

The Commoner.

express his sympathy with the Republic's President on the ground that it might be construed as an expression of preference between two friendly powers that are now at war. It happened that the Queen of England died while this war was in progress and no words of eulogy were too strong for our President to convey across the water by way of assuring the English people that we sympathized with them in their great loss.

How then does it happen that although the President of a small republic is staggering under the greatest load that can fall upon a man no word of sympathy has reached him from the President of the greatest republic on earth.

How does it happen that although the President of this great republican government loses no time in expressing sympathy with kings and emperors, that he utterly ignores the opportunity to express sympathy with the president of a republic?

It is true that the mother of the German Emperor possessed "noble qualities." These did "endear her memory to the American people, exactly as the memory of any good woman is endeared to any good people. But the wife of Paul Kruger possessed "noble qualities." She made sacrifices which the good mother of the German Emperor was never called upon to make. She showed heroic devotion to her husband and to her country which the good mother of the German Emperor never had an opportunity to display. She died a prisoner of war, held a prisoner of war by the representatives of an empire, and her life was sacrificed because of her devotion to the principles which in the past we have been fond of calling "American principles."

And yet the President of this republic has no word of comfort to give to the President of the South African republic; he has no word of consolation to offer to the stricken people of the South African republic; he has no tribute to pay to the "noble qualities" of one of the most heroic figures in the history of the world—for the wife of Paul Kruger was an heroic figure.

But it cannot be doubted that the American people, regardless of political prejudice, do entertain for President Kruger the most sincere sympathy in the hour of his bereavement; and they do entertain for the memory of his beloved wife that high and endearing respect which is due from a people who have lived and profited by a great principle to any man or woman who has suffered and died because of devotion to that same principle.

Mr. McKimley missed an opportunity when he permitted the time to pass away without giving expression to American sympathy for the bereaved President of the South African Republic.

It is entirely proper that we should have tears and love for the stricken people of a monarchy; but should we not also have love and tears for the stricken people of a republic?

Why Ostracise the Best?

The loyal democrats who have borne the burden of recent campaigns and who have made pecuniary sacrifice to support demo-

cratic principles ought to learn something of the meaning of reorganization by running over the list of suggested presidential candidates. Among the men who supported the democratic ticket in 1896 and in 1900 (not because of party regularity but because of conviction) were some of the best, bravest and truest democrats ever known and yet none of them are mentioned in connection with the presidency. The reorganizers want "harmony" and their method of securing it is to place under the ban all who believe in the creed of the party as promulgated by recent national conventions. The reorganizers consider three things essential to "success," viz., first, the abandonment of the Kansas City platform; second, the nomination of candidates who do not believe in that platform and, third, the selection of a national committee composed of men who either opposed the ticket in 1896 or gave it passive support. Why ostracise the best men in the party? Why place a premium on disloyalty?

Hearing from the Voters.

At the Democratic convention recently held in the 33d Ohio Senatorial District the following resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, That the democracy of the Thirty-third Ohio senatorial district in convention assembled do most emphatically indorse the national platform adopted at Kansas City in 1900 and the state platform adopted at Columbus in 1901; and be it further

Resolved, That the nominee of this convention be and he is hereby instructed and pledged to support no man for United States senator who is not and who has not been a faithful and consistent exponent of each and every declaration of democratic faith enunciated by said platforms and who will not pledge himself unequivocally to use every honorable means to secure the enactment of said declarations into law.

Let the good work go on. The voters are being heard from and their voice is for democratic principles, pure and undefiled.

United States senators ought to be elected by a direct vote of the people but until that reform is accomplished members of the state legislature should be chosen with a view to their vote in the senatorial contest, and instructions are always proper. It is to be hoped that other districts will follow the example set by the Democrats of the 33d.

Inexcusable Misrepresentation.

The New York World seems to love darkness rather than light. The following paragraph states what the World has ample reason to know is a misrepresentation. It says:

"It is rather a pity that Mr. Bryan has discouraged the threatened bolt of the 16 to 1 lunatics in Ohio. It would have been interesting to see the simon-pure Chicago and Kansas City platform democrats of that state stand up to be counted this year on a bolt, with the full approval of their 'matchless leader.' But Mr. Bryan is too shrewd a politician to give the sanction of his name to such a test. He is now a great stickler for regularity, though he supported the Weaver electoral ticket in 1892, and in the elections of the three following years, including the important congressional election of 1894, he repudiated the sound-money plank of the national democratic platform of 1892."

It is a well known fact that the Democratic

National Committee, acting in the interests of Mr. Cleveland, advised the Democrats of several western states to vote for the populist electors in order to take the states out of the republican column, it being impossible to elect the Democratic ticket. In this way Kansas, Colorado, Nevada and Idaho were taken from the Republicans and the Republican majority in Nebraska reduced to about four thousand (it gave a republican majority of nearly thirty thousand in 1888.) A man ought not to be called irregular when he follows the instruction of the national committee. It might be added that although Mr. Bryan tried to help Mr. Cleveland in 1892, Mr. Cleveland helped the Republican party in 1896, while Mr. Weaver supported Mr. Bryan.

The World is also in error as to the platform of 1892. It contained the following plank: "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 discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage." Some qualifying words were added for use in the eastern states but the above declaration in favor of the double standard was used to hold the democrats of the South and West in line. The principle of bimetalism was repudiated by Mr. Cleveland and his cabinet was made up of gold standard advocates. When it became evident that the party had been betrayed by its leaders, an organization was formed within the party—not to repudiate the platform of 1892, but to give to it an honest interpretation. The platform of 1896 (the silver plank) was not different in principle from the platform of 1892, but was free from ambiguity. It was in harmony with the party's record in congress until Mr. Cleveland used the patronage of his high office to force through a Republican measure—the unconditional repeal bill, and even then he could not secure a majority of his party to approve of his veto of the Seigniorage bill.

The financiers wrote the platform of 1892 to deceive the people and trusted Mr. Cleveland to betray his constituents. In 1896 the party clung to democratic principles and repudiated the construction which Mr. Cleveland had placed on the preceding platform. These facts are known to the readers of the World and ought to be to the editor.

Practical Respect For Ancestors.

On December 22, 1820, at Plymouth, Daniel Webster delivered an address. One year later John Adams, referring to this address, said: "This oration will be read 500 years hence with as much rapture as it was heard. It ought to be read at the end of every century, and indeed at the end of every year forever and forever."

Five hundred years have not yet rolled away since Webster delivered this oration. Indeed not 100 years have passed by, and yet even at this time it is doubtful if this address would be listened to with "as much rapture as it was heard."

John Adams spoke well when he said that this address should be read at the end of every