



Weekly Press Forum

Jefferson City (Mo.) Democrat: Did you ever hear of a boodler being sent to the penitentiary on a technicality?

Manson (Ia.) Democrat: The anti-toxin trust is the latest. It will sooner or later have some heavy stockholders in hell.

Frankfort (Ind.) Standard: Harmony? Why, of course, harmony with a big H, but the tail shouldn't presume to wag the dog.

Clinton (N. J.) Democrat: Stand by the solid rock of principle! Meet issues as they come. The American people, as a mass, are not "quitters."

Paulding (O.) Democrat: Unless someone is actually punished soon in the postal frauds case the people will consider the republican campaign a farce.

Whatcom (Wash.) Blade: The republican party believes in advocating anything that will lead to temporary success, changing base as often as is deemed expedient.

Jackson (Cal.) Dispatch: It begins to look as though the republicans are producing more scandals and frauds than they will be able to hide from the people during the coming campaign.

Shelbyville (Ill.) Leader: It begins to look as if the patriots who want to nominate a ticket "satisfactory to Wall street" would have to fall back upon the grand old partyette of Palmer and Buckner.

Alma (O.) Democrat: Down with the gang of reorganizers and their battle cry of "anything to win." If we are to be dominated by the Wall street gamblers and sharks, let the party of trusts keep the job.

Lima (O.) Times-Democrat: Machen should be given a place on the republican national committee. Perry Heath says he is a talented man, and that is what the committee will need as much, if not more, than money this year.

Rockville (Ind.) Tribune: Look out for the democrat who is opposed to men and policies to which republicans are also most bitterly opposed. There is something wrong with democracy that is in harmony with republican opinion.

Woodsfield (O.) Spirit of Democracy: By a "glorious diplomatic triumph" we secured open ports at Antung and Mukden. It turns out that to reach them with vessels we must dig canals. We are great on canals. Let Russia beware.

Auburn (Neb.) Granger: If President Roosevelt hadn't been a perfect trust smasher we would have trusts in our fair land at the present time. How thankful the people should be that Teddy brained the trusts on the spot. Nipped the evil in the bud.

Frankfort (Ind.) Standard: Let's see: The tin plate trust was one to which the republicans "pointed with pride" as a good trust. Query: Will all good trusts cut wages 50 per cent—right in two in the middle—as the tin plate bosses have done?

Fostoria (O.) Times: County and state officers, corporations, politicians, grafters and cranks are all organized into associations to promote legislation in their respective interests.

Next thing the taxpayers will take a notion to organize; then look out.

Emmettsburg (Ia.) Democrat: Why should democrats think for a moment of nominating a man for president who is inclined to serve the corporations instead of the people? Democratic triumph should mean far more than the possession of the offices.

Lamar (Mo.) Leader: The battle is between the people on one side and organized greed on the other. There can be no compromise between these two forces, not at least until the Golden Rule shall be observed by all men. Better defeat than compromise with dishonor. We believe the Kansas City platform should be reaffirmed.

Yukon (O. T.) Sun: We don't believe the democratic convention could be persuaded or forced into nominating an extreme gold democrat for the presidency, nor bluffed into repudiating the Kansas City platform. But we do believe that a candidate will be nominated and a platform adopted that will command the earnest support of all democrats, and republicans who are tired of the spasmodic Mr. Roosevelt.

Jackson (O.) Herald: The reorganizers are always going back to "sane" democracy, but nobody has yet been found who was capable of telling just what or where that would be. On the other hand the real and loyal democrats are facing the future. They mean to hold on to all that was good in the past and grapple with the new questions that have arisen in recent years.

Sulphur Springs (Tex.) Democrat: A return to Clevelandism means more trusts, more bonds, asset currency and the enthronement of a monied aristocracy in this once free republic and the fastening on the limbs of a free people the fetters of a galling despotism. A continuance of the republican party also means the same thing, for both favor Wall street and the money trust, the father, promoter and protector of all the pernicious breed.

Wilmington (Del.) Jeffersonian: Wages are down; the cost of living is up; workmen out of employment have difficulty in finding jobs; the trusts control the republican party, and that party "stands pat." Will not workmen have enough intelligence this fall to vote the democratic ticket? Why should a workman, who has formerly voted the republican ticket, permit partisanship to lead him to vote against his own interests in favor of the party controlled by the trusts?

Toledo (Ill.) Democrat: And now Colonel Henry Watterson boldly announces that the platform of 1896 and 1900 caused the overwhelming defeat of democracy. If we recall the matter correctly the colonel bolted Bryan in 1896 and assisted in the election of McKinley and seemed powerful glad that the republicans had triumphed. Bolters, like the colonel and Grover Cleveland, are always at the front, giving advice, but we believe the party prefers to seek advice from men who vote the democratic ticket.

Seward (Neb.) Independent-Democrat: Those persons who would have the public believe that the reorganizers are going to control the next democratic national convention know not whereof they speak. They forget that the rules provide that before a candidate shall be nominated he

shall have received a two-thirds vote of the entire delegation making up the convention. Suppose, for argument's sake, the reorganizers have a majority in the convention: even then they cannot nominate, and the nominee will have to be acceptable to the western democracy before he receives a two-thirds vote.

Rawlins (Wyo.) Journal: The Cleveland wing of the democratic party is a small one. It is composed of men who sulk in their tents when a candidate is nominated of whom they do not approve, as well as some who openly vote with the enemy. They are not the men who are ready to do and dare for the party, and while true democrats will welcome them back to the party if they come prepared to fight for the principles of democracy, they are very much mistaken if they believe that the party will again be surrendered into their keeping until they have shown that they are once more democrats.

Phillipsburg (Kas.) Post: The republican party cannot elect any candidate for president without a big campaign fund. It never has. It never will. Their resources in the past has been in selling out to the trusts and large manufacturing interests, taking their money and promising them immunity in legislation. Its resources in the future will be the same. While directly this money comes from the trusts, indirectly and in the end it is extracted from the people who are compelled to pay exorbitant prices for all goods which these monopolists control. Eliminate the trusts and living will be easy.

Jackson (Tenn.) Dispatch: But we deny that these bolters should now ask the democratic party to truckle at their feet and give them the best positions at its command. No man who refused to vote for the democratic nominees in 1896 and 1900 should be nominated for the presidency. Nor should any man be sent as a delegate to the national democratic convention who has not been loyal to his party's nominees. Traitors to the party should be made to feel the heinousness of their offense. Loyal soldiers should receive the reward of constancy and zeal in their country's cause. Put none but democrats on guard.

Franklin (Tenn.) News: Mr. Olney has taken himself out of the running for president, if, indeed, he was ever in it. A man that has no more political sagacity than to try to revive a Cleveland boom at a harmony banquet clearly evinces two facts: First, that he has not that broad conception of public sentiment so necessary in a man who would become the chief officer of a great government, and, secondly, that he would, if elected, undertake to pursue the same policy that his former chief for whom he now tries to revive a boom pursued when he was president, a policy which disrupted and almost destroyed the party to please the plutocrats. Exit Olney.

Enid (O. T.) Democrat: Understand that we democrats are not opposed to the Isthmian canal, but we are in doubt as to the methods to obtain it. We want it done fairly. We do not want to bully anybody into it because we are strong enough to do it. It would be just as fair for a big ruffian to invade the premises of

a weak neighbor and take the choice of his garden and then threaten him with a beating if he resented it. That's all there is in it. There is a legal way to obtain what you want. If a neighbor don't want to sell a valuable horse or piece of ground, you have no right to get up a combination to jump it and take it away from him whether he will or no. What becomes of law and equity if you do this? Wherein are the rights of nations?

Rawlins (Wyo.) Journal: In an attempt to help along the Roosevelt boom an eastern writer says that people who are opposing him do so because they fear him and do not know what to expect next. The statement is true, but not in the way in which the writer intended it. It is true that no one knows what to expect next from a man who shouts loudly against the trusts and retains in office an attorney general whose only indorsers are the trust magnates—a man who instead of using the money appropriated by congress for the prosecution of criminal trusts is using it and the power of his office to protect the men he is supposed to prosecute. It is also true that the people fear him because of his own statement that words not backed by deeds are meaningless, when he is himself addicted to the habit of using lots of words and carefully avoiding following them up with deeds.

Bryan Confirmed.

The American this morning repels with indignation the statement made by Mr. Bryan that the democratic committee in New York and Indiana spent \$1,000,000 in those states in 1892, and that one trust contributed \$175,000 to the democratic campaign fund. It quotes the emphatic denial of Mr. Harrity, the chairman of the national committee in 1892, and assumes that this clears the election of Cleveland from any taint of corruption. The Washington Post points out that Mr. Harrity, while denying the correctness of the figures used by Mr. Bryan, was careful not to say that nothing was contributed to the campaign fund by the trusts, and it adds:

"No well-informed democrat, and certainly no democrat who took a prominent part in the management of that campaign, has denied, or is going to deny, that the money was solicited from the sugar trust, and was received by the management of the second Cleveland campaign. Mr. Harrity says: 'Why, the total campaign fund was not greatly in excess of the amount he names. As for one trust giving \$175,000, why that is too extravagant a remark to discuss. There was no contribution to the campaign fund that came anywhere near Mr. Bryan's figures.'

"Mr. Harrity very carefully abstains from denying. He simply says that no trust gave so much as \$175,000. Intelligent democrats have long known that their party's record on the trust question contained this incident. And they have known that the incident was further embellished by a schedule in the tariff of 1894 reciprocating that contribution."

This is a confirmation of the general truth of Mr. Bryan's statement, which will far outweigh the prejudiced and partial utterances of the Nashville American.—Nashville News.