

the death of a starved peasant in his hut as dreadful and impressive as that of a king on the scaffold.

It will take a long, long time to leach the snob, the lackey, out of us, to transform us from wealth and rank-worshipping creatures, inheriting our abasement of soul from endless generations of subservient ancestors, into self-respecting, self-owning democrats, valuing other men for what they are and not for what they have in the way of either property or position.

Do you think for a moment that the life of each of those tenement women and children was not as dearly prized by the woman and child as King Edward's life is prized by him, or Mr. Rockefeller's by Mr. Rockefeller? And can you doubt that the death of the poor women and hapless children wrenches the hearts of those who were near to them and loved them quite as sorely as the death of King Edward or Mr. Rockefeller would wrench the hearts of those to whom they are near and dear?—Editorial in Chicago American for August 22.

#### UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL. HE REPORTS THE PRESIDENT'S GREAT SPEECH.

(From the Original Manuscript.)

Dear John: I'm havin' lots of fun; been goin' around with Theodore, "curbin' the trusts." We went down to Providence last week, and Theodore made 'em a great speech; f-i-n-e, I tell ye!

It looks as if Theodore was a-runnin' ag'in fer President, and I don't know but he'd get it if he'd show he was a-lookin' out for my interests—had his eye on me instead of on the trusts. But he's wilful, Theodore is—slow takin' a hint—not clear in his words, and gets his feet tangled in the reins sometimes; but he made a great speech at Providence on the trusts.

"Publicity is the first step," says Theodore.

"Pshaw! Theodore," says I, "that's Dave Hill's thunder, and Russell Sage approves it. Give 'em something fresh or western! Give 'em the niggers at San Juan hill! Whoop 'em up!"

"Publicity is most important," persisted the President.

"Hurrah!" says I, catchin' on. "We'll have the sun to shine all night next term, as well as all day. We'll illuminate 'em till they all shine out like beef and coal and Standard Oil. Hurrah!"

"The nation must take control," says Theodore.

"Knox!" says I. "He's the boy! He's got it now! Hurrah fer Knox!" Here the President called for a drink of water.

"But the power must be exercised with moderation," says he.

"Knox again!" yells I. "Nixie Knox! He'll do it with moderation. He's the gentlest Attorney-General we ever had. Eats nothin' sharper than pumpkin pie. Knox is the man!"

I don't think the President liked all my responses, though I certainly did put lots of ginger into his speech, for he paused now, and requested the gentlemen on the platform (that meant me) to put the floral horseshoe on the locomotive. Theodore is a good advertiser.

"Shoe the iron horse," says I.

"That's it," said Theodore, smilin'; "you did hit it once."

"The state is no good after trusts," resumed Theodore. "The nation must assume control, but the nation has no power yet. Big combines are inevitable, and I see no promise of a complete solution—"

"But, thunder!" says I, "Theodore, what am I a goin' to do for meat and coal? Must I starve and freeze?"

"The best thing to do," says Theodore, "is to hoe corn like the mischief, and have nobody meddle, particularly people who are least well off in the world's goods—who don't have anything; for if people who don't have anything would lose all they have, they'd come to direr prosperity yet."

"Scat!" says I. "Theodore, you are gettin' mixed up. How could meddlin' hurt a man who has nothing? What has he got to lose?"

"All people are living better," says Theodore.

"Or strikin' to do it," says I.

"It's true, some of the rich have grown richer, but I deny the poor are poorer—"

"Where did the rich get it from, Theodore?" says I.

And so we ran along, but we made a great speech at Providence.

UNCLE SAM.

#### JUSTICE AND BENEVOLENCE.

"I believe," said Mrs. Dillingham, in her most judicial manner, "that you are really proud of it."

"Of being a Democrat? Of course I am."

She looked at me curiously. "You admit yourself that every horsethief is a Democrat?"

"Approximately."

"And you know the party is always wrong?"

"It certainly has the gift for do-

ing the right thing at the wrong time."

"And you surely cannot approve of that horrid Tammany?"

"Not altogether."

"And you are always quarreling among yourselves."

"Usually."

"Then why," she asked, "why did you say you are proud of being a Democrat?"

"For very much the same reason, madam, that I am proud of being an American citizen. The Democratic party would carry American citizenship to its logical conclusion."

"Broadly speaking," I told her, "the Democratic party is founded on the instinct of justice, while the Republican party is based on the impulse toward benevolence."

"And that's why you are a Democrat," she cried. "I thought you men were supposed to be logical."

"That is our weakness, we flatter ourselves."

"But surely," she argued, as one who states a poser, "benevolence is higher than justice."

"On the contrary, justice is the higher virtue and the one that is most needed in the state, the virtue that is last to develop in the individual or the nation.

"A two-year-old child has benevolence highly developed. Your little Tommy insisted on rubbing a smudge of sticky candy into my face only a few minutes ago out of pure benevolence. Possibly he has that trait to a marked degree by inheritance from his mother. But that does not prevent him from trying to pull kitty's tail out by the roots in total disregard of justice—justice requiring a recognition, if you please, of pussy's right to the pursuit of happiness, which in pussy's case is the undisturbed enjoyment of its own members."

"Children are little savages," she frankly admitted, "but you are altogether wrong when you say that justice is the later development in a nation. Haven't they always had laws? And yet you say yourself they are only just beginning to show Christian tendencies?"

"It would seem so, and yet as far back as you can go in history you find benevolent kings, kings who were good to their subjects, kings who relieved their distress, kind masters to their slaves. But kings who recognize the rights of their subjects have always been a scarce article.

"Most of the slaveholders," I went on, "were kind to their negro chattels.

The patriarchal system was a benevolent institution."

"Yes," she broke in with an annihilating glance, "and who abolished slavery? I have always heard it was the Republican party. I suppose you will say now it was the Democrats."

"That illustrates the very point I had in mind"—I hadn't thought of it till that minute, but it pleased me to pretend to have anticipated her stroke. "There was a handful of abolitionists who were for freeing the slaves as an act of justice, and they were the most unpopular people in America. All a man had to do was to say he was an abolitionist to get mobbed on the spot, whether it was in Massachusetts or Illinois, as well as further south. They were for justice, and they were the most lonesome people in America because the popular idea of justice had not developed to that point yet.

"The Republican party was presently swayed by the impulse of benevolence, compassion, pity—and under that impulse, complicated with federal questions, they freed the negroes. The nation was not ready then nor even yet to do it as an act of justice to the negro in recognition of his rights."

"And where was your Democratic party all this time?"

"The Democratic party was hopelessly involved on the wrong side of the slavery question. There was no party in the United States except the despised and hated abolitionists who could comprehend that anything was due to the negro in justice. Even then the Democratic party was following its instincts for justice in its poor human way, laying so much stress on the rights of the states that it never perceived the other rights. The mind of the party had not developed far enough to comprehend the rights of the negroes, and for not being able to see it the party got jolly well licked. And served them right.

"I regret to say that there are many Democrats who do not to this day appreciate the rights of the negroes. There is an inherited prejudice against our black brethren that I can understand though I may not approve of it. It is not easy to acknowledge the equality of a man whom we regard as an inferior. It is much easier to be kind to him than to be just to him. And therefore the Republicans are fairly successful in living up to their ideal while the Democrats are very far from fulfilling theirs. I suppose Mrs. Dillingham, for instance, would do anything in the world for old Dinah—ex-

cepting to recognize her as an equal—say to sit at table with her?"

"Then the Republican party did accomplish something while the Democrats were waiting for that ideal of theirs to arrive," she suggested, "and you say it hasn't come yet. And still you are proud of being a Democrat. Oh, you men."

I was supposed to be completely floored. Happily for me I am so obtuse that I never know when I am vanquished in argument. I ventured to call her attention to the fact that this happened nearly forty years ago. The Republican party was then doubtless a decade in advance of the Democrats. The Democrats were facing to the rear, dwelling on the past phase of the question, which in a political party is a moral sin. Whereas it is now the Republican party that dwells on its glorious past and is serenely oblivious to the good time coming in the reign of justice—

But I fell into that very error right there. For the discussion to Mrs. Dillingham's mind stopped with her last word. For as a woman is entitled to the last word, whatever a foolish man adds to that is but labor and sorrow.

I am not allowed to get beyond the admission that the Democratic party was wrong forty years ago—not even by reminding her that that was before she was born.—John Stone Pardee, in Red Wing Argus.

#### THE OHIO KEYNOTE.

Speech of Hon. Tom L. Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland, as temporary chairman of the Democratic convention of Ohio, at Sandusky, O., September 3, 1902.

The principles of democracy, always old, but never obsolete, confront us to-day, both in local and in national questions.

One of these national questions relates to trusts. For this evil our adversaries advise publicity as the remedy. Publicity! That might protect investors against fraud; but how could it protect the public against monopoly, which is the basis of trusts? Men whose incomes have increased but little or not at all, but whose living expenses have increased enormously—why should they care for publicity? What is needed is not examinations of the account books of the trusts; it is the sweeping of monopolies from the statute books of the people.

The money question also is national. And let me tell you this is no dead issue, as some would have us believe. Dead though it may be in one form, it is alive in other and more radical forms. So long as Wall street inter-

ests dictate our financial policies, the money question cannot die. You know that I have never accepted the doctrine commonly known as "sixteen to one." I have worked with those who do accept it because I have believed, as I believe yet, that the free silver fight was the first great protest of the American people against monopoly—the first great struggle here of the masses against the privileged classes. It was not free silver that frightened the plutocratic leaders. What they feared was free men.

We have in national politics also the vital question of self-government. Shall we continue to govern distant colonies from Washington, as distant provinces were governed by imperial Rome before her fall, and as crown colonies are governed by the British empire to-day? That question also is at bottom a monopoly question. There would be no subject colonies if colonies could give no monopoly franchises.

But national questions are not for us to deal with in this state convention. Great as is Ohio in territory and population and wealth, important as she is in the sisterhood of states, influential as her Democracy is capable of being in the counsels of the national party, she is not great enough, nor important enough, nor is her Democracy influential enough, to warrant this convention in dictating national policies or remodeling national platforms. We have not been elected for that purpose. The function of revising national platforms belongs with conventions chosen for national purposes. Our function, so far as national questions are concerned, begins and ends with an unmistakable identification of the Democratic party of Ohio with the Democratic party of the republic. That can be done in good faith only by acknowledging the authority of the latest national expression of party doctrine on national questions. In my judgment, therefore, this convention ought to recognize the Kansas City platform. It ought also to pay the tribute of its respect to the great Democrat, who has in two national campaigns brilliantly led us against the Republican party and its allied hosts of nonpartisan monopolists.

Having done that, it is our duty to turn to the affairs of our own state. Let us be fair to our adversaries. They are in the majority in the legislature, and at the last session of that body they passed the Longworth bill which makes it easier in the future to amend the state constitution. Under that law we of Ohio shall no longer be tied down by the narrow ideas of half a