

platform makes a fundamental declaration of principle of extraordinary value in honest politics.

Specifically this is a tariff-for-revenue plank. It favors the reduction of the tariff to the basis of the needs of the government economically administered. Under the Constitution as now construed, this is probably as far as the party can go. But it is a great advance. "Tariff for revenue only" is far and away beyond Cleveland's go-lightly "tariff reform."

Yet in principle the platform stands for free trade to the farthest limit that is economically possible; for it denounces "protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few." This is substantially the plank Tom L. Johnson tried to get into the platform of 1892. His phrase was "protection is a fraud." But he had to consent to have this changed to "Republican protection is a fraud," before the Ohio member of the committee on resolutions, Lawrence O'Neil, would take the responsibility of bringing it in as a minority report. We now have Johnson's full and true sentiment—protection is robbery.

And for this also are we indebted to Mr. Bryan. As reported by the sub-committee the platform in its tariff plank was a timid, apologetic and indefinite promise of gradual revision. As it stands it is for tariff for revenue in immediate purpose and for free trade in principle.

The value of these general statements of fundamental economic principle has but little necessary relation to the possibility of electing the Democratic candidates this year. That is a matter of small moment in comparison with the fact that the Democratic party in 1904, by unanimous action of its national committee on resolutions, and the unanimous vote of its national convention, has declared as part of the party creed, not perfunctorily but clearly and with definite aim, some of the most vital principles of democratic government. To these declarations all future conventions can be referred as to Democratic landmarks, and be effectively urged to conform. With so much gained—recognition of the natural law of competition, demand for a "rev-

enue only" tariff, and denunciation of protection as robbery—it is not too much to hope that a rapid even if fluctuating pace will soon be set by the Democratic party in the direction of adjusting to these general principles the appropriate and logical matters of detail which relate them to current public affairs.

No analysis of the St. Louis platform would be complete without considering the contest over the money standard plank and Mr. Bryan's conceded victory regarding it. The sub-committee inserted a plank declaring that—

The addition to the world's stock of money metals of \$2,000,000,000 in eight years, of which the United States has been able to obtain \$700,000,000, has settled the question of the monetary standard of this country and removed it from the field of politics.

This plank was, upon Mr. Bryan's motion in the resolutions committee, struck out by a vote of 35 to 15, and the platform was adopted by the convention with that plank omitted. The convention therefore left the gold standard question an open one to be dealt with freely in the future.

Nor is this situation of suspense at all changed by Judge Parker's dispatch and the convention's reply. That correspondence amounts to nothing more than that either a gold standard man or a bimetalist may properly be a candidate on the platform, because the platform is silent upon the money question, taking sides neither with the silver men nor with the gold men. Thus the financial question is not necessarily abandoned; it is merely suspended to be revived or not as circumstances demand. Whatever one's opinion on the merits of this question may be, no fair man should regret the refusal of the party to declare any disturbing question settled.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

ST. LOUIS.

St. Louis, July 10.—The Democratic national convention closed with the early hours this morning. It was an historic convention.—a convention that is likely, somewhat after the example of the Charleston convention of 1860, to go down into history as the culminating death spasm of a worn out party regime.

The historic personages of this historic convention, measured by the standards of momentary success, were Parker and Davis, its presidential candidates; David B. Hill, its political manager and boss, and August Belmont, its financial adviser and guarantor of Wall street campaign funds. But its only historic name, in the exalted and nobly enduring sense, was that of William J. Bryan.

Labeled "a political corpse" by both the Republican and the Democratic organs when he came upon the ground; sneered at by these hirelings of plutocracy, because no brass bands escorted him from the railroad station to his hotel, for he rode there unostentatiously in a cab; jeered at because no Hills nor Belmonts, no bosses and no parasites, no place hunters nor place givers waited upon him at his rooms, but only men who were solicitous for good government instead of "good pickings"—coming thus to a convention hopelessly packed against all that he stood for in Democratic politics, Mr. Bryan departed, not master of the convention, yet master of the situation. He looms up to-day taller than his tallest enemy, the trusted popular leader of American democracy, trusted now as well for his powers of statesmanship as for his gifts of oratory and his fidelity to conscience.

All the convention managers were outclassed by Bryan in everything but chicane and toadyism, where he has no standing at all. In oratory he soared so high above their best that they confessed their lack of a speaker to meet him in debate. In diplomacy he rose so far superior to the greatest among them that they were able to outdo him in their own resolutions committee and their own packed convention only by compromising with him in apparent good faith and then with apparent bad faith allowing if not causing their candidate to stultify the compromise after the convention had nominated him upon it. Bryan's was the only voice among national leaders to be heard above the din of "band-wagon" shouters and "pie-counter" hustlers. While they were shouting for their party right or wrong, and its success no matter how ignoble, he was pleading for the country before party, for principle before policy. While they held their packed and mind-bound delegates in leash, he moved the unfettered and really more representative body of spectators, not with glittering word-structures but with a vitally eloquent because honest and intelligent appeal to common sense perceptions of what is right. If they were greater as manipulators and bosses, he was a towering giant among them as a leader of plain men and honest thought. Those were true words of the New York World in its editorial of the 9th, when, in retracting what in its unmodified hatred of Bryan it had said of his passing "from the leadership of the Democratic party," it declared: "Mr. Bryan

has not passed; he seems to be stronger than ever."

William J. Bryan is indeed stronger than ever. Others have control of the party machinery, he has the confidence of the masses. While they are dicker-ing with Wall street for campaign funds and with political hucksters for purchasable votes, he stands forth a clearer and grander as well as stronger figure than ever, the acknowledged political champion of democracy against plutocracy, and the political leader of the democratic Democrats.

The first day's session of the convention I reported last week (p. 215). The first session of the second day, the 7th, was uneventful. Nothing occurred but a repetition of the unpleasant indications among Southern delegates and spectators of anxiety to nationalize race issues. Considering these indications in connection with the notorious fact that the Parker interests rested upon a combination of Wall street financiers and Southern delegates, it was difficult to avoid a suspicion that the slave oligarchy of the '50's had escaped from the tomb of dead issues and made a coalition with the "frenzied finance" of today. Emphasis was given to this suspicion during an interval in the proceedings of the next day, the 8th, when Richard Pearson Hobson, the ex-naval officer of Merrimac fame, responded to an invitation to make a speech from the platform. Under this sanction by the managers of the convention he coupled Cleveland's plutocratic performance in suppressing the Debs strike at Chicago by military power and regardless of law (p. 195) with the Negro hating policy which has become almost as rampant in plutocratic circles at the North as it is anywhere at the South.

It is part of the plutocratic policy of contempt for "the lower classes." Negro hatred is not race hatred at bottom; it is class hatred. Plutocracy holds the working classes of all colors and races in contempt. When white workingmen, through education or wealth or both, "break into" the "upper" class, they bring with them no label of their "low" origin, and in a generation or two it is forgotten. But Negroes, no matter how wealthy and polished they may become, carry upon their faces, in the color of their skin, the evidence of their "menial" class, and can never escape it. It is this and this alone that makes the Negro question a race question. Plutocracy, North and South, would keep the working class "in its place," as a menial class; but in the South the working class is composed for the most part of Negroes, and the Southern working class is consequently pictured to "upper" class imaginations as the Negro class. Thus the labor question takes on in the South the form of a race question. It is no more a race question in fact than the question of peasant equality in Europe is a race question.

Mr. Hobson brought together in his speech at the convention, these two aspects of plutocratic contempt for laboring classes. He praised Cleveland for putting down the railroad strike in Chicago in 1894 by invading the State of Illinois with Federal troops (under the advice of a lawyer who represented professionally at the same time both the railroads that were resisting the strike and the Cleveland administration), on pretense of suppressing an insurrection which it is proved by the testimony of his own adherents did not occur until after the troops arrived. Passing from that felicitous allusion, Hobson connected it with expressions implying, if they meant anything, that it is the mission of the Democratic party to hold Negroes in subjection to the whites as a menial class economically and politically. His assertion that "intelligence must govern," plainly meaning, in the light of the context, that whites must govern Negroes, was somewhat of an anti-climax on the lips of a man who exhibits a degree of intelligence by no means superior to that of almost any Negro who has had approximately equal educational opportunities.

But leaving Hobson's speech of the 8th, which was important only because it had in some sense the indorsement of the convention that nominated Parker, I shall return to the regular order of events on the 7th.

At the morning session a report came from the committee on rules and order of business. As this committee had reported in favor of admitting delegates from Porto Rico, on the ground that the Supreme Court has held it to be part of the territory of the United States, but against admitting delegates from the Philippines on the ground that the Supreme Court has not so decided as to them, and the policy of the Democratic party rejects that view of their relations to this country, a question was raised. It was proposed to treat both alike, either by refusing to admit the Porto Rico delegates or by admitting the Philippine delegates. But the report of the committee was sustained, and the Porto Rico delegates only were admitted. One of them, A. M. Molina, returned the thanks of the delegation to the convention in a brief speech from the platform, which was appreciatively received.

Soon afterward the convention adjourned for recess. Upon its reassembling in the afternoon the committee on credentials reported. This committee had found in favor of seating the delegates from the Philippine islands, but that part of its report was ruled out of order by the temporary chairman, John Sharp Williams, who held that a country which is not a part of the United States cannot be represented in a Democratic convention to nominate a President of the United States.

The only other question of importance

in connection with the credentials was the Illinois contest (pp. 170, 177) against John P. Hopkins, which now came up for consideration upon a minority report submitted by Mr. Bryan. The committee had reported in favor of the Hopkins delegation; Mr. Bryan's minority report asserted that the Hopkins delegation had been foisted by force and fraud upon the Democracy of the State of Illinois. The convention decided against the minority report, upon the call of States, all the Parker delegates standing solidly by the acts of the fraudulent managers of the Illinois convention. In figures the vote was 299 for Bryan's minority report and 647 against it.

That action was immediately preceded by the most exciting episode of the convention up to this time. Bryan's reception of the day before (p. 215) had astonished all who believed him politically dead. But when he appeared in his place this afternoon, the reception he received was long sustained and thrilling in its enthusiasm. When it had lasted 15 minutes the Parker delegates, seeking to turn it to account for themselves, paraded with a Parker banner. At first they scored, for the shouts and cheers ran higher than before. But this was because most of the audience were still shouting for Bryan, not having noticed the Parker banner. As knowledge of the deception spread through the great hall, where some 14,000 people were gathered, the cheering subsided, and in less than five minutes more it was over. When Bryan appeared upon the platform to read the minority report of the committee on credentials, the cheering was renewed, but he succeeded with some effort in stilling this demonstration so as to be heard.

This minority report was a lengthy document, setting out circumstantially, on the basis of affidavits, the facts, undisputed except by the unverified word of the officers of the Illinois convention, that Hopkins had arbitrarily governed that convention; that he had seated its temporary chairman without a roll call; that the temporary chairman had gavelled himself into the permanent chair without a roll call; that roll calls had been denied throughout the convention except at the end on instructions for Hearst; that minority reports of committees had been thrown into the waste basket as "merely advisory," and that the only redress of the defrauded delegates—fully two-thirds of those elected at the primaries—was either to make a riot or to appeal to the national convention.

In speaking in support of his minority report, Mr. Bryan first showed his power in the convention. His speech on this question was a marvel of electric but restrained oratory and convincing debate. Bourke Cockran was urged to reply but refused, giving as one of his reasons that Bryan was right. His speech had but one dominant

note, but that was a ringing note for a Democratic convention. "If there is one Democratic principle more fundamental than another," he said, "it is the right of a majority to rule. If you destroy the binding force of that principle there is nothing that can hold a party together." But "in the State of Illinois the majority was not allowed to rule." Elaborating this point with an illustration both apt and stinging, Bryan said of Hopkins and his abettors:

My friends, the evidence shows that no band of train robbers ever planned a robbery upon a train more deliberately or with less conscience than they did. And these men who planned it and who carried it out have the audacity, the impudence and the insolence to say that because they certify that what they did was regular you cannot go behind their certificate. If that is good law in a Democratic convention, it ought to be good doctrine in a court; and if it is good doctrine in a court, then the only thing that train robbers have to do in the future is to make a report of their transactions over their own signatures. I repeat, that after they have committed their crime, all that train robbers will have to do is to certify over their own signatures that it was a voluntary collection, taken up for religious purposes, and deny you the right to go behind their certificate.

In reply to the weak responses made to his opening speech Mr. Bryan described Mr. Hopkins, the prime mover in this Illinois conspiracy, and Mr. Cable, one of its beneficiaries as delegate at large, as having been promoters of the bolting Palmer-Buckner ticket of 1896, and as having then "kept the path hot between their headquarters and the Republican headquarters."

Both speeches were strong in every sense, argumentatively as well as oratorically. They would have carried any unfettered, free-minded tribunal. They did convince the judgment and command the sympathy of the spectators, the great majority of whom were in the building on tickets and passes supplied by Bryan's bitterest political enemies. But they could not carry a majority of the delegates. These were "adamant," as one pluto-Democratic paper put it. George A. Schilling gave a better explanation. "It was a time," said he, "when 'train robbers' had to stand together."

The net result of the convention's decision was in effect a notification to majorities of all Democratic State conventions hereafter, that if little cliques of political conspirators attempt by force and fraud to override their will, the only remedy is riot and bloodshed then and there; for the national convention, if it follows this precedent, will recognize the clique of conspirators when they merely certify to their own regularity, no matter if every duly elected delegate swears, as two-thirds of the delegates to this Illinois convention did, to their irregularity and lawlessness.

Bryan's minority report will appear in the records of the St. Louis convention as a damning indictment of the good faith of the committee on credentials

and as a stern rebuke to the Parker delegates through whose votes that committee was sustained.

After this exciting episode permanent organization was effected, Champ Clark being elected chairman. In introducing him the temporary chairman made a strong democratic speech, one which, but for his narrow, bigoted, belittling "white man's" speech of the day before, would raise him high in the estimation of democratic-Democrats. I reproduce it for what it may be worth, with the suggestion that if Mr. Williams meant what it implies he could not have meant all that he said the day before, unless he experienced conversion over night:

I have the honor of presenting to you as your permanent chairman a man who, when it comes to tariff legislation, is a Democrat; who, when it comes to trust legislation, is a Democrat; who, when it comes to the great principle of equal opportunities and equal burdens for all the sons and daughters of men, is a Democrat; a man who is a Democrat in the narrow, American, partisan sense, and a man who, beyond all that, is a democrat in the world sense of believing in equal rights all over the surface of God's earth, for all of God's children, and special privileges to none of them.

Mr. Clark's speech of acceptance was disappointing. Though a better speech as a whole than was Williams's of the day before, it fell below the level of a statesmanlike performance. It was only a stump speech—somewhat superior to that of Williams. Both were pert and fippant, lacking in dignity and lacking in power. Neither is comparable, considering the purpose of all, and the solemn occasions of delivery, with Root's keynote speech in the Republican convention at Chicago.

Nothing important was done on Friday, the 8th, except as Hobson's "raw" speech was important, until the evening session, which began at 8 o'clock. The difficulty of agreeing upon a platform had kept the resolutions committee out until that time. But at last a unanimous report came in. Bryan had secured modifications which made the platform on the whole the best a Democratic convention has ever adopted. Even the race question plank is acceptable, considering the spirit of race intolerance which pervaded the place and demanded expression.

As to the tariff, the platform's denunciation of protection as a robbery of the masses for the benefit of the few is the squarest deliverance on that question the Democrats have yet made. In spite of Champ Clark's protest that the party is not a free trade party, and that the free traders in it are only as atheists in the Republican party, this is an outright declaration for free trade. No party can denounce protection as robbery and then deny it is a free trade party, without either stultifying itself or approving robbery.

The principal contest in committee, however, had been a give-and-take compromise between Mr. Bryan, representing the Democratic Democracy, and Mr. Hill, representing the plutocratic Democracy in general and Judge Parker's candidacy in particular. Under this compromise the gold standard question, the income tax question, the greenback retirement question, the asset bank currency question, and several others were left out of the platform. This was done in the interest of harmony, for the purpose of presenting a united front to the Republican enemy; and by means of this compromise between Mr. Bryan and Judge Parker's representative, harmony was achieved. The platform so reported was quickly adopted with enthusiasm by the convention, although no one heard it, so weakly did Senator Daniels, the chairman of the committee, read it. Then the nominations for President began.

The building was packed, probably not less than 16,000 persons being within its walls. Alabama gave way to New York, and Mr. Martin W. Littleton, a New York elector in 1896 on the bolting Palmer-Buckner ticket, presented Judge Parker's name in florid but unsubstantial rhetoric, vastly more suggestive of a bright senior's oration at a college commencement than a thoughtful statesman's speech in a national deliberative body. He denounced the Chicago and the Kansas City platforms, as was appropriate in view of his record, but he refrained from arguing against them, and he never once rose above the plane of "band wagon" politics. At the close of his speech, when he named his candidate, there was a Parker demonstration of shouting and cheering lasting 32 minutes—from 9:28 to 10 o'clock.

When California was reached in the roll call, Hearst was nominated. Thereupon came the Hearst demonstration of shouting and cheering, which lasted 37 minutes—from 10:34 to 11:11.

Gray was nominated by Delaware, Miles by Kansas, Olney by Massachusetts, Wall by Wisconsin, and John Sharp Williams by North Dakota.

There had been an entire collapse of sentiment for Cleveland. Until three days before the convention the arriving delegates were strenuously urged by letter, telegram and personal approach, to center upon the ex-President; but it soon became clear that David B. Hill held this convention in the hollow of his hand, and after that the Cleveland diversion was abandoned as hopeless.

Next to Parker and Hearst the important candidate was Cockrell. He was nominated by Missouri, and the demonstration that followed rivaled those for Parker and Hearst. In one respect it was the most impressive demonstration of all, for in an instant, as it almost seemed, every one in the great hall was waving an American flag. Thousands of flags had somehow suddenly come into

being. The demonstration lasted 28 minutes—from 1:35 in the morning to 2:03.

The first nominating speech to rise above the "pie-counter" level was Clarence S. Darrow's. In behalf of Illinois, Mr. Darrow seconded the nomination of Hearst. He sized-up the convention for the Wall street annex it was trying to make itself, and spoke accordingly, to the great satisfaction of most of the audience, but to the dismay of the "band wagon" contingent and the anger of the insiders.

When Nebraska was first called Bryan rose, but only to announce that Nebraska had changed places with Wisconsin. Yet it was full five minutes before he could be heard to say this, so demonstrative were the spectators.

Nebraska was called in due time, in Wisconsin's place. Nebraska sent Bryan to the platform. The hour was 3:53 in the morning. Such a reception as this vast audience—still numbering not less than 10,000 people—gave to Bryan then, no speaker, no delegate, no personage at all except Bryan himself had been honored with.

He had been two nights without sleep; he was hoarse and tired; his enemies called him a "back number;" the bargain-bound leaders glowered; there was no hope of moving the shackled delegates as to their votes no matter how favorably they might respond with their applause; everything was against him and nothing in his favor save the confidence of the people, who were better represented by the spectators than by the delegations. Yet he delivered an historic speech—the only historic speech to which that convention had listened. It was the general opinion that this was the greatest speech that even Bryan himself had ever delivered. Every word was audible. Every phrase fitted exactly into place. Every sentence expressed its thought sharply, and every thought was uplifting.

He had come to lay down the commission his party had given him in 1896 and renewed in 1900, and his report was summed up in a superb but modest paraphrase of St. Paul's memorable words: "You may dispute whether I have fought a good fight; you may dispute whether I have finished my course; but you cannot deny that I have kept the faith."

At first he pictured the military spirit of the Republican party, which the whole convention condemned and for the suppression of which they were united in purpose. Then he reminded them of the platform upon which all had agreed, waiving their differences in order to make this united fight against militarism. But a platform is not enough, he proceeded. We must have a candidate who fits the platform. Who shall he be? He himself had none to urge. Should the convention nominate Hearst, more distinctly than any other the labor candidate, Nebraska would support him.

Should it nominate Wall, who stands with the East on the gold question and with the West on other questions, Nebraska would support him. Should it nominate Pattison of Pennsylvania, Nebraska would support him. Only Parker and Olney were omitted. And while Nebraska had commissioned him to second the nomination of Cockrell, as he did, yet Nebraska made no demands. It only asked that Democrats shall not be forced to choose between Republican militarism and Democratic plutocracy; that a pilot be chosen who "will guide the Democratic ship away from the Scylla of militarism without wrecking her in the Charbybdis of commercialism." The greatest of all issues, he said, greater than the silver issue, or the tariff issue, or the trust issue, is the issue of plutocracy versus democracy.

At the most impressive part of Mr. Bryan's speech, the Saturday's dawn began to flood the place, and when he closed the new day had fully come. His speech had lasted from 3:53 to 4:38. At its close there came for 10 minutes the most spontaneous and enthusiastic demonstration of the convention.

At 5:41 in the morning Parker's nomination was made unanimous and the thousands who had sat or stood in the Coliseum hall for nearly 10 consecutive hours began to throng the street. Nothing now remained but to nominate a candidate for Vice President and that was postponed until 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

Despite his defeat on the candidate, Bryan's supporters were happier than Parker's. Both sides felt that Bryan had scored a triumph on the platform, and that in his speech he had made it clear to the country that Parker's defeat will be a defeat for which he and his friends are not responsible. It will be the defeat of the plutocratic-Democrats and not of the democratic-Democrats. And both sides realized that Bryan's speeches were the only ones of the convention at all worthy of the occasion. They all knew, moreover, that he had outgeneraled his more numerous adversaries. The "dead candidate" had become again the living leader of the people.

But Parker had a surprise in store. He had remained silent about his convictions on every political question all through the campaign he was making through Hill and Belmont for the nomination. No one could discover what his views were, if he had any. No one knows yet except on a single question, and that question he himself solemnly asserts is permanently settled, while the convention as solemnly assures him it is not an issue. Why he should have raised it, then, is a mystery. But he has raised it, and in such a manner as to leave room for but one inference—an inference of bad faith.

While he had been strenuously silent,

Hill had represented him; in committee Hill assured his colleagues that he was ignorant of Parker's opinion on this very question; in committee Hill asserted that Parker had told him he would accept the platform of the convention; in committee Hill agreed, with Belmont's approval (both of them Parker's authorized agents in procuring his nomination) to certain compromises in order to secure harmony, Bryan accepting the compromises with the same object in view. These compromises included an understanding that the money question—the one question that stood in the way of harmony, should not be allowed to enter into the campaign. To that agreement Judge Parker was as much a party as Hill, and in honor as well as for harmony's sake, he was bound not to bring the discordant money question into the campaign. The time for him to speak, if he thought it necessary to speak, was before his nomination, not afterward, and through instructions to his managers in advance of the confirmation of the compromise, not by a public declaration after the compromise had been confirmed by the convention.

Bryan's words, when he came from a sick bed at 10 o'clock Saturday night to meet this new trick of plutocracy, were peculiarly apt, though excessively mild: "It was a manly thing in Judge Parker to express his opinion before the convention adjourned, but it would have been a manlier thing had he spoken before the convention met."

This speech was dramatic. At first Bryan's words were inaudible from his physical weakness. Then his voice gathered volume, and soon its notes filled the hall and every syllable came distinctly. Be manly, be honest, take the people into your confidence, was the dominant note of this speech. If you want to declare for the gold standard, do so by amending the platform. "I will offer no objection except to vote against it." But don't resort to the subterfuge of interpreting the platform by the reply you are proposing (a reply which they adopted) to make to Judge Parker's dispatch.

The reply was as cowardly as the dispatch was tricky. No sensible man will accept Parker's byplay as an indication of independence, courage and sincerity, as his supporters would have it. As Gen. James B. Weaver wittily said, replying to some of Parker's eulogists: "It is an optical illusion to suppose Parker to be a foot higher than yesterday; the illusion is caused by the fact that the convention has sunk three feet lower." Under all the circumstances the inference is strong that Judge Parker (whether of his own motion or under the advice of Belmont makes no difference), sought in this manner to secure the benefits while evading the obligations of the compromise his political managers had made for him.

It is inconceivable that Judge Park-

er should have rashly courted unpopularity for himself and his ticket. But his sensational dispatch, and his choice of Davis (the plutocratic West Virginia Democrat, whose son-in-law is the plutocratic West Virginia Republican, Stephen B. Elkins) for running mate might imply indifference to popular disapproval. They certainly confirm all that Mr. Bryan implied about the plutocratic policy of Parkerism.

Bryan made one more speech. It was in reply to the speeches that followed his previous one, and for the purpose of offering an amendment to the dispatch to be sent to Judge Parker. In this he protested that he had done his utmost to bring harmony and that if harmony were jeopardized the fault lay at the door of others. John Sharp Williams responded with a bitter personal attack upon Bryan, declaring that Bryan had presented the spectacle throughout the convention of a man pleading for harmony when his had been the only voice of discord. It was manifestly a false and malicious accusation, but Williams had bargained himself away to the money-changers, and this last stab went with the bargain as "lanyap."

Mr. Bryan's fight was over. He had placed the democratic Democrats fairly before the country and could do no more without weakly yielding to the malicious efforts to make him "bolt." So he rose once more, but for a moment, and withdrawing his amendment said:

Our delegation will vote for the candidate for Vice President that New York wants. We are not going to do one thing to mar the harmony of the convention.

It was said in good faith and in good faith it was carried out. But the convention could hardly have missed the irony, whether intended or not, of this submissive climax. To Bryan himself it must have seemed that if serious suggestion and careful argument, coupled with appeals for calm deliberation in securing harmony, were to be denounced as wanton discords, it were better, without further ceremony, to refer all the remaining business of the convention to the Parker leaders and let them make harmony after their own models and upon their own responsibility.

Democrats who are active in politics, however democratic they may be, and however outraged, will doubtless support this ticket, in order to retain party standing. They are not to be blamed for that. It would be folly for an active man in Democratic politics to abandon the party now. His active opposition as a bolter would be more acceptable to the bosses than his ineffective support within the party. Moreover, the pendulum which now swings toward plutocracy in the Democratic party has swung so far that

the return swing is near at hand, and those who are in place to catch it as it swings back should not lose their advantage of position. But it is a fair wager that active party men will find it a difficult task to secure the aid of their friends for this Presidential ticket of the plutocratic Democracy. Indications are not lacking that no inconsiderable army of Democratic voters will leave August Belmont and the Standard Oil crowd who made the Parker-Davis ticket to their own devices to elect it. With the Populist party offering a good democratic ticket, and a superior democratic platform; with the Socialist party confronting better propaganda opportunities than it has ever had; with the Prohibition party moving with renewed vigor into the campaign, there are ways in which unfettered democratic Democrats can protest against the sale of their party to the votaries of "frenzied finance." Even Roosevelt may not be so objectionable to them, when contrasted with Parker. In those circumstances, organization Democrats who are hunting honest votes instead of campaign funds, will find their place as workers for Parker in the campaign no sinecure, however earnest they may be.

One fact became evident, after Parker's dispatch arrived. The Parker faction was anxious to force Bryan to bolt. They would be happier now if he had bolted. They know full well that a formal bolt would serve them better and democratic Democracy less than any other single event.

L. F. P.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, July 14.

The event of the week is the action of the national Democratic convention at St. Louis, which effected a temporary organization on the 6th with John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, as temporary chairman (p. 215), and after disposing of contests, completed its permanent organization on the 7th, with Champ Clark, of Missouri, as permanent chairman.

At the evening session of the 8th, the platform, over which the committee on resolutions had been in conflict for two days, was reported to the convention unanimously by Senator Daniel, of Virginia, the chairman of the committee. It was immediately adopted as reported, and is in substance as follows:

It declares "devotion to the essential

principles of the Democratic faith," which are impressive of the necessity, particularly at this time, of "reform and the rescue of the administration of government from the headstrong, arbitrary and spasmodic methods which distract business by uncertainty, and pervade the public mind with dread, distrust and perturbation." Applying these principles to the living issues of the day, the platform demands "freedom of the press, of conscience and of speech—equality before the law of all citizens; right of trial by jury—freedom of the person defended by the writ of habeas corpus; liberty of personal contract untrammelled by supplementary laws; supremacy of the civil over military authority; a well disciplined militia; the separation of church and state; economy in expenditures, low taxes, that labor may be lightly burdened; prompt and sacred fulfillment of public and private obligations; fidelity to treaties; peace and friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none; absolute acquiescence in the will of the majority, the vital principle of republics." Becoming more specific, it declares on the subject of labor for—

the enactment and administration of laws giving labor and capital impartially their just rights. Capital and labor ought not to be enemies. Each is necessary to the other. Each has its rights, but the rights of labor are certainly no less "vested," no less "sacred," and no less "unalienable" than the rights of capital.

Regarding the labor and military disturbances in Colorado, the platform reads:

Constitutional guarantees are violated whenever any citizen is denied the right to labor, acquire and enjoy property, or reside where interest or inclination may determine. Any denial thereof by individuals, organizations or governments should be summarily rebuked and punished. We deny the right of any Executive to disregard or suspend any constitutional privilege or limitation. Obedience to the laws and respect for their requirements are alike the supreme duty of the citizen and the official. The military should be used only to support and to maintain the law. We unqualifiedly condemn its employment for the summary banishment of citizens without trial or for the control of elections.

On "government by injunction" this is the declaration:

We approve the measure which passed the United States Senate in 1896, but which a Republican Congress has ever since refused to enact, relating to contempts in Federal courts, and providing for trial by jury in cases of indirect contempt.

The platform favors liberal appropriations for waterways; opposes "the Republican policy of starving home development in order to feed the greed for conquest and the appetite for national 'prestige' and display of strength." demands economy in expenditures, honesty in the public service, investigation of maladministration; condemns refusal of Republicans in Con-