

fully apparent in respect to mining claims and the organization of railroad, banking, and other corporations, and the granting of franchises generally. It is necessary that there be somebody or officer vested with legislative authority to pass laws which shall afford opportunity to capital to make investment here. This is the true and most lasting method of pacification.

This is military genius! It is all done for purpose of pacification! The Filipinos are now fighting for their homes and the land which they have occupied from time immemorial. Take away their land and they will have nothing left to defend! How simple the plan! Strange that it had not been thought of before!

Weyler starved the Cuban's so that they had no strength left to fight with, but the Taft plan is much more effective because it leaves the Filipinos nothing to fight for.

Unless the conscience of the American people is seared there must be a revolt against the proposition to surrender our principles of government, our sense of justice and our ideas of public morality at the demand of the greedy and conscienceless syndicates which are hovering like vultures over the Philippine Islands.



## A Sample of Harmony.

It is fortunate for the democracy of the nation that at the very beginning of the fight the reorganizers furnish a sample of the harmony which they recommend to the party at large. St. Louis, the chief city of one of the great democratic states, is chosen as the theatre for the exhibition of this model reconciliation! A mayor is to be chosen who will hold office during the World's Fair, and certain men who did not think it important that the nation should have a democratic president are convinced that it is a matter of paramount importance that St. Louis should have a democratic mayor. Of course, it was thought necessary that so important an office at so important a time should be filled by a man of "eminent respectability," but it is strange that among the many thousands in St. Louis who are in the habit of voting the democratic ticket, not one could be found who measured up to the standard set by the reorganizers.

Mr. Rolla Wells, the gentleman who was nominated by the democratic city convention, renounced his allegiance to the democratic party in 1896 and resigned the presidency of the St. Louis Democratic club. He actively co-operated with the bolting contingent who supported the republican ticket that year, and in 1898 he openly opposed the democratic candidate for Congress in his district. In 1900 his influence was given to the republican national ticket, and he has not since that time returned to the democratic party, or announced his acceptance of democratic principles as set forth in the party platform.

The resolutions adopted by the local convention which nominated him include an endorsement of "the fundamental principles of democracy," but Mr. Wells, if elected, will be able to define and construe those principles to suit himself.

Mr. Wells is personally, no doubt, a good man. According to the Republic, Mr. Carpenter of the National Lead Company, a republican, gives Mr. Wells a certificate of good character, and Mr. Walsh of the Terminal Railroad Company endorses the certificate. Even the Globe-Democrat cannot withhold its testimony to his respectability.

It may be that the situation in St. Louis is

such as to make it necessary to disregard party lines, but if such is the case, the candidate should run as a non-partisan or as an independent. Mr. Wells has been affectionately described by his friends as "a man who can win," but what if he can win? It would not be fair to hold the democratic party responsible for the administration of a man who, by his own act, severed himself from his party and repudiated its principles.

A party must have principles as well as an organization, and a national convention is the proper body to declare those principles. If, after a platform is adopted, any member cannot conscientiously support that platform, he has a perfect right to leave the party, and no one can justly criticize his action if he is honest with himself and with his party. But a man cannot be outside of a party and inside at the same time. Those who remain inside the party have rights as well as those who desert it. They have a right to insist that any one who leaves his party and opposes its platform and candidates shall return in some open and formal way before he can again consider himself a member. It is not enough that Mr. Wells condescends to accept a nomination and a chance of election to an important office; that is merely an acceptance of a benefit from a party which he repudiated and spurned. Before he is entitled to be called a democrat he must in some way manifest his willingness to accept the party creed. He may be willing to have the party accept his principles, but not willing to accept the party's principles. He may think it humiliating to return to the party, but is it not more humiliating for the party to surrender to him?

The democratic party showed in the campaign of 1900 that it was ready to welcome any returning democrat, and it is doubtless just as ready now to extend a welcome to those who opposed the ticket in 1900, provided they express a willingness to accept the principles of the party and give some evidence of their intention to support the party's candidates in the future. The prodigal son is always well treated when he sees the error of his ways and rejoins the family, but he ought not to demand a deed to the house as a condition precedent to his return.

The nomination of Mr. Wells may, in St. Louis, be attributed to his private character or personal merits, but outside of St. Louis it is everywhere hailed as a triumph for the reactionary elements of the party.

The Louisville Courier-Journal says of it:

This action of the party in St. Louis (the democratic nomination of a "gold bug" for mayor) is evidence that the process of reunion is going on. It also shows how rapidly the silver issue is passing from public view in such an extreme democratic state as Missouri. It is a most auspicious indication of the decline in party strife and the return of the masses to the old leaders under whom it was led to victory in former years.

In the campaign of 1900 the democratic party stood for the Declaration of Independence and for industrial independence as well as for financial independence, and the democrats of St. Louis gave loyal support to the ticket. The republican party stood for an imperial policy and trust domination as well as for the gold standard, and Mr. Wells gave his influence to that party. The more prominent he was as a man and the more influence he had, the more valuable was his support to the

republican ticket and the greater the loss to the democratic cause. If Mr. Wells has changed his views, let him publicly announce his conversion to democratic principles and his sins, though they may be many, will be forgiven. Of course, if the conversion did not occur until after he made up his mind to seek the nomination for mayor, some might doubt the sincerity of the change, but so far he has failed to give even that much comfort to the democrats.

If Mr. Wells has undergone no change of opinion, what reason is there to doubt that he will use the influence of his office to defeat democratic congressmen in 1902, as he used his individual influence to defeat democratic congressmen in 1896, 1898, and 1900? Is there any reason to believe that the environment which led him out of the democratic party has lost its controlling influence over him? If he is the same man that he was in 1896, 1898 and 1900, official position will simply increase his power to do harm and weaken the party in its effort to overthrow republican doctrines.

Mr. Wells' nomination is a part of the plan of the reorganizers—national in its extent—to capture the organization by stealth and then make the democratic so much like the republican party that there will be little choice between them.

The democratic party now stands for definite principles and it aggressively opposes republican policies. The Kansas City platform embodies the principles of the party, and the rank and file of the party are attached to those principles. Those who oppose the Kansas City platform will not make an open fight against it—even Mr. Wells would not have been willing to risk a nomination on a platform repudiating the Kansas City platform—but under the pretense that success can be won under the leadership of the reorganizers, men are being pushed forward for local offices who have no sympathy with democratic principles.

The election of 1894 gave some indication of the fate which awaits the party if it becomes the tool of organized greed and bids only for the favor of the plutocratic element of the country. Democrats cannot afford to lose sight of democratic principles in their eagerness to secure a local victory, which, when secured, is nominal rather than real.



## A Good Amendment.

Judge Brewer of the United States Supreme Court, in a recent address, called attention to a defect in the jury system, viz., the requirement of a unanimous verdict. While in criminal cases the rule which gives the prisoner the benefit of a reasonable doubt makes it necessary to preserve the unanimous verdict, there is no reason for adhering to it in civil cases. California and Kentucky have already secured this reform, and it has been discussed in other states. Under the present requirement, a jury often reports to the judge that it cannot agree and is sent back with the instruction to remain in the jury room until an agreement is reached. In such cases it is little more than a test of endurance. The law should be amended so that two-thirds or three-fourths of a jury may render a verdict.

The New York World, in discussing the question, says that up to the time of Edward III. the English jury consisted of fifteen, eighteen or twenty, and that twelve were required to agree in a verdict. The unanimous verdict, it seems, is an innovation, and it has not been justified by experience.