

Weekly Press Forum

Rockville (Ind.) Tribune: That big democratic picnic at Chicago ought to satisfy even the plutocratic press where the "rank and file" stand.

Jerseyville (Ill.) News: All democrats should understand that the reorganizer plea is nominally for harmony and in reality for the republican party.

Hastings (Mich.) Journal: The republican press is again nominating democratic candidates for the presidency. They are getting a lot of fun out of it, too.

Rochester (Ind.) Sentinel: Democrats who do not want to win and republicans who do not want the democrats to win are talking in favor of Grover Cleveland.

Langdon (N. D.) Courier-Democrat: Senator Hanna says he would join the Salvation Army and go to preaching if he had time. The senator is a good deal like "the rich young man" of the Bible. He hates to let go.

Jonesburg (Mo.) Journal: Republican papers are very busy these days bringing "good men" to the front for places on the democratic ticket. When the democrats choose their standard-bearers, the republicans' wishes will not be consulted.

Eureka (Ill.) Democrat-Journal: Republican papers cite the fact that the government has taken a hundred million from the people more than it needs, by exorbitant taxes, as an evidence of "prosperity." Any old thing seems to go for an argument in that camp.

Fairbury (Neb.) Journal: The two most prominent candidates for president on the democratic side are Wm. R. Hearst and Tom Johnson. The Journal could support either of them on the proper platform, but we want no Dave Hill or Grover Cleveland or Arthur Pue Gorman.

Westmoreland (Pa.) Democrat: The absolute subserviency of the republican party to Quayism has been demonstrated by the fact that, thus far, not a single republican county convention, in Pennsylvania, has had the independence or courage to condemn the unconstitutional and infamous press-gag law.

Bloomfield (Ind.) Democrat: When democrats quit bidding against the republicans for monopolistic favor the day of their triumph is in sight. There is a big majority of the American people who believe in democratic principles. All they want is a party that will fight for them, and they will get together.

Bowling Green (O.) Democrat: Grover Cleveland is to publicly open his presidential campaign with a speech at a Commercial club banquet at Chicago in October. Pshaw! The gall of some persons is amazing. The democrats of the country have no use for G. C.—but perhaps it is a republican nomination he is after, as his political affiliations for some years past would indicate.

Sigourney (Ia.) Review: Let us see, it was President Roosevelt who recommended publicity as a cure for trusts. The president believed that by compelling those combinations to make public their transactions it would act as a sort of "cure all" for the disease. It is noticeable that the same physician has recommended and enforced secrecy as the remedy for the postal outrages that have been in vogue during his administration. It seems to make a difference whose affairs are to be made public as to the efficacy of the medicine.

Clinton (Ill.) Register: In the future the letters g. o. p., used by the republican party, will be transposed and read p. o. g.—post office grab.

Lewisburg (W. Va.) Independent: The tariff plank in the republican platform of Iowa is a mere juggle of words that makes no positive declaration and simply means nothing. It declares that if any schedule is too high, it should be reduced, and if any schedule is too low it should be increased. Any fool could write a plank like that.

Portsmouth (O.) Times: We have not yet heard of Roosevelt threatening to send around minions and shut down business entirely at Evansville because the whites are driving all the blacks out of the town. Neither do we see a certain class of papers projecting such thunderous editorials against the Hoosiers for their bloody exhibition of race prejudice. With some people the location of a crime is far more heinous than the crime itself.

New Bloomfield (Pa.) Democrat: The question now being asked is, What has become of the "Iowa idea?" It seems to have "gone glimmering like a schoolboy's dream, the wonder of an hour." After all the beating of tom toms and sounding of hew gags anent this "Iowa idea" the platform adopted by the Iowa republicans was a straddle and a fake on the tariff reform and revision question and all the analysis of it on earth could make nothing else out of it.

Monmouth (Ill.) Democrat: The fact that Grover Cleveland has accepted an invitation to speak before the Chicago Commercial club this fall, and the further fact that a number of his old political friends and allies are also invited to attend the meeting, is taken as evidence that his "corpulency" has really designs on the presidency again, and there is much stir in political circles in consequence. We are not a prophet, but predict that the "auto" that fetches Grover in the presidential ring in 1904, will be so badly punctured that both it and the only living ex-president will look worse than a Mexican dollar does to a gold bug, before the finish.

Lowell (Mich.) Ledger: The presidency of the United States is too great a temptation for mortal man. No matter how great or good a president may be or how lofty his purposes when first installed, he very soon begins to lay his plans for reelection, always at a sacrifice of principle. Cleveland was not proof against it, nor is Roosevelt. What has come of the latter's bluff against the trusts? What is the trouble with the postoffice fraud investigations? Why this "hushing up" of the scandals? What of the demand for tariff reform, as expressed by McKinley in his last speech, and as echoed by Roosevelt on his accession to the presidency? Only the overmastering desire for another term furnishes the answer. The presidential term should be extended to six years and the president made ineligible for re-election. Then the people would get the best there is in a man of mind and conscience. For, having nothing further to expect of public preferment, the president would be independent of the rascals and enemies of good government, who always swarm around one who has fat offices to give out, like flies around a molasses barrel. The instituting of this reform, together with the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people, would work wonders for the public good. Let us hope to see them both enacted.

THE COMMON PEOPLE

(Continued from Page 5.)

"therefore, the sense of hearing of the grasshopper is in its legs."

That the common people do respond to appeals to right, is a historic fact. All down the highway of history you find its landmarks. Go back to Palestine, go back to the days when the man of Galilee preached through that far eastern country, when the doctrines of truth, of righteousness and love, echoed among the hills of Palestine, and who was it that heard him? They all heard him. But the common people heard him gladly. It was not the remorganizers, it was not the Pharisees that heard him gladly. It was the common people.

Come down a little later. When printing was invented, and when the powers that ruled in those times tried to suppress it, what was it that brought printing out into the open and made it spread ideas of truth and justice all over the world? The demands of the common people, the desires of the common people; it was they that welcomed printing, and with it all the knowledge that printing was capable of spreading over the earth.

Come down a little farther, a little nearer to our own times. Who were the people that followed Cromwell? Who were the people that gave us the British constitution, which has in it so much of what is best in popular government? Who was it that rose up under Cromwell's leadership and made that constitution possible? It was the common people of England.

And now turn to this Declaration of Independence that we have heard read here today. A century and a quarter ago on this very day—we have the evidence of it in letters from aristocrats of Philadelphia, living there at the time, which tell how a mob of the common people, these letters call them a mob of common people, how that mob of the common people listened for the first time to the reading of this grand old document. The first time it was ever read in public, it was the common people who welcomed it. The aristocrats sneered at them and at it and held aloof. Their own private letters of that day tell us that all the respectable people, they called them the respectable people, stayed away on that historic occasion. It was the common people of that day who welcomed the Declaration of Independence, as it is the common people who welcome it now.

Then if you come down a little farther still, when Jefferson in 1800 appealed to the common people against the aggressions of the aristocrats of that time, the common people responded to him. Half a century later there was another call for the common people. As the democratic party which Jefferson had given birth to became demoralized by the slavocracy of this later period, a new democracy sprung up. It was the democracy of Abraham Lincoln. It could not call itself "democratic" because there was already a trade mark on that name. So it went back to the days of Jefferson for a name and took the original trade mark of Jefferson's party. He had not named his party democratic; he had named it republican. Therefore the new democracy of the fifties called itself republican, and the common people of that time flocked to it. A few years more and this newer democracy had lost its democratic moorings. I am not talking politics, my friends; I am simply referring you to history. There came a later time, I say, when the spirit of democracy felt that it had been driven out of the new home that Abraham Lincoln had made for it, and then it appeared in another place and the common people responded to a newer democratic leadership.

So we have in this country the response of the common people to appeals to right, to the clarion of true

democracy, not only in 1776, and in 1800, and in 1860, but also in 1896. (Applause.) The common people did not win in 1896. That was a lost battle in a war that is not yet ended. But they did respond. And the other people kept away—as they did in Palestine, as they did in Philadelphia, as they did in Jefferson's day, as they did in Lincoln's time. The common people responded to the new democratic leadership of 1896; and although they lost the battle then, and may lose battles in the future, there will be a glorious victory yet to crown the work of this new inspiration of democracy.

Many who did not understand the call in 1896 are finding out—not exactly what they missed, for they could not very well realize that—but what they have got. It is written large in the story of the trusts. Look at these trusts all over the country. See how they are absorbing every interest. By the way, did you ever hear a definition of the trust? I suppose you have. Everybody seems to have his own definition. But I have found a pretty good definition in a set of verses. Maybe it isn't a definition either, but at any rate it is a suggestion as to the character of the trust. These verses are called the song of the Nancy Bell, or something like that. I suppose most of you have read it. It is a quaint story in rhyme of a ship-wrecked crew on a barren island. No succor came and they had to get food by killing off one another and turning cannibals. Finally they reduced the whole ship-wrecked party down to the mate and the cook; and then the verses go on to tell how the cook was getting a broth ready, and the mate was standing by to see that it was a good palatable broth, for he loved that cook, and how the cook said: "Now come on; it is your turn!" and then how the mate grabbed the cook and threw him into the broth and lived off him till a passing ship came that way. All this horrible experience drove the mate crazy—that is the explanation of the verses—and he used to stand upon a city street and sing them with this refrain:

For I am the cook and the captain bold,

And the crew of the captain's gig,
And the midship mite and the bo's'n tight,

And the mate of the Nancy brig,
He had Morganized them all, and was a trust. (Applause.)

Now, I want to say a word to the common people; not about them, but to them. Remember this, it does not make much difference how little progress you make toward the right at any time; it does not make much difference how far or how often you are shoved back. The question is, Which way is your face turned? If your face is turned toward the right, and you keep it turned toward the right, and you go forward with a struggle, slowly, painfully it may be, now pushed back by superior force, but now gaining a little, and all the while your face to the right—if you do that, you are winning the greatest of victories. Even the gaining of the whole world, even the winning of all you strive for, might not be so great a victory. Come what may, be we moved forward or be we pushed backward, let us keep our faces to the right. In that way we shall establish the right. In that way we shall conquer the enemy. At any rate, we shall rise. But if you have your face toward the wrong, even if you do recoil once in a while toward the right, with your back to it, because the wrong doesn't look good, or taste good, or smell good, but on the whole you are going toward the wrong, you will end down at the bottom of the sea of hell—if there is any sea there. The question, my friends, is one of direction. It is not a ques-