

tested. They could not tell what he might do should they turn out and seek by heroic efforts to place him in the White house. Should their efforts succeed, he might not, after all, be able to conduct 'a safe administration.' But there is distinctly a better feeling in business quarters toward him."

There is no doubt that the corporate interests have an understanding with Judge Parker, for without such an understanding they would not think of supporting him. The decision in the merger case shows how important it is that the president should be in sympathy with the people rather than in sympathy with the corporations. The three judges appointed by Mr. Cleveland dissented from the opinion of the court, and as Judge Holmes stood with them, it would only require one more judge to change the decision, even if Judge Brewer's separate opinion does not already indicate the probability of an adverse decision in another case.

If Judge Parker were nominated by the influence of the corporations and elected with the aid of their contributions, is there any doubt that his appointees would be corporation men? Can the democratic party afford to lend itself to a movement to so make up the supreme court as to nullify the efforts of the people at reform? To secure remedial legislation the people must have not only the house, the senate, the president, but the supreme court also, and as the members of the supreme court hold office for life, that department of the government is hardest to change. As president, Judge Parker might appoint one, two, or even three supreme justices, and his appointments might bar the way to relief for ten or fifteen years. Can the party afford to take such a chance? Judge Parker has been before the country as a candidate for a year, and in all that time he has never expressed himself upon a single public question or indicated his views on a single issue. Can we afford to nominate a question mark? If so, we need not be surprised if the voters indulge in exclamations.

Democracy's contest with plutocracy is not a sham battle or a make-believe fight. It is a terribly earnest struggle, and the decision in the merger case has pointed out with great distinctness the possible result of a mistake in the selection of a candidate. There are hundreds of democrats whose sympathies are with the masses of the people and whose opinions are known—men who have had more experience in political life than Judge Parker, and who would poll more votes on election day. Some of these men have been mentioned; others have not. Surely among those who have been proposed or might be proposed it is possible to find someone who will give voice to the democratic conscience, and lead a charge against the cohorts of organized and predatory wealth.

The republican party is controlled by the corporations; it is dominated by the trust magnates and financiers. The president has signally failed to enforce the criminal section of the anti-trust law, and his attorney general hastens to allay any fears that the merger decision might have excited. The president will have the support of Wall street unless the democratic party nominates a man nearer to the corporations than he is. Could the democratic party afford to get between the republican party and the trusts, even if it were possible to do so? If Mr. Parker reaches a man with a record, if his conviction the Huston and his position on public issues are fully defined, Mr. Hill's championship of his cause might not be sufficient to entirely destroy his availability, but with his opinions unknown and his aspirations in the hands of Mr. Hill, it is not unfair to regard Mr. Hill as the keeper of his conscience, and who is so poorly qualified to keep any one's conscience.

The fact that Mr. Parker is an enigma ought to remove him from consideration, and the situation is made still worse by the blight of Mr. Hill's support. When to this is added the overshadowing danger which the merger decision has pointed out, is it not time that the honest, earn-

est, loyal democrats awake from their lethargy, lay aside the thought of compromise, and begin an aggressive campaign to save the democratic party from the menace of corporate control?

If Mr. Parker is nominated it must not be as a "harmony candidate"—it must be with the knowledge that he represents the same element, the same influence and the same methods which during Mr. Cleveland's second administration led the democratic party through "the valley of the shadow of death."

### By and For the Classes.

A Kennet Square, Pa., reader of The Commoner directs attention to Mr. Lincoln's Gettysburg speech and says that the most familiar quotation in that famous address has been used in a way to give a distorted meaning. The suggestion made by this reader is so interesting that his statement on this point is printed in full:

"The quotation to which I refer is—'That we here highly resolve . . . that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.'

"Did Mr. Lincoln use the word government as a proper noun? If as a noun—then in a sense so many use it: a 'government of the people, by the people, for the people?' This form would give to the prepositions 'of' and 'by' precisely the same meaning, i. e., government derived from the people. The tautology is too apparent to admit of his having used it in this sense.

"My contention is that Mr. Lincoln used the word 'government' participially, denoting more of action than substance, and that the phrase, 'government of the people, by the people, for the people,' (a most concise yet comprehensive definition of democracy), was meant to be the subject of the modified verb 'shall perish,' and that in the sentence 'government of the people, by the people,' the preposition 'of' bears the same relation to the sentence that it does in government of the pupils, by the teacher; government of the laborers, by the bosses.

"In using the expression, as many speakers do, 'Government of the classes, by and for the classes,' 'Government of the trusts, by and for the trusts,' the people fail to see, or feel, how they are affected, but by making it 'government of the people, by and for the classes,' as I believe Mr. Lincoln meant the formula to be used, it presents a nauseous and revolting dose to freemen everywhere.

"Granting my contention, then, would it not be well to define the form of democracy we advocate as: government of the people, by and for the people; and plutocracy—the form we decry and detest—as: government of the people, by and for the money-changers, always keeping in view that the people are being governed, whether by and for themselves, or by and for the classes, in disregard of the will and wishes of the people."

### Sermons on Burton.

Writing for the Chicago Tribune, William Allen White, the well-known newspaper man of Kansas, delivers an interesting sermon with Senator Burton's unhappy experience as the text.

Mr. White, like Senator Burton, is a republican, but he says that the conviction of Mr. Burton will surprise no one in Kansas. According to Mr. White, this is true because "Burton's character has been well known in Kansas for twenty years."

Referring to Mr. Burton, Mr. White says:

"Four or five years before he went to Washington as a senator from Kansas he was a professional candidate for senatorial honors. He had served a term or two in the lower house of the state legislature, where he openly solicited bribes and was charged dozens of times in the newspapers of the state with being a boodler without the slightest resentment upon Burton's part. Time and again newspapers have charged Burton with violating every obligation of life, social, moral, political, and financial, and he made no attempt

to bring these newspapers to the bar of justice."

Mr. Burton's election is explained by Mr. White in this way:

"His election was due to the influence of railroads in state politics. Every local attorney for the Rock Island, the Missouri Pacific, the Santa Fe, and the Union Pacific who had any influence was at Topeka working for Burton. Peremptory orders came out of Chicago and St. Louis in the campaign which ended with Burton's election demanding that local Kansas railroad lawyers support Burton or lose their places."

Then Mr. White says that Mr. Burton "has furnished a horrible example to young men who would go into politics as a means of profit," and he preaches a very eloquent sermon upon the value of honesty.

This is all very true; and yet, one cannot avoid the reflection that Burton's present day condition speaks for itself and sermonizes accordingly. Mr. White would do better to address his sermons to the republican party. How did it happen that a man whose character, it was well understood in Kansas for twenty years, was a bad one, could be elected to represent that state in the senate? How did it happen that the republicans of Kansas chose for United States senator a man who dared not resent the charge that he had openly solicited bribes, that he was a boodler, and that he had violated every obligation of life? How did it happen that the allied railroads were able to elect this man to the senate?

The railroads did not provide the election machinery. The republican members of the Kansas legislature did the choosing. Would it not be well, then, for Mr. White to address some of his sermons to the republican leaders of Kansas; and not only to the republicans of Kansas, but to the republicans of other states who have submitted to railroad domination, just as tamely as the republicans of Kansas have done?

While Mr. White is engaged in the delivery of sermons, would it not be well for him to take as a text some of the other members of the United States senate? It is not necessary that he take those who have been engaged in small transactions and, largely because of the smallness of the scheme, have been brought to punishment. There sits in the United States senate today a man who is notoriously the representative of the greatest of all trusts. In the discharge of his senatorial duties, he shows no concern, whatever, for public interests. His business is to protect the interests of the great trusts; every other consideration is ignored in consideration for the trust. Every public interest must bend to the private interests of the multi-millionaires represented by this particular senator.

Burton did wrong and undoubtedly deserves punishment; but is it not, after all, a mockery for newspaper writers to prate about the cheap wickedness of the Burtons, while closing their eyes to the iniquity on a much larger scale of other public men who have not been called to account, but who in spite of the notoriety of the fact that they are representatives of special interests, yet retain places of honor in the republican organization?

### Concentration.

The publication of the second annual report of the steel trust affords the Wall Street Journal an opportunity for comparing the size and operations of the steel trust with other familiar things. The Journal says that it does this in order that its readers may be able to arrive at a truer appreciation of the wealth and business of this great trust. It must be admitted that the Journal has succeeded in preparing an interesting showing:

"For instance, the assets of the United States Steel corporation amount to \$1,583,845,298. Now compare that with the total amount of cash in the United States treasury, which is \$1,413,110,665.

"The capital stock of the United States Steel corporation is \$868,583,600, and its bonded indebtedness, together with that of the subsidiary companies is \$568,138,535, making a total of \$1,436,722,135. Compare this with the interest-bearing debt of the United States, which amounts to \$901,470,950.

"The United States Steel pays in interest on its own debt and that of the subsidiary companies \$25,636,657, and it paid in dividends last year \$43,111,735, making a total of \$68,748,392. Com-