

### THE NEW YORK CONVENTIONS.

The recent state conventions in New York afford additional evidence, if any was required, of the farcical character of our nominating system. The theory of nominating conventions is ideal, thoroughly democratic and seemingly in accord with the representative system of government. In theory the delegates act for their respective communities and are supposed to vote according to the wishes of their constituencies. But the practice is entirely different. In the republican state convention the delegates were not solicitous about the wishes of those who elected them, but consulted only the preference of the ruling spirit and the real power of the convention, Thomas C. Platt. The candidates would have been the same and the people of New York would have had as much to do with their selection, had the delegates remained at home and let Mr. Platt announce through the newspapers the names of the men for whom he wanted them to vote.

Nor was the democratic convention essentially unlike the republican. The same methods prevailed. They differed only in the name of the one who gave orders. These were as faithfully carried out in one as in the other. Unquestionably a large majority of the democratic voters of New York favored the nomination of Comptroller Bird S. Coler for governor. If the people of New York had had the right to determine their candidate, Coler would have been the man and he would have been the next governor. But when the delegates met at Saratoga they did just as the delegates to the republican convention did, except that they went to Croker instead of Platt for their inspiration. The Tammany boss imperially decreed that Coler should not be the nominee, and he was not. Thus the will of Croker triumphed over the sovereign will of several hundred thousand sovereign people.

The man whom Croker chose for temporary chairman gives us a very correct idea of the intellectual fibre of his political agents. His name was McCarren, first name unknown, a local Tammany celebrity. We do not know his ward. His speech to the convention was distinguished by this gem of forensic eloquence:

"In each presidential contest some feature, apart from the candidate and the platform, impresses the minds of the people," (applause) and that, "when the history of the campaign of 1900 is written, nothing will arrest the attention of those who may read it as much as the fact that in no contest that preceded it was the bell rung so loudly."

Then they all "whooped her up for McCarren."

It is the Crokers and the McCarrens

that are expected to carry the state for Bryan, and it will be the Crokers and McCarrens to whom will be entrusted the responsibility of federal administration in the state of New York if Bryan is elected president. From Seymour and Tilden to Croker and McCarren is indeed a mighty step but such is the phenomenal change wrought by Bryanarchy. The democratic party in New York is not unlike the democratic party in other states that have yielded to the demoralizing and degenerating influence of the advocate of national repudiation. One who espouses national dishonesty cannot long retain the respect and confidence of those who believe in individual honesty. He must content himself with ostracization from decent and reputable political association and reconcile himself to an alliance with those of whom Croker is a type.

### MARYLAND.

In 1896 Maryland gave McKinley a plurality of 32,000. Up to that time it had been recognized as one of the strongest democratic states. That the result in 1896 was intended as a rebuke to Bryanarchy is evident from the vote in the state election of last year when the democrats, upon an old time democratic platform, carried the state by 12,000. Those who were active in the sound money movement in 1896 do not seem to be less so this year. The honest money league of Maryland was recently reorganized. This organization was started in 1896 by independent voters. Of the committee of seventy who were active in the original organization, only two are for Bryan this year. If this is a fair test of the feeling among sound money men throughout the state, Mr. Bryan will again lose this democratic state.

### AS OTHERS SEE US.

European papers are poking lots of fun at the Quixotic campaign of Bryan and Croker against imperialism. To really appreciate the humor of the situation one should read the spicy and pointed comment of London papers upon the uncrowned Tammany king. Mr. Poultney Bigelow visited the United States to attend the democratic national convention. In the current number of the London Contemporary Review he tells how we make presidential candidates in this democratic republic. About Mr. Croker, the most important figure at the convention, Mr. Bigelow says:

"The German emperor in the robes of the Black Eagle radiates no more power by smile or frown than does His Majesty King Croker holding audience in the bedroom of a Kansas City hotel. The Kaiser is limited by a constitution; Richard Croker is less trammelled, his power is complete; he governs a com-

munity vastly more rich and populous than was the whole of Prussia when Frederick the Great ascended the throne and his treasury is full. There is not a crowned head in Europe that does not envy Mr. Croker; there is not a crowned head west of Warsaw whom Mr. Croker cannot afford to pity."

The London Financial Times, in commenting upon Mr. Bigelow's tribute to our own Richard, says:

"On landing in New York a few days before the convention, this western autocrat was met, among others, by an eminent politician of Tammany hall, whom he had had occasion to reprimand. The offender was treated as an acquaintance, not as a friend—Tammany knew at a glance that he was 'of no further use on earth—at least politically.' Then Mr. David B. Hill, late governor of New York, crossed the path of the Nikola-like despot. For the moment he was flung aside, but only for the moment. 'Mr. Croker had arranged for the public humiliation of his rival—he proposed him for the vice-presidency.' The manoeuvre brought to their feet a string of speakers who nominated other candidates, and turned to the best account the fact that Mr. Hill declined in 1896 to throw in his lot with the free silverites, 'and thus the only notable democratic politician in favor of gold as a standard of value was drummed out of the party.' Even Mr. Bryan, with his programme, figures merely as a pawn on this amazing chess-board. Mr. Croker told Mr. Bigelow that 'he thought the time inopportune for a reform of the civil service,' (we are not much surprised at that); he likewise showed indifference to the mere wording of the platform—so far as free silver was concerned; his followers would vote for any platform, and therefore, his desire was to secure a platform agreeable to Mr. Bryan and his followers.' Such is the western realization of dreams of an unfettered democracy!"

### BRYANARCHY AND THE BOERS.

Honorable William Sulzer, the well known Tammany congressman and erstwhile democratic candidate for the vice-presidency, is one of the leading pro-Boer statesmen of this country. He was the promoter, chief orator and custodian of the funds raised at the reception held in Washington in honor of the Boer envoys. He got up the meeting to express sympathy for the Boers in their struggle for independence and to raise funds for the widows and orphans of fallen South African heroes. Our own Windy V. Allen was one of the speakers. The new accession to Bryanarchy, the emotional A. P. A. orator of Kansas City, Webster Davis, was also engaged as a spellbinder. But the position of grand sachem of this patriotic gathering of condoling statesmen, Mr. Sulzer thought fully reserved for himself. He led in the exhortation, after the manner of an