

ciples, but promised to return as soon as there was any attempt to surrender its creed. Mr. Williams can now take up the work again and with him as a leader it ought not to be difficult to put the Massachusetts democracy again on sound principles.

The reorganizers of Indiana made great boasts after their victory in the state convention. Well, the Sentinel had things its own way; it was in a position to have a controlling influence in the management of the campaign. It rejoiced over the elimination of every issue that was "dead" or even wounded and yet it has to mourn as large a republican majority as could have been polled against the Kansas City platform. The democrats of Indiana have lost the advantage of education along democratic lines; they have made it necessary to apologize for democratic timidity and now they have met with overwhelming defeat. Before they enter another campaign the democrats of Indiana should take their stand on the national platform of the party and try to earn a victory by deserving it.

In Illinois Mr. Hopkins, whose corporate connections make it impossible for him to feel any interest in the triumph of a real democracy, took charge of the party machinery and destroyed the party's chances at a time when republican dissensions gave a hope of victory.

In Wisconsin where the reorganizers dropped the money question to please the gold democrats and then dodged imperialism to please the corporation republicans who were alienated by La Follette's reform tendencies, the democratic party was badly defeated.

In Pennsylvania, where Patterson was nominated on a platform confined to state issues, the republicans rolled up an enormous majority, thus proving what ought not to need further proof, namely, that national issues cannot be ignored even in the presence of important state issues.

The same experiment was tried in Michigan with the same results.

In Minnesota the republican candidate for governor profited by his fight against the railroad merger and scored a victory against the splendid democrat who led the democratic ticket. Ex-Governor Lind, by his personal popularity, saved the Minneapolis district to the democratic party.

In Colorado, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Idaho and other western states the people were originally republican; they were driven away from that party by its position on the money question, but many of them have been drawn back by the improved conditions which have followed an increase in the world's supply of gold, and the gold democratic papers have furnished them an excuse by constantly boasting that the reorganizers had captured the democratic party—the two factions of the gold party thus working together in the interest of the republican party as in 1896.

The fight in Ohio attracted wide-spread attention because of the prominent part taken in it by Mayor Tom Johnson of Cleveland. The opposition of John R. McLean and the treachery of the Cincinnati machine increased the republican majority, but Johnson has too much confidence in the justice of his cause to accept this defeat as final. He has already renewed his declaration of war and will yet win his fight for a more equitable distribution of the burdens of taxation.

Cleveland Again.

Ex-President Cleveland has again emerged from his seclusion and volunteered his advice to his former political associates. As usual, his speech gave more delight to the republicans than to the democrats. Ignoring the stealthy schemes of the financiers and the insidious encroachments of imperialism, he urged tariff reform and anti-trust legislation as the only issues before the country, but how could he be so obtuse as to think that his argument would strengthen the democratic posi-

tion? He was president when the democrats had a chance to secure tariff reform and to destroy the trusts, but he did not help to do either. In his message of 1887 he did not discuss the principles involved in a high tariff; he simply called attention to the injustice of unnecessary taxation. When he sought a second nomination (after declaring against a second term in his first letter of acceptance) he gave an ante-convention indorsement to a platform which surrendered the democratic position on the tariff question. In 1892 the platform which came into the convention with his approval was so flimsy and ambiguous that the convention repudiated it and adopted a much stronger tariff reform plank than he desired. After the victory was won he refused to call an extra session of congress to take up the subject, and began at once to coerce his party into the acceptance of a republican financial policy. Even when congress met in regular session and agreed upon a bill—a very poor one, but the best that could be secured at the time—he not only refused to sign it, but gave out a letter condemning it. The inconsistency between what he now says on the tariff question and what he has done, is so glaring that he only brings ridicule upon the party when he poses as a special champion of a low tariff.

But his reference to the trust question was even more unfortunate, for he not only did nothing to destroy the trusts, but the campaign fund in 1892 was so largely contributed by the corporations that his administration was mortgaged to them.

Why, it may be asked, should these facts be recalled at this time? Why not rejoice that Mr. Cleveland talks in favor of a few democratic policies, even though his record is out of harmony with his words? Because he represents that element in the democratic party which once betrayed the people into the hands of the money changers, and until he brings forth fruits meet for repentance his active support of a ticket throws suspicion upon the candidates and alienates more voters than his arguments can win. The rank and file know that he was false to his party pledges and that his subserviency to Wall street terminated what might have been a long era of democratic supremacy. Had he taken the people's side of the money question, as Jackson did, he would have driven the republican party out of power for a generation; but instead of doing that he alienated the real friends of democracy and then led the corporation element out of the party. As a church organization is weakened rather than strengthened by members whose lives give the lie to their professions, so the democratic cause is retarded rather than advanced by men who loudly proclaim their adherence to democratic principles and yet repudiate those principles when in office. A principle exemplified in the life is worth several on the tongue, and the distinguished ex-president's political principle are purely lingual.

Organize for 1904.

In the late campaign the democracy in some places tried the experiment of ignoring the democratic national platform with a view to "harmonizing" the party. This plan was proposed by those who, by aiding to elect a republican president, became responsible for the evils which they now seek to cure, but these alone would have been powerless but for the aid of regular democrats, some of whom were tempted to waive their principles for a promise of success, and some of whom were willing to allow the reorganizers to learn by experience that it does not pay to run from the party creed and court enemies instead of friends.

But whatever the excuse it can no longer do service. Whenever the reorganizers have had control they have been unable to secure official postage, even where they have been willing to trade their birthright for it.

The voters have refused to be deceived by the gold-plated democracy and those who have advo-

cated an "anything-to-win" policy can no longer offer loaves and fishes in return for support. Defeat is no disgrace; every election brings defeat to one party. And those who believe that they are right suffer no humiliation if a majority is recorded on the other side; but when men are inspired only by hope of success and then fail, they die without prospect of resurrection.

Those who accept the Kansas City platform as the party creed and labor to carry its principles into effect are neither dismayed nor disheartened by the reverses of 1902. They are battling for financial and industrial independence; they are trying to call the nation back to ancient and honorable ideals. They are not responsible for what others do or leave undone, but as for themselves they prefer to go down with their convictions rather than surrender to the commercialism that now dominates the republican party.

It is now time to organize for 1904. In every state where the reorganizers are in control of the party machinery a league should be formed within the party for the avowed purpose of holding the party to its principles. The fight should be made at the primaries where the voters speak for themselves. Honest principles should be advanced by honest methods, and the only honest way of settling a question is to leave it to the people themselves. Let the Kansas City platform democrats get together in each precinct and county and form themselves into a league for the defense and propagation of democratic principles. Those who are working for a common purpose should know each other and be strengthened and encouraged by communion together.

An Emphatic Reminder.

During his campaign as democratic candidate for congress from a New York city district, William R. Hearst made use of an illustration that should be carefully studied by the administrative authorities at Washington. Mr. Hearst said:

"There were 16,000 good, brave American soldiers at Santiago, and Mr. Roosevelt was one of them. Now, I wish to cite the behavior of those American soldiers at Santiago as an example of what Americans do when they mean business. Of those American soldiers, regiment after regiment was armed with old-fashioned, out-of-date, worthless Springfield muskets. And opposed to them was regiment after regiment of Spaniards armed with the best and most destructive weapons of modern warfare—the Mauser rifles. Did our boys hang back and refuse to fight? Did they spend their time devising reasons for not going into battle? Did they sit down and say they would wait a few years for a constitutional shipment of Mauser rifles from Washington?"

"They did not. They took their old-fashioned, out-of-date Springfield muskets, and they fought the Spaniards with them, and they whipped the Spaniards with them.

"Now, my friends, when your political soldiers, your representatives, your senators, and your president, are as anxious to fight the trusts as our boys at Santiago were to fight the Spaniards, they will take the legal and political weapons they have at hand, and they will whip the trusts with them—and you will not have to wait for a constitutional amendment."

This is a complete answer to those who claim that we must wait for constitutional amendments to give us relief from trust exactions. While waiting for constitutional amendments the trusts will be growing stronger and more exacting, and fortifying their position against any onslaught of constitutional writ.

The way to fight the trusts is to make use of the weapons now at our command, and keep on using them to the utmost while looking about for weapons that promise to be more effective.

Interesting Statistics.

Bulletin No. 42 of the department of labor contains some valuable and startling statistics con-