

the manufacturers; but a movement of the universal human mind." The object of this movement, according to the Chronicle, is "to save waste, and it has been so successful in this that one is amazed to think that the world should have been so long in discovering it." Then, in concluding this eloquent defense of the trust system, it insists that the democratic party "cannot array itself against business enterprise and progress and endure."

The New York World, the Brooklyn Eagle and the Chicago Chronicle are the leading organs of the reorganizing element. The editors of these papers and the politicians who train with them become very indignant when anyone suggests a platform in line with democratic tradition; and yet they have no hesitancy in presenting as a democratic platform the policies that have chiefly characterized the republican platform.

For a long time these papers and their followers pretended to favor harmony. Long ago that mask was dropped. They denied that they were bent upon reorganization. They have been driven from that disclaimer. It is true that they even now deny that they are representing the trust magnates and the men who win gold under the policy of imperialism; but their denials are of little value in the face of the fact that with small change, their editorials could be printed in republican newspapers that are owned or controlled by these selfish interests.

Is it possible for intelligent and candid democrats to remain in doubt as to the purpose of the reorganizers?

The Massachusetts Platform

In last week's issue of The Commoner, the New York platform was discussed and the generalities, uncertainties and evasions of that platform were pointed out.

Next comes the Massachusetts platform and this, too, was adopted by a convention which offered to the democracy a candidate for president. Of the two platforms, the Massachusetts platform was the more candid, because it did not attempt to say anything on the issues before the people. The New York platform was cunningly devised and intended to deceive; but the bay state convention practically said to the democrats of the country: "It is none of your business what our candidate thinks or what he will do."

The Massachusetts democrats declare that they have the ideal candidate for the presidential nomination and they ask the country to accept their assurance that he is all right in every particular. To prevent any disappointment before the convention, the Massachusetts democrats take the precaution to draw the veil over his views, a futile precaution, for in his New York speech, proposing Mr. Cleveland's renomination, Mr. Giney, the Massachusetts candidate, gave to the country a clear understanding as to the kind of president he himself would make.

There is only one political doctrine to which the Massachusetts platform distinctly refers, and that is no longer an issue. It commends Mr. Olney's position on the Venezuelan controversy with England. As this has been indorsed by all political parties, it can no more be made a campaign issue than could the nation's position in the war of 1812.

The New York convention presented no issue at all; the Massachusetts convention suggests an issue that was settled ten years ago; the next reorganizer convention might content itself with passing a resolution commending the discovery of America. What an animated campaign we shall have if the Wall street element writes the democratic platform! And to think that all this cowardice is displayed at a time when the republican party is unable to defend its position on a single question; at a time when a bold, honest and consistent fight for genuine democracy would provide abundant hope for success.

The Gresham Law.

The Gresham law, as it is called, was not a legislative enactment, but merely the statement of a principle by an Englishman by the name of Gresham when he was at the head of the treasury department. It was to the effect that the cheaper coin would drive out the more expensive coin, the reason being that the more expensive coin would be exported or melted for use in the arts, while the cheaper coin would be circulated among the people. This had reference to clipped coins, or coins that had been worn by use. To apply it to bimetallic the ratio must be taken into consideration. If the legal ratio in this country was less than the legal ratio in Europe the under-valued coin would either remain here at a premium or would be exported, but as most of the coined silver of the world circulates at a ratio more

favorable to silver than ours, bimetallics contend that silver would not drive gold out.

Who Knows?

Referring to Judge Parker, the Brooklyn Eagle says: "His ability and his availability are recognized. The kind of platform which he would prefer and on which he would insist is well enough known. The kind he would not tolerate and on which he would not stand, under any circumstances, is also known. The sort of man who should be nominated with him is clearly understood. Almost any northern as well as many a southern state abounds with examples of the right sort of democrat to name for vice president with Parker for president."

The "kind of platform which Judge Parker would prefer, and on which he would insist" may be "well enough known" to August Belmont, to Grover Cleveland, to David B. Hill and to the editor of the Brooklyn Eagle; but what has Judge Parker ever said to permit democrats generally to form an idea of the kind of platform he would prefer?

Aside from the New York platform, recently presented to the public, the only way we have of judging of the kind of platform Judge Parker would prefer is by observing the zeal with which men who are closely allied with Wall street labor for Judge Parker's nomination.

The reorganizer newspapers tell us that Judge Parker's national platform would not be written exactly as the New York platform was written. That being true, what method have we for discovering Judge Parker's position on political questions other than by an inspection of the elements that are most energetic in pushing his candidacy?

Grover Cleveland seems to know where Mr. Parker stands and Cleveland is satisfied. The editor of the Brooklyn Eagle seems to know where Mr. Parker stands and the editor of the Brooklyn Eagle is satisfied. David B. Hill and Joseph Pulitzer seem to know where Mr. Parker stands and Hill and Pulitzer seem to be satisfied. So far as democrats generally are concerned, they must be satisfied with the assurance from these men that Judge Parker is "eminently satisfactory."

It is very probable, however, that democrats generally will decline to nominate for the presidency a man concerning whose public views the people are in ignorance.

Parker's Vote.

The Chicago Chronicle, in defending Judge Parker, says: "If it be admitted that Judge Parker voted for Bryan, which is not at all certain," etc. What reason has the Chronicle to express doubt as to Judge Parker's vote in 1896? To be sure, the letter relied on for proof says that Judge Parker voted the national ticket of the democratic party and the Palmer-Buckner crowd claim that their ticket was the real democratic ticket; but as the Parker letter was written to "Bryan democrats," it is hardly possible that Judge Parker could have meant that he voted the Palmer-Buckner ticket. To accuse him of that would be to accuse him of misrepresentation. If the Chronicle has any proof it ought to produce it or withdraw its suggestion. If anyone has any doubt on the subject, he ought to write to Judge Parker and get his answer.

Now for the Hill Bill.

It was proposed in the senate in an amendment to the sundry civil bill to authorize the secretary of the treasury to purchase silver bullion for subsidiary coinage. The advocates of the Hill currency bill, among other provisions of which is one authorizing the secretary of the treasury to recoin the standard silver dollars into subsidiary coin, objected to the senate amendment and it was defeated.

Some Washington correspondents say that the senate amendment was defeated because the republicans did not desire to engage in a silver discussion during the closing hours of congress. Perhaps a better idea of the cause of the senate amendment's defeat may be obtained from the following paragraph which appears in several Washington dispatches: "One effect of the failure to legislate, treasury officials say, will be a scarcity of subsidiary silver coins before the present year ends."

When congress shall assemble for the December session, we may expect that the advocates of the Hill currency bill will push their argument on the ground that the great necessity for smaller coins requires the passage of the Hill bill in order

that the metal in the silver dollars may be used for the smaller coins.

A more simple way to provide the remedy would seem to be to purchase sufficient silver bullion with which to issue small coins; but the republican way is to destroy more than 500,000,000 silver dollars on the pretense that the bullion in those dollars is needed for subsidiary coinage, but in reality to aid in the accomplishment of Wall street's effort to replace "the dollar of the dagdies" with the dollar of the bankers.

Why and Wherefore Belmont?

The New York World has taken offense because of Mr. Bryan's criticism of the New York platform; and yet in its issue of April 20, the World not only condemned the New York platform, but went into personalities concerning the influences behind Mr. Parker's New York boom. Among other things, the World said:

"The selection of the four delegates-at-large was another mistake. The names are disappointing. They will command neither respect at home nor influence at St. Louis. Mr. Hill is a 'narrow-gauge' politician with a long series of blunders and failures to his discredit. Ex-Senator Murphy, a protectionist and one of the perfidious manglers of the Wilson tariff reform bill, is a 'has been.' Mr. Ridgway is known politically as simply an unimportant member of the Brooklyn local machine. As for Mr. Ehret, he is a 'successful brewer,' without education, destitute of political knowledge, experience or standing, a mere money-bag.

"To add to the incongruities between the platform and the men selected to represent it, the name of James T. Woodward, the astute president of the Hanover Bank and a prominent member of the Morgan gold syndicate that bedevilled President Cleveland's administration—a combination which the World had the pleasure of smashing—appears as the first presidential elector-at-large! Why and wherefore Woodward?"

The World adds: "The worst thing about truth is that it must be often told to our friends for their good." Then why does the World so strenuously object when democrats who believe in democratic principles as they were enunciated in the platforms of 1896 and 1900 protest against what they believe to be an attempt to republicanize the democratic party?

While the World has discovered that James T. Woodward, "the astute president of the Hanover Bank and a prominent member of the Morgan gold syndicate that bedevilled President Cleveland's administration," is conspicuous among Mr. Parker's representatives, how does it happen that the World has overlooked the more conspicuous August Belmont?

If the World is so devoted to truth that it must even go into personalities, why does it not observe the very important part August Belmont is playing in connection with the Parker boom, and why does it not ask "Why and wherefore Belmont?"

"Recruits and Recruits."

The Chicago Tribune says that Mr. Bryan objects to the democratic party obtaining recruits and that "if the democratic party does not get recruits, it will be beaten again." The Tribune adds: "If the democratic party re-enunciates the same principles and makes a fight on the same issues again, only a minority of the American voters will enroll themselves in its ranks."

Instead of objecting to the democratic party obtaining recruits, Mr. Bryan wants the party to grow larger and larger. He does not believe that this can be accomplished by delivering the party into the merciless keeping of the Wall street financiers and the trust magnates. He believes that the party can win the only success worth having by deserving it. In his opinion, whenever the party turns its back upon the people, repudiates democratic principles and surrenders to Wall street, it will not only go down to ignominious defeat at the polls, but will forfeit the confidence and respect of intelligent men.

If there is any force in the statement that the party must not re-enunciate the principles upon which it made the fight in 1896 and in 1900, the argument must be applied to every one of the important issues presented in those campaigns. If this argument is sound as to the party's position on the money question, then it is sound as to the party's position on the tariff question, the trust question, and the question of imperialism.

The democratic party has repeatedly met defeat on the tariff question; and yet democrats