

ly declare its purpose and renominate Mr. Cleveland. Parker, alias Belmont, could not be substantially different from Cleveland, alias Morgan, and either would mean that organized wealth would continue to plunder the people as mercilessly as it does now. August Belmont is too shrewd a financier to advance money or loan influence without security, and the fact that he is exerting himself to secure the nomination of Judge Parker ought to convince any reasonable mind that with Parker in the chair the judges appointed to the supreme court would be known in advance to sympathize with the corporations on the great issues which have been dividing the country.

What friend of equal rights and just legislation would think of nominating either August Belmont or David B. Hill for president? Why, then, should any democrat delude himself with the hope of any substantial reform if the party puts at its head one who would commit his political interests to the hands of two such notorious representatives of organized greed?

No wonder Judge Parker has remained silent. It is not a question of judicial ethics that restrains him; it is the fact that he cannot discuss the great questions now pressing for solution without alienating either the voters upon whose suffrages he must rely, or the financiers from whom his campaign fund is to come. It would be a reflection upon the intelligence of the party to think that its members could be brought to the support of an aspirant who not only refuses to give utterance to his opinions, but places his campaign in the hands of men known to be hostile to the interests and rights of the common people.

Commercialism in the Church.

The New Haven Palladium publishes a sermon recently delivered by the Rev. Dr. Ralls of that city which shows how the commercial spirit is invading even the church, and casting its shadow over religious institutions. The following quotation from the sermon presents the facts as related by the minister:

"Let us illustrate this. A few months ago I preached in this place a sermon against stealing. I pointed out some of its modest forms and showed that some things that passed for high finance were simply robbery on a large scale. I cited several instances. The report of the sermon came to one of these men, one of the most prominent of these modern financiers. He made his complaint to me in two letters. He denied nothing. He simply asserted two things. One was that I should have been silent, for the chief Christian virtue was charity. The other was this sentence: 'Although I have given several million dollars to the churches, since your attack upon me I have decided to make no further contributions in that direction.' Now that is what some men call the old, orthodox idea of the gospel. The gospel of Christ means the forgiveness of sins and charity for all. Let the preacher proclaim this and be silent on all else. Let the Morgans and Rockefellers and Schwabs float their watered stock, and then bring their gifts to church and college, and say, 'We are delivered to do these things.' Charity is not the chief Christian virtue, but love. And Christian love is no maudlin sentiment. It is the passion of the cross, clear of vision, loving men, hating iniquity, with eternal enmity for all evil. And it is that preaching of the cross applied to all life, rebuking sin and warning and inviting the sinner, condemning the wickedness of men and lifting up the broken-hearted—it is that that we need today. The dangerous heresy today is not a theory about the person of Christ, but the opinion that there is any part of life or of the world from which Christ may be shut out as the king and the rule of life."

This incident shows how the trust magnates are attempting to coerce the church and its ministers. The Morgans, the Rockefellers and the Schwabs have silenced many a tongue that ought to be thundering against wickedness in high places and against larceny on a grand scale. It is fortunate that we still have many preachers who, like Dr. Ralls, will not be silenced, and who will speak out against the demoralizing and corrupting tendencies of present-day commercialism. The sanctimonious sinners who rob their neighbors all the week and then piously contribute a part of their plunder to the church, talk about old-fashioned religion much as Mr. Cleveland and Mr.

Hill talk about old-fashioned democracy. Just as democracy is of no value except as it aims at justice in government and equity in legislation, so no religion is of any value that does not lead to virtuous living.

There is a great need today for more ministers who will stand up in their pulpits and apply Christianity to the every-day life of their members, and by so doing withdraw their membership from association with those who debase elections, bribe legislators and corrupt government for the purpose of exploiting the people afterwards.

Letter to the Iroquois Club.

Mr. Andrew J. Ryan, Chairman Invitation Committee, Iroquois Club, Chicago.—My Dear Sir: I am just in receipt of your invitation to attend the twenty-third annual banquet of the Iroquois club to be held on the 13th inst. I thank you for the invitation, and regret to say that I shall not be able to attend. I trust, however, that those present will take advantage of the occasion to present to the country the importance of maintaining democratic principles as they were set forth in the platforms of 1896 and 1900.

The merger decision shows how closely the supreme court is divided and how easy it is for those who sympathize with corporate wealth to find plausible reasons for staying the hand of the law when it attempts to rebuke those who exploit the people. Under our constitution the president appoints judges and those who have watched the decisions in the Hayes-Tilden contest, in the income tax case, in the trust case, and in the cases involving the policy of the government in the Philippines cannot doubt that it is as important to have judges who sympathize with the people as to have judges learned in the law.

In the present struggle between plutocracy and democracy the corporations are seeking to control the supreme court, and if they can do that the house of representatives, the senate and the president will be powerless to protect the public.

I trust that those who are honored with an invitation to speak at your banquet will raise a note of warning against the attempt now being made by the money magnates to control the democratic convention and to secure the nomination of a democratic candidate who will be obligated in advance to betray the hopes of the democratic masses. Yours truly,

W. J. BRYAN.

Republicans Fear Trust Issue

The press dispatches from Washington indicate that the republican leaders are trying to secure an early adjournment, April 28 being the day now under consideration. The republicans are afraid of the trust issue and are trying to avoid it by an adjournment. The merger decision has put the administration in a dilemma; it must either take the position that the trust law is sufficient and enforce the law or it must take the position that the present law is insufficient and then recommend some specific and effective remedy—that is, it must do one or the other of these things if it is going to meet the issue. But it grows more and more apparent that the party in power does not intend to do anything whatever on the trust question, and therefore the republican leaders are trying to get away from Washington so as to escape responsibility. The democrats of the senate and house ought to insist upon some affirmative and positive action against the trusts. Public attention ought to be called to the cowardice of the republicans upon this subject, and public attention can be called to it if the democrats in the senate and house will daily bring the matter up and demand action. They can refuse to vote and obstruct other and less important legislation. If the democratic leaders will but focus attention upon the inaction of the republicans, they may be forced to do something. No adjournment should be consented to until the trusts are put in the process of ultimate extinction. The democrats will be handicapped in their effort to hold the republican party responsible for the present trust domination of the government unless they themselves put forth every effort in their power to secure remedial measures.

Et Tu, Cleveland!

On another page will be found ex-President Cleveland's indorsement of Judge Parker as a fit presidential candidate of a "sane democracy." That settles it. When Mr. Cleveland puts the burning brand of his cordial approval upon an aspirant for the democratic presidential nomination, it is apt to disfigure the aspirant for life. In view of the indignation which the indorsement

has aroused, the judge may well paraphrase Caesar's language and exclaim, "Et Tu, Cleveland!" If Mr. Hill had been as shrewd a manager as he is credited with being, he would have enjoined the Sage of Princeton from thus early exposing the influences behind the Parker boom.

A People's Victory.

On another page will be found a report of the decision recently handed down by the supreme court in the case brought before the interstate commerce commission by Congressman Hearst. Believing that the attorney general was not performing his duty in the prosecution of the coal trust, Mr. Hearst instituted proceedings at his own expense before the commission, but was blocked by the refusal of the railroad and coal officials to testify or to produce their books and the contracts under which they operated. The supreme court has with but one dissenting judge held that the witnesses must answer and produce books and contracts, and the way is now open to break up the combination. The decision is an important one, and Mr. Hearst deserves great credit for his part in forcing this step toward relief from the extortion practiced by the coal trust.

Betrayal and Betrayer.

We are told by the New York World that at a meeting of democrats held recently in New York city, one speaker referred to David B. Hill as "the up-state Judas who has twice betrayed the party and after giving it the kiss did not have the grace to hang himself."

Another speaker eulogized "our noble and vigorous old Roman, Grover Cleveland," saying: "Grover Cleveland has never found it necessary to say 'I am a democrat.'"

Another speaker, referring to "our noble and vigorous old Roman," said: "The pilot who has twice steered us between the Scylla of monopoly and the Charybdis of socialism can be trusted to guide us again. If the people will again turn to him he will sweep the country."

What is there about party desertion that Mr. Hill should be branded as the "up-state Judas who has twice betrayed the party," while Mr. Cleveland, who not only betrayed the party in two national contests, but betrayed the trust the party placed in him during his second administration, should be labeled "our noble and vigorous old Roman?"

Perhaps Mr. Cleveland never thought it necessary to say, "I am a democrat;" and yet, his acts during his second administration did not indicate that he was a democrat, while in the national campaigns of 1896 and 1900 he contributed materially to the election of the republican ticket.

If the speaker who said that Mr. Cleveland "twice steered us between the Scylla of monopoly and the Charybdis of socialism," will examine the files of the New York World during the year 1895, he will discover, if, indeed, he is ignorant of the fact, that "our noble and vigorous old Roman" was operating hand in glove with monopolists, and acting very much as a republican politician would be expected to act.

Empty Honors.

While the Grover Cleveland boom was flourishing—flourishing in the columns of the Brooklyn Eagle and the New York World—the editor of the World and the editor of the Eagle engaged in a long drawn out controversy as to which of the two editors originated the Cleveland boom. But when the Cleveland boom died, these editors ceased to wrangle.

Now that both the World and the Eagle have taken up with the Parker boom, the editors of these papers are discussing the question as to which of the two originated the Parker boom. In a recent editorial, the Eagle says:

"The primacy of the Eagle in the Parker movement is indisputable. Its primacy in the movement for Cleveland was indisputable, and that primacy was gratefully acknowledged by Mr. Cleveland himself, when he brought the movement for himself to an end. Facts like these fake care of themselves. We do not have to boast about them, and, to tell the truth, boasting has little respect and less imitation here. We hardly need to call attention to them, except when they are misrepresented by those who would crowd them out of view. Calling attention to them, however, and merely doing so, is sufficient.

"Our readers know, all our contemporaries know, and all their readers know that the primacy of the Eagle, first in the Cleveland re-