Major, 357, 358.
- Globe, St. Paul (Defunct), 13, 163, 168.
- Gold Plank Defeated, 282, 283.
- Gold Democrats, 102.
- Gold Standard, 9, 54, 326, 327, 328, 329, 335.
- Gold Telegram, Parker's, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 256, 278, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 391.
- Goodman, Mr., 282.
- G. O. P. Dictation, 81.
- Gorman, Senator A. P., 11, 13, 86.
- Gould, George, 96.
- Government by Injunction, 130.
- Government Ownership, 323, 324, 325, 371, 372.
- Government Paper vs. Notes, 202.
- Grant, Hugh J., 206.
- Gray, Senator, 122.
- Greenbacks, 40.
- Green, Mr., 282.
- Gresham Law, 133.
- Gunsaulus, Rev. Frank, 213.
- Hail, Jensen, Hero, 329.
- Hale, Senator, 67.
- Hamlin, Charles S., 247, 256, 257, 304, 305.
- Hanna, Mark A., 27, 33, 221, 222, 354.
- Hard Times, 197, 198.
- Harlan, Justice John M., 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81.
- Harmony, 90, 98, 99, 176.
- Harrison, President Benjamin, 11, 156, 166, 389.
- Havemeyer, H. O., Testimony Before Senate Committee, 121, 122.
- Havemeyer, Mr., 354.
- Hayes, Rutherford B., 346, 388.
- Hayes-Tilden Commission, 171.

- Haywood, D. C., 308.
 Hearst, William R., 93, 113, 209, 244, 293, 314.
 Helen Keller's Sermon, 93.
 Hendrix, Joseph C., 15, 16.
 Henry, Patrick, 378.
 Hepburn, A. B., 122.
 Herald, Boston, 13.
 Herald, Fremont, 349, 350.
 Herald, Nashville Christian, 450.
 Herald, Pentacostal, 450.
 Hillis Attacks Plutocracy, 409.
 Hill Currency Bill, 181, 182, 183, 184.
 Hill, David B., 86, 87, 89, 93, 97, 100, 113, 116, 119, 120, 140, 194, 205, 206, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 264, 265, 266, 299, 303, 304, 352, 353.
 Hill, James J., 35, 159, 160.
 Hill's Summersault, 205.
 Hoben, Rev. Allen, 212, 213.
 Holcomb, Governor Silas A., 11.
 Holmes, Justice O. W., 71, 80, 88, 123, 124.
 Hope, 459.
 Hopkins, John P., 209, 210, 309, 311, 312, 314, 316.
 Howe, S. G., 99, 100.
 Huntington, C. P., 320.
 Hurd, Mr., 282.
 Illinois Contest, Mr. Bryan's Speech On, 308.
 Illinois Democratic Convention, 208, 209, 210.
 Imperialism, 20, 21, 32, 81, 91, 118, 219, 367, 368, 369, 375, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 386, 387, 426, 435, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 467, 468.
 Imperialism Bearing Fruit, 357.
 Implement Trust, 100.
 Imprudent Benefactors, The, 414.
 Income Tax, 171, 283, 412, 425.
 Independence Not a Scuttle Policy, 386.
 Independence, South American, 226, 227.
 Indefensible and Intolerable, 231.
 Individual's Part, The, 406.
 Indiana, 20, 48, 49.
 Indiana Democratic Convention, 210.
 Injunction, 130.
 Instruct, 34.
 Insulting the Flag, 387.
 Insurance, Life, 464, 465.
 Inter-Ocean, Chicago, 144.
 Inter-State Commerce, 71, 93.
 Inter-State Telephone Co., 95.
 International Fire Engine Co., 95.
 International Salt Co., 95.
 International Telephone Co., 95.
 Issue, The Paramount, 26.
 Jackson, Andrew, 2, 38, 56, 70, 204, 346, 412.
 Jackson, Congressman, 282.
 Japan, 64, 65.
 Jay, John, 337.
 Jeffersonian Principles, 337.
 Jefferson, Thomas, 16, 38, 175, 204, 208, 219, 250, 337, 338, 339, 348, 378, 388, 412, 426, 447.
 Jennings, Governor, 42.
 Jensen, James, 329.
 Johnson, Tom L., 27, 33.
 Joking Is Unsafe, 335.
 Jordan, William George, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366.
 Journal, Atlanta, 13.
 Journal, Minneapolis, 329, 330, 331.
 Journal, Sioux City, 371, 372.
 Journal, Wall Street, 68, 69, 96, 97, 159, 187, 188, 329, 330, 331.
 Judge Reagan's Letter and the Answer, 136.
 Judges Are Human, 171.
 Justice the First Essential, 227.
 Kansas, 89, 90.
 Kansas City Platform, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 31, 33, 34, 54, 57, 71, 72, 75, 82, 89, 90, 99, 100, 101, 116, 118, 119, 120, 131, 158, 163, 169, 170, 172, 176, 188, 194, 201, 202, 203, 204, 231, 237, 302, 368.
 Kansas Is In Line, 89.
 Knox, Philander C., 187, 188, 215.
 Kruger, Paul, 280, 281.
 Labor Bills Postponed, 130.
 Labor's Splendid Example, 144.
 Labor Unions, 145, 207, 208, 210, 211, 212.
 La Follette's Fight, 220.
 La Follette, Gov. Robert M., 173, 174, 220, 221, 319, 320, 321.
 Lawlessness, 184.
 Lawrence, A. M., 309.
 Lawson, Thomas W., 284, 285, 286, 287, 353, 464.
 Leader-Press, La Crosse, 194.
 Lesson in Imperialism, A, 467.
 Lexow Committee, 206.
 Liberty a Supreme Good, 232.
 Lincoln, Abraham, 52, 214, 219, 426.
 Lindsey, Senator, 122.
 Lodge, Senator Henry C., 122.

- Logan, George, 175.
 Long, Ex- Sec. John D., 91.
 Luck, Amos, 2.
 Madison, James, 388.
 Maginnis, Mr., 283.
 Mahoney, J. J., 245.
 Mail and Express, New York, 6.
 Man With the Hoe, 179.
 Martin, John I., 243.
 Martin, Congressman, 65.
 Maryland, 47.
 Mask Torn Off, 7.
 Massachusetts, 39, 48, 132, 140.
 McCausland, E. E., 308.
 McCarren, State Senator, 206.
 McKinley Bill, 49, 69, 91, 158, 159, 195, 217.
 McKinley Campaign, Secrets of, 131.
 McKinley, William, 222, 319, 354, 405.
 McNeel, Walter B., 186.
 Meadowlark, The, 415, 416.
 Measuring Gold by Itself, 223.
 Memory, 456.
 Menace of Militarism, 384.
 Menzies, G. V., 308, 315.
 Mercer, David H., 143, 144.
 Merger Case, Northern Pacific, 70, 76, 124, 171.
 Merger Decision, Northern Pacific, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 84, 171.
 Meyer, Cord, 174, 206.
 Milburn, John G., 367, 368.
 Militarism, 384, 385, 386, 393.
 Ministerial Speculators, 103.
 Missouri Bankers' Association, 179.
 Mistaken Friends, 389.
 Money in Politics, 174.
 Monroe, James, 388.
 Montague, Gilbert Holland, 339.
 Moody, Attorney General, 343.
 Moody, John, 94, 97.
 Moral Issue, The, 14.
 Morton, Levi P., 352, 353.
 Morgan, J. Pierpont, 82, 92, 96, 151, 153, 154, 155, 159, 160.
 Munger, Judge W. H., 411.
 Municipal Ownership, 416, 417, 442.
 Must Be Honest, 9.
 Narrow Escape, A, 134.
 National City Bank, New York, 122, 147.
 Navy League, The, 343.
 Nebraska, 6, 10, 11, 50.
 Nebraska Democratic Platform, 202.
 Nebraska Farmer, 416.
 Nebraska's Vote in 1892, 185.
 Nevada vs. Colorado, 376.
 Newlands, Senator, 256, 257, 282.
 News, Baltimore, 418, 426.
 News, Denver, 242, 373.
 News, Lincoln, Nebr., Evening, 5.
 New Hampshire, 2.
 New Jersey, 48, 140.
 New York, 6, 18, 20, 48, 49.
 New York Platform, 112, 127, 132, 140, 148, 206.
 New York Speech, 112, 126.
 Northern Securities, 35.
 Not Harmony, But Surrender, 98.
 O'Brien, Edward F., 357.
 Officeholders' Opinion, The, 90.
 Oil Literature, 339.
 Olney, Richard, 86, 132.
 Oppose Popular Government, 36.
 Optimism, 93, 94.
 Ordway, E. W., 133, 134.
 Others, 381.
 Pacific Packing Co., 95.
 Palladium, New Haven, 91.
 Palmer and Buckner, 29, 33, 49, 130, 316, 447.
 Panama, 21.
 Panics (1873, 1893), 216.
 Parcel Delivery, 436.
 Parker's Acceptance, 336.
 Parker and Davis, 233, 234, 235, 236, 390, 393.
 Parker, Alton B., 13, 86, 87, 88, 89, 97, 98, 100, 101, 113, 114, 116, 119, 120, 134, 135, 140, 174, 180, 194, 206, 215, 222, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 278, 279, 280, 296, 299, 300, 301, 303, 304, 306, 307, 314, 333, 335, 342, 343, 345, 346, 359, 367, 368, 369, 374, 375, 382, 390, 391, 393, 394, 405, 446, 458.
 Parker, Judge, on Imperialism, 367.
 Parker's Letter, 374.
 Parker Not Available, 86.
 Parker's One Term Pledge, 345.
 Parkhurst, Dr., 445.
 Pass Evil, The, 410.
 Patents, 99, 100.
 Pattison, Governor, 256, 257, 293, 294, 305, 323.
 Payne, Postmaster General, 221.
 Peabody, Gov., 373, 374, 376, 403.
 Peckham, Justice, 81, 123, 124.
 Pennsylvania, 140.
 Pennsylvania Railroad, 35.
 Pensions, Old Age, 443, 444.

- People's Victory, A, 93.
 Perkins, George W., 6.
 Pettigrew, Richard F., 263, 264, 282, 300.
 Philippine Commission, 86.
 Philippine Delegates Not Admitted, 279.
 Philippine Independence, 133.
 Philippine Islands, 59, 67, 68, 85, 90, 91, 94, 387, 468.
 Philippine Issue Emphasized, 377.
 Philippine Railroads, 85.
 Platform of 1884, 150.
 Platform of Nebraska Democracy, 188, 202.
 Platforms, Democratic, 1840, 203; 1844, 203; 1848, 203; 1852, 203; 1856, 203; 1902, 61.
 Platforms, Political, 127.
 Pledged to Wall Street, 179.
 Plutocracy, 409, 410.
 Poe, Mr., 256, 257.
 Political Honesty, 126.
 Popular Platform, A, 194.
 Popular Election of Senators, 325, 441.
 Postal Votes, 440.
 Post, Houston, 138.
 Post, Louisville, 61.
 Post, Saturday Evening, 149.
 Post, Pittsburg, 81, 82.
 Post, Washington, 87.
 Potter, L. F., 180.
 Power of Gold, 352.
 Praise from the Chronicle, 169.
 Predatory Politics, 210.
 Prentiss, Judge, 209, 314.
 Preparing for Hard Times, 197.
 President's Acceptance, The, 322.
 President's Message, The, 427.
 Press, New York, 206.
 Private Monopoly, 231.
 Primaries, Watch the, 13, 14.
 Prosperity, 91.
 Protection to Depositors, 437, 441.
 Prudence, 414, 415.
 Psalm, Fourth, 212, 213.
 Public Opinion, 196.
 Quarles, Senator, 221.
 Questions to Parker, 278.
 Quinn, Mr., 312, 315, 316.
 Race Question, The, 417, 418, 465, 466, 467.
 Railroads, 410, 411.
 Railroad Groups, 95, 96.
 Railroad Lobby, 319, 320, 321.
 Railroads, New York, New Haven & Hartford, 187, 197.
 Railroads, Rock Island, 187.
 Railroad Systems, Independent, 96.
 Railway, Baltimore & Ohio, 240.
 Railway, New York Central, 320.
 Railway, Piedmont & Cumberland, 241.
 Railway West Virginia Central & Pittsburg, 240.
 Ralls, Rev. Dr., 91, 92.
 Real Politicians, The, 413.
 Reagan, John H., 136, 138.
 Reciprocity, 8.
 Record-Herald, Chicago, 3, 35, 101, 103, 104, 107, 111, 112, 131, 335, 354.
 Reducing Southern Representation, 465.
 Reed, Thomas B., 413, 422, 423.
 Reforms Within Reach, 436.
 Religious Argument, The, 450.
 Reorganization Means Clevelandism, 31.
 Reorganizer Doctrine, 75.
 Reorganizers Unfold Their Plans, 68.
 Reorganizers, 7, 33, 42, 53, 60, 70, 75, 76, 89, 90, 98, 176, 177, 180.
 Republican Platform, The, 216.
 Resolutions Committee, The (1904) 256.
 Rhode Island, 47.
 Rhodes, Mr., 283.
 Rockefeller's Bible Class, 145.
 Rockefeller, John D., 35, 82, 92, 96.
 Rockefeller, John D., Jr., 145.
 Roosevelt's Great Opportunity, 398.
 Roosevelt's Threats, 318.
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 5, 7, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42, 69, 82, 83, 117, 128, 137, 138, 140, 142, 162, 179, 180, 186, 187, 188, 218, 221, 233, 234, 289, 318, 319, 333, 342, 343, 349, 356, 359, 382, 387, 388, 389, 390, 395, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 405, 418, 446, 447.
 Rose, David S., 243.
 Rothschilds, 140, 151, 153, 154.
 Running Amuck, 186.
 Russia, 64, 65.
 Russia's Awakening, 369.
 Sanity, 129, 139.
 Schwab, Charles M., 6, 92.
 Second Speech (St. Louis Convention), 302.
 Self Government, 91, 396, 407.
 Shall The People be Allowed to Rule? 208.

- Shall They Rule or Be Ruled? 319.
 Sharing the Punishment, 402.
 Shaw, Sec. Leslie M., 84, 143, 144.
 Sheehan, W. F., 241, 242, 243.
 Sherman Anti-Trust Law, 5, 67, 70,
 71, 72, 75, 76, 89, 160, 187, 188, 349,
 350.
 Sherman Silver Law, 61, 62, 63, 423.
 Shiveley, Mr., 256, 257, 282.
 Sibley, Congressman, 151.
 Silver Democrats Vindicated, 382.
 Silver Dollars, 101, 102.
 Silver Question, 33.
 Six Year Term, 195.
 Smelting Trust, 95.
 Snell, Millionaire, 205.
 Socialism, 163, 169.
 Society's Prodigal Son, 177.
 South Dakota, 65.
 Sparks, John, 376, 403.
 Spooner, Senator, 220, 221.
 Stafford, Ray, 282.
 Standard Oil, 45, 95, 339, 340, 341,
 342.
 State Insurance, 464.
 State Ownership of Railroads, 323,
 329, 371.
 Statistics in Stocks, 3.
 Stay at Home Vote, The, 405.
 Stevenson, Adlai, 11.
 Steel Company, United States, 6.
 Stevens, Harry T., 144.
 Stillman, James, 34.
 St. Louis Convention, 40, 90, 102,
 222, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247,
 279, 412.
 St. Louis Platform, 99.
 Success Magazine, 354.
 Sugar Trust, 95, 122, 206.
 Sully, Daniel J., 82.
 Sumersault, Hill's, 205.
 Sun, Baltimore, 47.
 Sun, Manila Sunday, 357, 358.
 Taft, Sec. William H., 85, 86, 380.
 Tariff, Protective, 22, 436.
 Tariff Question in 1896 and 1900,
 158.
 Tarpey, Mr., 282.
 Tascott, Willie, 204, 205.
 Telegraph, Dubuque, 372.
 Teller, Senator Henry M., 376.
 Teufelsdröckh, 228, 229, 230.
 That Unprecedented Victory 446.
 There Are Others, 215.
 Thomas, Ex-Gov., 264, 282.
 Those Labor Planks, 283.
 Those Little Questions, 278.
 Tillman, Benjamin, 242, 243, 245,
 259, 264, 265, 282, 299.
 Times, Richmond, 13.
 Times, New York, 75, 76, 186, 187.
 Timming, Mr., 282.
 Tobacco Trust, 95, 339.
 Todd, Percy R., 197.
 Tolstoy, 198, 199, 200, 201, 435.
 Toole, Governor, 403.
 Tribune, Chicago, 39, 40, 41, 42, 210,
 333, 334, 388.
 Tribune, New York, 134, 205.
 Trust Bogies, The, 147.
 Trust Defenders, 147.
 Trusts, Federal License of, 71, 72,
 461, 462, 463, 464.
 Trust Lottery, The, 6.
 Trusts, Seven Great Industrial, 95.
 Trusts, Truth About, 94.
 Try It, 159.
 Two Men I Honor, 228.
 Unemployed Labor, 333.
 Unexpected Candor, 60.
 United States Realty Co., 95.
 United States Ship Building Co., 95.
 United Telegraph and Telephone
 Co., 95.
 Utley, Judge, 103.
 Value of Constancy, The, 418.
 Vanderbilt, Wm. H., 340.
 Van Wyck, Augustus, 194.
 Venezuela, 132.
 Vesaley, Mr., 282.
 Virginia-Carolina Chemical Co., 95.
 Virtuous Trusts, The, 210.
 Von Plehve's Assassination, 316.
 Waiting Till Election is Over, 181.
 Wall, Edward C., 243, 293.
 Wall Street, 18, 24, 26, 34, 35, 36, 54,
 55, 70, 76, 89, 96, 97, 98, 102, 125,
 132, 139, 144, 145, 148, 149, 150,
 156, 172, 174, 177, 179, 395, 423.
 Walsh John R., 210, 281.
 Washington's Advice, Booker, 417.
 Washington, Booker T., 465.
 Washington, George, 388.
 Wasted Time, 344.
 Watch the Primaries, 13.
 Weaver, Gen. James B., 11, 185, 186,
 246, 247, 282.
 Wellman, Walter, 35, 36, 101, 131,
 353, 354.
 Western Federation of Miners, 208.
 Western Union Telegraph Co., 95.
 West Virginia, 47.

- When Should Congress Convene? 468.
- White, Andrew D., 316, 317.
- White, Justice, 81, 123, 124.
- White Mountain Paper Co., 95.
- Why Not Now? 97.
- Why Not Own Them? 85.
- Why the War? 64.
- Wilfey, Judge L. R., 90.
- Will Shaw Explain? 143.
- Wilson Tariff Bill, 57.
- Williams, John Sharp, 245, 256, 257, 258, 278, 279, 282, 307.
- Winston, Dr., 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456.
- Wisconsin, 173.
- Wood, C. L., 308.
- Woodman Spare That Tree, 191.
- Woodward, James T., 174, 175, 176.
- World, Biblican, 212.
- World, New York, 8, 9, 12, 40, 41, 61, 97, 158, 174, 175, 176, 215.
- Wright, Luke E., 377, 378, 379, 380.
- Wright, Whittaker, 41.
- Writing of The Platform (1904), 282.
- Young, Allie W., 9.

The Commoner

ISSUED WEEKLY

W. J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE \$1.00 PER YEAR

The Commoner is a weekly journal, which, while devoted in its editorial department to the discussion of political, economic, and sociological questions, furnishes its readers each week a supply of general literature of the highest order. It is hoped that the discussion of political events as they arise from time to time will interest those who study public questions, regardless of their party affiliations. Subscriptions can be sent direct to **The Commoner**. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents. Advertising rates furnished upon application. Send for free sample copy and clubbing offer. Address all communications to

The Commoner
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

Life and Speeches

of William J. Bryan

An illustrated octavo, 465 pages. It contains a biographical sketch of Mr. Bryan prepared by Mrs. Bryan. Also the more important speeches delivered by him during his two terms in Congress and during the two presidential campaigns in which he was a candidate. This is the most complete record of Mr. Bryan's work in public life that has ever been published. It is printed on fine quality of paper, and contains over forty very interesting and instructive illustrations.

Substantial cloth binding, \$1.50 per copy, postage prepaid. Address all orders to THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Nebraska.

The Commoner, Condensed

A Political Reference Book

As its title indicates this book is a condensed copy of THE COMMONER for one year. It is published annually and the different issues are designated as Volumes I, II, III, etc., corresponding to the volume numbers of THE COMMONER. The editorials which discuss questions of a permanent nature have been selected, and with some of the best articles from the other departments are reproduced in THE COMMONER, CONDENSED.

THE COMMONER CONDENSED contains a complete reference index, which makes it a valuable handbook. Facts and figures, arguments and reasoning on leading issues, and information of value to those who take part in discussions of live political questions will be found in its pages.

The book is published to enable readers of THE COMMONER who have not kept a complete file of the papers to obtain the important articles that have appeared during each year, in convenient form for preservation.

Price in strong cloth binding, by mail postage prepaid, \$1.50; in paper binding, 50c. Address all orders to

The Commoner, Lincoln, Nebraska

