

ing of the World and its followers if they use the latest democratic national platform as a calcium light in which to read the real purpose of these reorganizers.

They tell us that "all the shackles have been struck off. There is no load of sectional issues or dead issues or economic fallacies for it (the democratic party) to struggle under." What change would the New York World and its associate reorganizers make in the latest democratic national platform (1908)? Will the World point out for the benefit of democrats the sectional issue, dead issue or economic fallacy contained in the democratic national platform of 1908?

What would the World take from that platform in order that the party may become "sane, progressive and cautious?"

Would it repeal the plank promising to restore the lower house of congress to its representative capacity, the plank condemning misuse of patronage, the declaration in support of the state governments in all their rights "as the most competent administration for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwark against anti-republican tendencies?"

Would the World repeal the plank denouncing the shelter which manufacturers find in the tariff and demanding that trust products be placed upon the free list?

Would it repeal the physical valuation of railroads plank, the over-issue of stocks and bonds plank?

Would it repeal the popular election of senators plank, the income tax plank or the anti-trust plank wherein it is asserted that "a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable?"

Would the World substitute a ship subsidy plank for the anti-ship subsidy pledge?

Finally, after writing the platform to suit the representatives of special interests, would the World choose as the democratic nominees candidates who could confidently count upon the active support of the special interests and whose campaign fund would be contributed by those interests?

The fact is that when the World pleads for a "sane, progressive and cautious" democracy it means, just as it meant in 1904, a "democracy" that holds the word of promise to the people's ear only to break it to their hope—a "democracy" that represents special interests rather than public interests, a "democracy" that spells ruin to the democratic party even as it spells privilege to Wall Street.

TOLSTOY

"Tolstoy is dead!" As the news follows the wires around the globe the world pauses to discuss the career of one whose name is known in every civilized land and whose thought has left its impress upon many millions. And who is this colossal figure whose falling shakes the earth? A nobleman? Yes, a nobleman by birth who ennobled nobility by his character and attainments. A novelist? Yes, a novelist who made facts more fascinating than fiction. A scientist? Yes, an instructor in the most important of all science, the science of life. He believed that the paramount duty of man is to know how to live. He taught that it is more imperative that man shall draw near to his Creator and lessen the distance between himself and his fellow men than that he should know how far the stars are apart or be able to measure the age of the rocks. And above all, he was a philosopher—a lover of truth—whose definitions and illustrations brought truth within the comprehension of the multitude. He was a moulder of opinion, putting into apt phraseology the heart cravings of the race.

He has been called the apostle of love, and no one since the Apostle Paul has preached it more persistently or practiced it more consistently.

He was a believer in the doctrine of non-resistance; he deprecated the use of violence under any and all circumstances, and yet this man who would not have resisted arrest or returned blow for blow was the only person in Russia to whom absolute freedom of speech was accorded.

He was also an advocate of "bread labor," the doctrine advanced by a Russian named Bondaref, to "clip the wings of luxury and lust." Tolstoy believed that lack of sympathy is the root of all injustice and that nothing but actual and continuous participation in the primary struggle that draws the world's nourishment from mother earth will inspire a spirit of brotherhood.

There will be differences of opinion as to many of Tolstoy's theories and dissent from

Plutocracy is abhorrent to a republic; it is more despotic than monarchy, more heartless than aristocracy, more selfish than bureaucracy. It preys upon the nation in time of peace and conspires against it in the hour of its calamity. Conscienceless, compassionless and devoid of wisdom, it enervates its votaries while it impoverishes its victims. It is already sapping the strength of the nation, vulgarizing social life and making mockery out of morals. The time is ripe for the overthrow of this giant wrong. In the name of the counting rooms which it has defiled; in the name of business honor which it has polluted; in the name of the home which it has despoiled; in the name of religion which it has disgraced; in the name of the people whom it has oppressed, let us make our appeal to the awakened conscience of the nation.—(Mr. Bryan at Madison Square Garden, New York, August 30, 1906.)

PLUTOCRACY

But democrats cannot make that appeal with candidates chosen by the special interests and upon a platform written by the representatives of those interests.

some of the applications which he has made of truths advanced by him, but no one will deny that with the sincerity of a pure heart and the intensity of a great soul he sought to bring himself into harmony with the Divine will and to serve society. To love God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself was the passion of the latter years of his life.

The Commoner will, from time to time, bring before its readers extracts from the essays of Tolstoy, but it shares the universal sorrow and offers a brief tribute now: The night is darker because his light has gone out; the world is not so warm because his heart has grown cold in death.

WILL THEY PERMIT?

Senator Rayner of Maryland, who is a member of the Baltimore Sun "conservative" committee charged with the duty of telling democrats what they must do gave to the newspapers an interview last July in which he said:

"Will Mr. Bryan and his followers permit the democratic party to nominate a president of the United States and to send to the people a platform of its own construction? If he shall insist, as I have no reason to think he will, that he must select a candidate for us and that he must frame the platform, then we must rise in our might and assert the principle that no man has the right to dictate the nomination and formulate the principles of the democratic party."

Now the question seems to be, will Senator Rayner and his followers permit the democratic party to nominate a president of the United States and to send to the people a platform of its own construction?

If Senator Rayner and the other gentlemen who refused to support the democratic ticket in 1896 insist, as we have every reason to think they will, that they must select a candidate for us and that they must frame the platform then we must rise in our might and assert the principle that no man has the right to dictate the nomination and formulate the principles of the democratic party—particularly when the man suggested as the candidate is the choice of the special interests and the principles formulated are in accord with the wishes of the representatives of those interests.

HAS IT BEEN MORGANIZED?

The Toledo Blade, insurgent republican, says: "The gravest danger in the blind revolt of the voters was the possibility of the crushing of the progressive republican movement. The complete Morganizing of the democratic party which has marked the last two years has made the progressive movement a vital necessity to the cause of decency and honor in governmental affairs. Of that fact there is no shadow of a doubt and it is a happy thing for the republic that political students may find in this latest party upheaval the absolute assurance that progressive republicanism lives and grows in stature and grace. The political tidal wave which has

swept the old party leaders and bosses into oblivion has not left republican devastation in its wake. It has, rather, swept clean a new land of glorious opportunity."

Democrats will do well to study this editorial carefully. Has the democratic party been "completely Morganized?" What do you think of it?

THE PANAMA CANAL EXPOSITION

The approaching completion of the Panama canal, like other coming events, casts its shadow before it. New Orleans and San Francisco are contesting for the honor of holding an exposition commemorating the great event, and both Louisiana and California have put their credit back of the respective cities. But why this rivalry? Why not have two expositions? This is a notable wedding—this union of the oceans. Let the marriage take place at Panama with appropriate ceremonies; then let there be a reception at the home of the bride's parents and another at the home of the parents of the groom. It is not necessary to decide which is man and which is wife—the Pacific may be regarded as the husband because larger or as wife because of its better disposition. New Orleans can very properly represent the next of kin of one and San Francisco the near relatives of the other. New Orleans is nearer to Panama and also much nearer to the center of population. Probably three times as many people would attend an exposition at New Orleans as would attend one at San Francisco, and yet New Orleans is remote from the Pacific coast—a section vitally concerned in the success of the canal. There is no place except the isthmus itself where both oceans can be properly represented. An exposition at New Orleans would slight the Pacific; an exposition at San Francisco would slight the Atlantic. Two expositions are necessary. Here's to New Orleans and San Francisco, wishing them both success! Here's to San Francisco and New Orleans; may they both win!

WHERE'S THAT BATH?

F. D. Warren of Girard, Kansas, editor of the socialist paper called "Appeal to Reason," was sentenced to six months in prison and a fine of \$1,500 in the United States circuit court of Kansas. The United States court of appeals at St. Paul affirmed the sentence.

Warren was accused of sending through the United States mails, envelopes on the outside of which was printed "\$1,000 reward will be paid to any person who kidnaps ex-Governor Taylor and returns him to the Kentucky authorities."

Thinking men cannot fail to observe that "justice" is much more "swift and stern" in the case of the socialist editor than it was in any of the cases brought against the sugar magnates. There will be no immunity bath for Warren.

Now the question is, why may not the law be enforced against those men who, obtaining monopoly on bread and meat and coal, conspire against the lives of the people?

IN NEBRASKA

The official election returns in Nebraska are not available, but the democrats elected Hitchcock to the United States senate and elected to the lower house Maguire of the First district, Lobeck of the Second district, and Latta of the Third district. The republicans elected Sloan of the Fourth, Norris of the Fifth, and Kindred of the Sixth. Thus the democrats will have three members of the lower house from Nebraska just as they have in the present congress.

The republicans elected the governor and the entire state ticket although the fight on governor was a non-partisan contest. Hitchcock, the democratic nominee for senator, received about 21,000 majority, while Aldrich, republican nominee for governor, received about 15,000 majority. For other offices on the republican state ticket the highest received about 11,000 majority and the lowest about 90.

The legislature is democratic, but a majority in each house is pledged to pass a county option bill, while every member is pledged to the initiative and referendum.

ENOUGH TROUBLE

A reader of the New York World writes to that newspaper to ask that its "anti-Roosevelt editorials" be reproduced in pamphlet form. Have we not enough trouble already on hand—with the Mexican revolution, the meat trust's pretense to reduce prices and the New York World's pose as a safe adviser of the democratic party—without this new and awful trouble proposed by this all too thoughtless reader?