

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 also their moral condition, both favor their liberty."

Who Wrote It?

"These are words of weighty import. They involve consequences of the most momentous character. I take leave to say that if the principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system of government will be the result. We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional liberty guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era of legislative absolutism."

Here is a serious charge brought against the majority of the Supreme Court of the United States. The court is accused of bringing about a "change in our system of government"—not only a change but "radical and mischievous" change. It is charged that in the event of that decision—and the decision was made—"constitutional liberty" would be lost and "an era of legislative absolutism ushered in."

What graver indictment could be brought against our highest judicial tribunal? Who wrote it? Who is guilty of thus reflecting upon the patriotism and purpose of the court? Let the republican papers ferret out the culprit and visit condign punishment upon him. Let him feel the righteous wrath of those pure and immaculate souls who always bow to a court decision (when it is on their side), and never utter a reflection against a judge (unless he decides against them).

Who wrote the words above quoted? Did they emanate from a demagogue; was this the wail of a defeated candidate; was it the speech of some disturber of the peace—some stirrer up of discontent?

No, the words will be found in a dissenting opinion of a justice of the supreme court of the United States of America. A democratic justice? No. A populist justice? No. A silver republican justice? No.

What then? They are the words of a republican justice of the supreme court—Justice Harlan—appointed by a republican president.

Hereafter, when republican papers desire to condemn those who criticise a supreme court decision, let them begin at the top and assail Justice Harlan first. After they have administered to him the rebuke which he, from their standpoint, deserves, they will be too much exhausted to attack those who quote Justice Harlan against the court.

Let the Dispatch Answer.

The Pittsburg Dispatch is very much disturbed because the editor of THE COMMONER is "egotistic" enough to differ from the Supreme Court.

Why does the Dispatch single me out for condemnation? Why does it not criticise the four Supreme Judges who had the temerity to

dissent from the majority? Why does it not castigate Justice Harlan for saying that the decision marks the beginning of an "era of legislative absolutism"?

If the editor of The Dispatch desires employment that will last during the heated term, let him try to answer the following questions: Is a constitution a good thing for the people of the United States? If he answers "No" he attacks constitutional liberty. If he answers "Yes", then let him answer the second question,—why is a constitution good for the people of the United States but not good for the people of Porto Rico?

These two questions look easy, but he cannot answer them to his own satisfaction or to the satisfaction of his readers. Therefore, he will content himself with scolding those who refuse to accept the court's decision as binding upon a great political question. But those questions will have to be answered.

Be Vigilant!

Several states hold elections this fall and these elections will have an important bearing upon the party as well as upon the nation.

The reorganizing element is seeking to secure control of the party; it does not openly proclaim its hostility to the Kansas City platform, nor does it propose a platform for the consideration of the voters.

Its plan of operation is to put forward candidates for the party organization who are not in harmony with the principles or purposes of the party. They work under cover of a desire for harmony, but it is the harmony which the burglar desires when he hopes that the members of the family will not awake until the valuables are removed from the house. The democratic party has no reason for existence except as it champions the rights and interests of the masses.

It has made its recent campaigns, beginning with 1896, almost without money and yet the party has polled a larger vote than it ever polled when it had a large campaign fund. It can secure a campaign fund again whenever the leaders of the party make secret pledges to the corporations, but these pledges will not be made by leaders whom the people trust.

If the men who deserted the party in 1896 or in 1900 are put at the head of the party before they give evidence of a change of heart they will drive more voters away from the party than they will bring to it.

The rank and file of the democratic party can respect an honest republican who calls himself a republican, but they will not respect a dishonest republican who calls himself a democrat. The democratic party has adopted a patriotic platform; it has asserted the right of the American people to have a financial policy of their own, to have industrial independence among the people and constitutional government wherever the flag floats. If the party will stand firm it can expect victory whenever the people realize the dangerous tendency of republican policies. But if the democratic party passes under the control of men who are in harmony with republican ideas the party will be in no position to appeal to the confi-

dence of the people. If republican policies are good the republican party has a right to administer them, and it should be permitted to enjoy the protection of its copyright. Those who believe in democratic principles as set forth in the Kansas City platform must be vigilant and that vigilance must begin with the primaries. Do not allow a man to be placed upon any committee, precinct, county, state or national, unless he is a believer in the Kansas City platform. If a man opposed to the Kansas City platform is sent as a delegate to any convention he should be bound by instructions and should have associated with him a sufficient majority who are sound on the platform. If a man objects to instructions, leave him at home; no democratic delegate will object to an expression from the voters whom he seeks to represent.

Chandler Locates the Hero.

The republican national platform in 1896 declared in favor of international bimetallism, and referring to this used the language, "Which we pledge ourselves to promote." One year ago, William E. Chandler, then a senator from the state of Vermont, offered a reward of \$100 to the delegate to the republican convention at St. Louis who inserted the words: "Which we promise to promote."

Mr. Chandler has discovered that these words were interlined in the concluding draft of the platform in the handwriting of Senator Lodge of Massachusetts. Mr. Chandler has therefore sent to Senator Lodge his check for \$100., accompanying the same with a letter from which this extract is taken:

"By reason of the premises you should without hesitancy accept the one hundred dollars as rightfully your money. All wise men know that McKinley and Hobart would not have been elected if the platform had not, while declaring opposition to the free coinage of silver, except as the result of an international agreement, also declared that the republican party favored such an international agreement if it could be secured. If McKinley and Hobart had not been elected in 1896, Mr. McKinley would not have been re-elected in 1900.

"Therefore those six words were of priceless value, and I trust that when all the facts are known my humble offering of one hundred dollars will be supplemented by such generous donations, not only from many members of the republican party, but as well from democrats who have so much trembled at every prospect of the election of Mr. Bryan as to adequately recognize the sagacity and courage which led you not merely to conceive, but to actually insert into the platform of 1896 concerning bimetallism the words 'which we pledge ourselves to promote.'

"That immortal declaration twice made Mr. McKinley president, and the fidelity with which the pledge has been fulfilled the world knows."

The Washington Times commenting upon this letter makes an interesting analysis as follows:

"The peculiar significance and value of this letter lie in the extreme probability that every statement contained in it is literally true. That this pledge was inserted to conciliate the silver men in the republican party and hold them to the support of Mr. McKinley is beyond any question. That it was

A Bit of Vermont Sarcasm.

Deliberate Hypocrisy.