

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 reargued, 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 reargued, 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.

Agitation.

The Wall Street Journal says that "those who prate the most about the 'money power' are more dangerous than any monopoly could be. If the corporations are growing bigger so is the country itself."

And yet, in the same article the Journal says that \$350,000,000 of the present outstanding loans of the banks of New York are held by seventeen individuals, which fact, according to the Journal, "shows how largely the resources of credit have been monopolized by a few persons mainly through the creation of great chains of banks and trust companies."

While apologizing for citing these facts the Journal says that what it has pointed out "simply emphasizes the fact that while the bulk of the people of this country realize the economic benefits of this concentration, they will look with jealous eyes upon its growth to elements that threaten to make the government of this country a government by the monied autocracy." Accepting the Journal's own statement concerning the seventeen individuals in New York, is it not fair to assume that it is about time for the people to "look with jealous eyes" upon the growth of the concentration tendency. This being true, is it not the duty of those who are opposed to monopoly to wage war upon it? How better may this war be waged than by persistent agitation directing public attention to the growth of these evils and seeking to bring the public mind to a proper appreciation of the seriousness of the situation.

Official Organs.

The Wall Street Journal says that the Standard Oil interests have invested a considerable sum of money in a New York daily newspaper, and will hereafter control that paper's policy. The Journal goes to considerable trouble to show that a "subsidized or inspired or controlled paper very soon loses its efficiency in a community like that of New York."

A great many people may be inclined to wonder why the Standard Oil company would deem it necessary to create an official organ. Republican newspapers generally, and a few newspaper editors who pretend to be democratic, have all along displayed great enthusiasm in the support of schemes in which the Standard Oil interests and other trust elements have been deeply concerned. There are among the daily newspapers of this country some publications that are believed by some people to have been subsidized; there are many others that are believed to be controlled, while it may, in truth, be said that the

republican papers, generally, during a political campaign, are at least inspired by trust interests; and yet, instead of these papers losing their "efficiency," as the Wall Street Journal would have us believe, we are told that they do in fact represent the intelligence, the patriotism and the business interests of the country. It is safe to say also that when the official organ of the Standard Oil interests firmly establishes its policy, it will be found to differ in no material point with the policy of the republican newspapers and the policy of the newspaper representatives of the reorganizing element.

Not Advocating Either.

"William Jennings Bryan said to one of his Washington intimates, just before sailing for Europe, that he thought Richard Olney was a man upon whom all factions of the democratic party could unite. He went so far as to say that the Massachusetts statesman would be entirely satisfactory to him. He said this for the purpose of having it repeated to others and of having an important political effect.

Mr. Bryan never said anything that by any possibility could be distorted into an excuse for the above. He never told any of his "intimates" in Washington or anywhere else that the distinguished ex-member of Mr. Cleveland's cabinet would be a good man to unite upon. The friends of Mr. Olney have a right to urge his nomination if they desire to do so, but it ought not to be urged as a harmonizing nomination. If urged at all it should be urged upon the ground that it would be unmistakable proof of the party's repentance for its conduct in 1896 and 1900 and a pledge that it would return to Clevelandism. Mr. Cleveland's nomination would scarcely be a more emphatic repudiation of the party's recent platforms than would the nomination of one who seriously proposes the ex-president's renomination.

About the same time another paper reported that Mr. Bryan was conferring with Judge Parker's friends with a view to advancing the judge's candidacy. This, too, is erroneous. Mr. Bryan has been busy for nearly a year trying to find out Mr. Parker's views on public questions, but so far has failed. The nearest approach to a clear and definite statement is that ex-Senator D. B. Hill will vouch for his soundness in every respect, but this recalls a remark once made by John Randolph. The Virginia statesman was at the race track and two strangers accosted him. One of them proposed a wager on a race and added, "Mr. Smith (the other stranger) will hold the stakes." "But," asked Mr. Randolph, "who will hold Mr. Smith?"

A Fit Leader.

It is said that the president intends to have Governor Crane of Massachusetts elected to succeed Senator Hanna as chairman of the national committee, and the New York Sun, which ought to be an authority on the question, says of him:

"The real objection to Mr. Crane must come from the new-timers, not the old-timers. He is a rich man, a man of trusts and corporations, of large acquaintance with men of business and finance. He belongs to the practical and plutocratic forces, for which Mr. Roosevelt nourishes a high-souled disdain. A censorious world, let alone a scrupulous conscience and a chivalrous and romantic temperament, might condemn an Attila of the trusts who employs a 'trust magnate' to persuade the trusts to 'loosen up.' Mr. Crane is an honorable and amiable man, but his unfortunate wealth and the company he keeps—the corporate wealthy—are disqualifications in this virtuous age."

A Question of Fertilizer.

The demoralization of the public conscience wrought by commercialism is well illustrated by the argument recently made by a southern democrat. He could not approve of the president's hasty action in recognizing the Panama republic, but he felt that the chief executive should be sustained because it seemed necessary to sustain him to get the canal, and the canal seemed necessary to the south. "Why," he continued, "what we need most in our state is fertilizer and with a canal we can get fertilizer from Chile for ten dollars less than it costs now." That settles the question. What is national honor compared with

cheap fertilizer? Who would be so unbusiness-like as to put an outworn commodity like justice in the scale against a shipload of guano? What though we impoverish the national character, provided the lands are enriched? There is, however, one ray of hope—at least one. Perhaps the manufacturers of fertilizer in the United States will espouse the cause of national honor. It may be difficult to arouse the public upon the moral issue involved in the Panama case, but no one can remain neutral when the line of battle is formed and General Domestic Phosphate, Col. Home Made Acid, Major Cottonseed Meal, and Captain Ox Blood begin to fortify our coasts against the attack of Commodore Foreign Fertilizer and his malodorous crew. To be sure, there has been some feeble and desultory firing over the principle involved, but the high tide of carnage will not be reached until the fertilizers meet.

An Explicit Platform.

The Philadelphia Record says: "Nothing in Mr. Cleveland's article is better than his statement that 'this is no time for cunning finesse, nor for use of words that conceal intentions or carry a double meaning.' The party in power may 'stand pat,' utter an equivocal platform and hope to remain in power by simple inertia, but the opposition can never dislodge it unless it tell the country plainly what its purpose is in seeking the control of the government."

All of the organs of the reorganizers commend Mr. Cleveland for his alleged desire for a plain and explicit statement of the party's position on public questions; but investigate carefully the utterances of these men and one will find that they do not desire nor intend, if it be within their power to prevent it, that the party take the people into its confidence. They want a platform that can be interpreted in one way to certain people, while an altogether different interpretation is placed upon it in other quarters.

The only explicit thing these gentlemen desire about the democratic platform is that the representatives of Wall street may read, at least between the lines, the assurance that under a so-called democratic administration the impositions of Wall street are not to be interfered with.

Tariff Shelter.

The American Newspaper Publishers' association met recently in New York and unanimously adopted resolutions urging the federal administration to enforce the anti-trust law against the paper trust; also declaring in favor of the removal of the tariff duties on pulp and paper.

Many of the members of this association are republicans, and it is significant that while these republican editors object to the destruction of the shelter which is found in the tariff by the trusts that impose upon the people generally, they very promptly demand the destruction of the shelter found in the tariff by the trust in which the newspaper men are most deeply concerned.

The New York Commercial referring to these resolutions says:

"It was to be expected that democratic publishers would encourage such a movement, but it was hardly expected that men who are constantly preaching the benefits and advantages of protection would desert their colors merely because, for the moment, they might profit thereby. How much conviction will protection arguments in the journals published by these men be apt to carry hereafter?"

It must be admitted that the Commercial correctly points out the inconsistency of republican editors and it will also be agreed that protection arguments published in these republican journals should not carry much conviction, and yet, perhaps some good will grow out of the situation. When the republican newspaper publisher, growing restive under trust impositions, finds relief for his own business through the destruction of the tariff shelter, he may conclude that perhaps it will be just as well to give to the people generally the same privileges and the same relief he demands for himself.

He "Just Laughed."

Now that Mr. Hanna is dead and Heath has resigned as secretary of the republican national committee, republican papers feel more free to condemn Heath and to point with pride to the claim that he was finally forced from his position by Mr. Roosevelt. Republican editors who