

tion in the assurance that if the democratic party will adopt a steady adherence to republican policies, it may "earn the right to a larger participation in the affairs of government." Perhaps this "larger participation" will consist of the privilege of fat offices and of productive special privileges to be bestowed upon a few individual democrats who succeed in transforming the democratic party so that it will not be a serious rival to the republican party.

The comments of the Kansas City Journal upon Mr. Ryan's article ought to be read by every democrat who has pride in his party. It must be evident to such democrats that the effort to reorganize the party along republican lines must be defeated if the principles for which the democracy is presumed to stand are preserved.

When democrats read in a republican paper the confession that "with scarcely any modification," the reorganizers' presentation of issues "could be adopted bodily into the republican national platform without doing violence to the views of that party," then they must realize the importance of protecting democracy's temple.

No time is to be lost in the work of organization. Democrats who do not desire to declare as a truth the falsehood that the democratic party has been wholly wrong and that the republican party has been wholly right, will not enlist under the banners of those who would republicanize the democratic party.

In every precinct throughout the United States democrats who believe in democratic principles should organize for the fight that is now on. It is important that no man be chosen as a delegate to a democratic convention who may not be depended upon to faithfully represent the will of the rank and file.

The Commoner will upon application furnish a form of constitution and membership blanks to all who contemplate the organization of democratic clubs; and when these clubs are established, they should be reported to The Commoner for the information and encouragement of others.

"Much Cry and Little Wool."

The Des Moines (Ia.) Register and Leader, a republican paper, attaches considerable importance to an article written by an Iowa reorganizer, which article is entitled "How to Win." This reorganizer says that he would prefer to see the democrats lose the next national contest "in issues based on prosperity than win on a tempest of calamity howling."

Just what is meant by "calamity howling" may be better understood when it is known that this reorganizer says that in 1900 the democrats made "an unjustifiable warfare on capital, trusts, and corporations." He declares that "the broad and unreasoning denunciation of trusts and corporations will not help the party which indulges in such weapons." He admits that there are "bad trusts" and says that the party should "crush the bad trusts" and yet he hastens to add:

"But no party will retain the confidence and support of the country by attacking every trust which dares show its head. And when it comes to selecting for slaughter the objectionable trusts, the trusts which do more harm than good, the trusts which have no friends, it will be found that there has been much cry and little wool."

This is a fair exposition of the reorganizers' position on the trust question, although all of them are not so frank in stating their views as this particular Iowa reorganizer is. Admitting that there are bad trusts and saying that the party ought to crush the bad trusts, this reorganizer sounds a warning that "when it comes to selecting for slaughter the objectionable trusts, the trusts which do more harm than good, the trusts which have no friends, it will be found that there has been much cry and little wool."

Is it not fair to say if the reorganizers' plans, as interpreted by this particular Iowan, were carried out, that the democratic party would not wage a serious warfare against the trust system? Can any one detect important difference between the republican attitude toward trusts and the attitude of the reorganizers as defined by the Iowa gentleman? Is there not in their pretended plans for curbing the trusts "much cry and little wool?"

Marplots.

The Philadelphia Public Ledger, a paper that may be depended upon to support republican candidates, refers to democrats who give faithful support to the national platform as "bourbons and marplots." That same paper insists that "if the democratic party is to have the slightest chance of success in the next national campaign, or if it is even to make a respectable showing at the polls," it must follow the men who in the opinion of the Public Ledger "were wise and honest and courageous enough to refuse to support the mischievous heresies of Bryanism as they were promulgated as the party's creed at Chicago and Kansas City." The Public Ledger refers to the men who bolted the democratic ticket in 1896 and in 1900 as "the shrewdest and best democrats in the country."

The Public Ledger has never been known to manifest genuine concern for the welfare of the democratic party; and democrats generally will not accept as a fact, upon the mere statement of a republican paper, that those who supported the democratic ticket and were faithful to democratic principles are "bourbons and marplots," while those who gave aid and encouragement to the enemy, who repudiated the platform when it merely explicitly stated the things for which the democratic party has always claimed to stand, were "the shrewdest and best democrats in the country."

It is not, in the least, surprising that republican papers like the Public Ledger should conclude that "the shrewdest and best democrats in the country" are those who support the republican ticket and embrace the policies of the Hannas, while the "bourbons and marplots" are those who support the democratic ticket and defend the principles of Jefferson.

Why Not Freight Ships?

The president is urging a larger navy under pretense that we need it to enforce the Monroe doctrine. No nation is likely to assail that doctrine, but if we need more ships, why not build transport ships? When the war with Spain broke out we had to buy a lot of vessels of doubtful value and pay for them at a high price. Why not build a few vessels that can be used for transport service in time of war and for merchandise in time of peace? With such vessels our government could establish lines between our seaports and the seaports of South and Central America. They would give experience to our officers and seamen, establish communication with the countries whose rights we guard, improve mail and freight facilities and at the same time give us vessels that can, in time of need, be added to our fleet? Why not? This would be a far more useful expenditure of public money than that which the president contemplates.

Too Much Confidence.

In an interview with a representative of the New York World, James J. Hill, the railroad magnate, says: "We are coming to a grave industrial reverse. It is hard to tell just when it will come, but it is approaching. It may come next presidential year, and the result of it will depend largely upon who is nominated for president. The

fact that money was hard last fall was a check on the wild speculation in manufacturing securities, and no doubt postponed the reverse which is destined to overtake us. There seems to be too much confidence in the ability of the country to walk right ahead of all other countries in manufacturing. The country can do it, but not without trouble, and not without changing its present course. It is indeed a grave crisis we are approaching, although few seem to appreciate it. A few years may see the closing of many factories and the throwing out of work of hundreds of thousands of men. We have been reaping the harvest, and the reverse is coming. How quickly we recover from it will depend largely on who is at the head of the country when the break comes."

A few years ago we were told that the trouble with this country was lack of confidence. Now Mr. Hill tells us that there seems to be too much confidence. The Washington correspondent of the Chicago Tribune also says that there is "too much prosperity."

It is all very perplexing to ordinary people, and yet we may be consoled by the fact that Mr. Hill intimates that if the right kind of a man is nominated for president in 1904 all will be well. It is not difficult, by the way, to understand what Mr. Hill means by "the right kind of a man."

"An Item for Reflection."

Forman, Ford & Co., of Minneapolis, have sent out to their customers a postal card containing the following suggestions under the head, "An Item for Reflection":

"If there was no duty to be paid on imported plate glass, based on today's market, an ordinary store front would cost \$100 f. o. b. Minneapolis. The same store front, with the present tariff added costs \$275, the consumer being obliged to pay \$175 extra for duty, which is the 'protection' given the 'trust.' As plate glass is manufactured entirely by machines, no skilled labor entering therein, (and machines are operated about as cheap in America as in Europe), it must be clear to any one that the 'trust' is not entitled to such enormous and unreasonable 'protection' as it has at present at the expense of the consumers of plate glass."

It certainly is worthy of reflection, and yet there are republicans who will assure without further argument that the tariff is necessary and that the country would go to ruin were it not for the power of the trusts to extort from the people.

Chandler Still Talks Silver.

Ex-Senator W. E. Chandler in a letter to the Washington Post insists that the only way to enable China to pay her indemnity to the United States, England and France is for these nations to remonetize silver, and he suggests a new ratio of 20 to 1. He says:

"Silver is the metallic money of more than half the human race and has been slowly sinking towards its value as a metal only and not as money; as gold would so fall if it were demonetized. Four thousand millions of silver is becoming, has practically become, merchandise instead of money which it had been from the dawn of civilization down to 1873. This demonetization is bringing poverty and distress to half the people on the globe. Remonetize and the misery will cease and China can easily pay."

"Moreover it is best for the United States to be wise in time. When the present bubble of fictitious capitalization, exaggerated values and inflated currency bursts and a money panic follows, there will be a mad rush for the only real money; that which is made of metal; and that money has been reduced one-half in quantity during the last third of a century."

"To lessen the evils of these bad times coming, silver should be remonetized by a renewed consensus of the nations."

It would be as easy to secure international bimetallicism at 16 to 1 as it would be at 20 to 1; 16 to 1 would not require any change in the present coins, while 20 to 1 would. However, it is refreshing to find a republican who appreciates the importance of the restoration of silver even if he does get four points off on the ratio.