

Monopoly and the Church.

A recent issue of the Pioneer-Press of St. Paul, one of the leading republican papers of the north-west, presents a dispatch under its "Pioneer-Press special service" telling of the deposing of Rev. Phillip E. Holp by the members of the Congregational church, at Angola, Ind. According to this dispatch, the Reverend Holp started a movement last spring to reduce the price of gasoline and kerosene by the organization of a local company. The Standard Oil company had been charging 13 cents per gallon for oil and gasoline, but as soon as the independent company received its supplies the trust cut the price to 9 cents in and around Angola. The dispatch goes on to say that many of the members of Mr. Holp's church are employed by the Standard Oil company, and that his friends claim that it was through the influence of this company that he was driven from the pulpit.

This is not the first instance in which the Standard Oil company has interfered in church matters. Henry D. Lloyd, in his book entitled "Wealth Against Commonwealth," tells how Mr. Matthews of Buffalo, an independent oil producer, was harassed in his church relationship because he insisted on prosecuting the Standard Oil company. On page 294 of the book above mentioned, it is stated that Matthews by his fight against the Standard Oil company reduced the price of oil from 12 and 18 cents to 6 cents per gallon. He was an officer in his church, but the wealthiest man in the congregation was an agent of the Standard Oil company, and received a salary of eighteen thousand dollars per year. He did not belong to the church, but was a member of the congregation, and was trustee and treasurer. He had recently taken the pastor of the church on an extended vacation trip to New England. When it came time for the election of church officers, the pastor called on Mr. Matthews and suggested to him that in view of the opposition that there was to him, and in view of what the newspapers had said about him, (corporation newspapers that had been belittling his efforts and ridiculing him), he had better not be a candidate for re-election. So Mr. Matthews dropped out and left the church to enjoy the pecuniary if not the spiritual support of its non-Christian, trust-fed trustee and treasurer.

Those who doubt that the vicious influence of private monopolies will finally debauch the church as it is now debauching the government, should read Lloyd's book, (published by Harper Bros., New York,) and especially Matthews' letter describing the persecution that followed his attempt to protect the people from the Standard Oil company. And yet there are papers so dominated by the great financial interests of the country that they spend more time describing the Sunday school work done by the Rockefeller family than they do in denouncing the un-Christian methods employed by the company from which the Rockefeller family derives its great wealth.

Will They Heed the Warning?

The Kenton County (O.) Press, edited by W. L. Finley, the democrat who introduced in the Ohio convention the resolution indorsing the Kansas City platform, has a lengthy editorial explaining the result in Ohio, and applying the lesson taught. After recalling the action of the Ohio convention, the turning down of the national platform and the prominence given to the men who had fought against the ticket, it asserts truly that "no democratic ticket ever had a better, more deserving candidate than Colonel Kilbourne." It thus explains the enormous stay-at-home vote:

In almost every school district of the state were loyal democrats who resented this treatment, who chafed at such betrayal. They loosed their memories and let them wander back to '96. They thought of men who bolted then and found that it was these same men who

had led the fight against the national platform at Columbus. Further, they found that the fellows who won at the state convention not only admitted, but boasted of their desertion in 1896 and that they had voted for McKinley or Palmer then.

What thoughts came to the minds of these men then? Read the returns.

They argued, "here are the fellows who voted against us in a national election or two repudiating my opinions, writing platforms and asking my support. They are not democrats. My democracy is better than theirs. I'll prove it. They voted the republican ticket when the platform did not suit them. I'll not vote at all when it does not suit me."

And all the persuasion and labor of local leaders could not disturb this conclusion. In almost every county committees worked with bound hands and gagged mouths. But the results of all their efforts were vain. The discontented cared not for the spoil of office. He was bent on rebuking his betrayers. And he did. All the wiles of local candidates could not get him to the polls to condone the injury his enemies had done him.

He stayed at home. Democratic counties tumbled into the republican column. Counties where democracy was thriving and growing and gaining were shoved back into the hopeless column.

It sounds well to say that the death of the president contributed to republican gains. But there were no republican gains. It was all, all democratic loss. Two weeks of campaigning was too short. Fudge. Two minutes were plenty of time to discuss all of the platform except the Johnson planks and they were tabooed outside of Cuyahoga. Discussion? Bah! Wasn't there discussion at Bucyrus? Weren't the crowd and the speakers there? Well, look up Crawford county's vote and see how great her democratic loss was.

The platform did it. Faithful democrats resented their treatment. But they did not do it as the gold men have done. The only query that can arise is, Which is the better democrat, the one who votes the republican ticket or the one who refuses to vote at all?

Will the lesson be learned? Will democracy regain its senses? Will it see in the light of experience the course to safety and to victory? Will it learn the virtues of steadfastness and consistency? We hope and believe that it will.

There is food for reflection in the opinion expressed by the Press. While the falling off in the vote was not entirely due to the silver democrats, it is doubtless largely due to them. The Commoner urged them to vote now and make their fight for the control of the next state convention, but there is a good deal of human nature in silver democrats as well as in gold democrats, and the result showed that a large number of those who had been active in preceding campaigns either felt that a victory won by an evasion of national issues would be more injurious to the party than a defeat; or, if they thought that defeat was inevitable, believed that a large adverse majority would be more serviceable to the party than a small one.

It is useless to argue that these democrats should have been loyal to the ticket. It is difficult to make men who have been loyal in the past feel that they should prove their loyalty by following the reorganizers who have been disloyal in the past. The result in Ohio indicates what will be the result if the reorganizing element obtains control of the party machinery. The question asked by the Press is a pertinent one. Will the "anything-to-win" democrats learn the lesson taught by the Ohio election? Will they see now what they ought to have seen before, that the party cannot win by the betrayal of the people? Will they learn now what they ought to have learned before, that an honest adherence to the interests of the masses of the people is expedient as well as right?

The Gold Stronghold Captured.

The readers of The Commoner know that in the campaign of 1896 the Palmer and Buckner ticket carried but one precinct in the United States, namely, Dudley township, in Haskell county, Kansas. The vote there stood: Palmer and Buckner, 3;

McKinley and Hobart, 2; Bryan and Sewall, 1. A reader of The Commoner sends in a statement signed by the county clerk of that county to the effect that Dudley township went democratic this year by a majority of seven.

The attention of the Chicago Chronicle, the New York World, the Louisville Courier-Journal and other gold standard papers is called to this fact. While they are "pointing with pride" to victories won by the reorganizers, let them "view with alarm" the recapture of this gold standard stronghold, which became so conspicuous five years ago.

The gold standard papers have magnified every victory which the reorganizers have won since 1896, now let them bow in humiliation over the sweeping defeat that has robbed them of the only precinct which their party has ever carried.

Ordinarily the change of a precinct would not be a matter of national significance, but the change of the only precinct that the Palmer and Buckner ticket carried is certainly a serious blow to the men who carried on that unique campaign of fraud and deception. The men who did the most talking for Palmer and Buckner voted the republican ticket, as did all whom they could secretly influence. The reorganizers are being led by those who either voted for the ticket that carried but one precinct, or pretended to support it while they voted the republican ticket. What will the democratic party be if they secure control of the organization? What promise of relief can the party give to the people at large if the policies of the party are controlled by bolters who have shown no repentance since 1896? What hope of victory can we have under the leadership of those who conducted the Palmer and Buckner party to so disastrous a defeat?

Beckham Replies to Durbin.

One of the most discreditable incidents in the history of the republican party is the effort of that party's official representatives to protect fugitives from justice, who are charged with the terrible crime of assassination. After pretending consideration of the demand for the surrender of Mr. Taylor to the Kentucky authorities, Governor Durbin of Indiana denied the requisition and addressed to the governor of Kentucky a long letter in which he expressed fear that Taylor would not be given a fair trial. Governor Beckham of Kentucky has made a dignified, manly, patriotic response to Governor Durbin's communication.

If there are some adjectives in Governor Beckham's letter, they are warranted by the serious condition with which the law-abiding citizens of Kentucky are confronted. If indignation is expressed in Governor Beckham's letter, it is amply justified by a condition wherein the governor of a great state like Indiana deliberately seeks to defend and protect fugitives from justice who are charged with participation in a murder, and whose only hope of escape seems to depend upon the political influence which they wield with high republican authorities.

Governor Beckham's letter is self-explanatory. It should be read by every citizen who objects to violence and who protests against assassination, regardless of the party or the individuals responsible for the wrong. The letter, as given by the Associated press, is as follows:

Frankfort, Kentucky.—Sir: Your refusal to honor the requisitions some time ago sent you by me, asking for the extradition of W. S. Taylor and Charles Finley, fugitives from justice from this state, charged with being accessories to the murder of William Goebel, was not unexpected, but the remarkable letter with which you accompanied the return of the papers was indeed a surprise to me, and I sincerely regret the necessity of this reply. It is true I had been reliably informed that you had incurred campaign obligations which committed you to the protection of these two valuable adjuncts to your political fortunes, and that they had been promised immunity