

The Chicago Chronicle is something like Artemus Ward's kangaroo, which was a "komical kuss." The Chronicle began life in 1895 as "the only Democratic paper in Chicago," and has been reared through the careful nursing of John R. Walsh, banker, plutocratic Democrat, head-center of Republican-Democratic rings, chief manipulator of politico-business deals and expectant partisan of Grover Cleveland's fourth candidacy as President. In 1896 the Chronicle "bolted" the Democratic ticket, and lost so heavily in circulation in consequence that it took the other tack in 1900. But no one trusted its democracy then, and it gained nothing by its spasm of pretended loyalty. Since the defeat in 1900, which it feebly tried to prevent but over which it strenuously rejoiced, it has masqueraded as an independent Democratic paper. The mask was thin, however, for the paper exhibited no signs of democracy beyond advocating the candidacy for 1904 of the nominal Democratic Cleveland. And now that Hill has side-tracked Cleveland with Parker, the Chronicle with refreshing honesty throws off its mask and openly declares itself to be what for the most part it has actually been, "a Republican" paper. Since Mr. Walsh owns the Chronicle and dictates its policy, it is to be presumed that he also is ready to renounce his pretenses of Democracy and henceforth to label himself honestly as "a Republican" plutocrat. Mr. H. W. Seymour, the publisher of the Chronicle, is already on record, in an interview in the Chicago Tribune of the 12th, as saying that Mr. Walsh is "as good a Republican as anybody."

The Chronicle becomes a Republican newspaper on the ground, so it says, that the St. Louis convention demonstrates that the Democratic party is "subservient to Bryan," and that it "is Bryan." It is uncertain where the Chronicle obtained the information which led it to this conclusion. Its own dispatches from St. Louis would not justify it at all. In the

Chronicle of the 9th F. E. Sullivan, the Chronicle's special correspondent at St. Louis, asserted that Mr. Bryan "had no more to do with" the omission of a money plank from the platform "than any other single member of the majority of the committee on resolutions; and "as a matter of fact, Bryan exercised no influence in the committee. He was regarded there as a repudiated, dethroned leader, whose presence was a misfortune and a harbinger of fresh disaster," and who "can never rise again." But the Chronicle never was strong on consistency. The comical thing about its last move is that it has been trying hard to force Bryan to "bolt," and now Bryan has made it "bolt." If all the plutocratic Democrats would follow Walsh's example, and all the democratic-Republicans would come into their vacated places in the Democratic party, American politics would be much improved.

To speculate upon the present political situation may be rather profitless, yet some possibilities of speculation are peculiarly interesting. Through Belmont, the plutocrats have invested probably a million dollars to capture the Democratic organization and nominate Hill's silent man. But they have done this less with a view to his election than to whipping Roosevelt into line by scaring him with a Wall street adversary at the polls. Should Roosevelt satisfy the Wall street crowd that he will walk their chalk line, they will naturally enough prefer Republican to Democratic success; though they are not likely to get excited over an election in which they "stand to win" no matter which candidate is returned. In these circumstances they will probably make comparatively small financial contributions to each party, and await the "safe and sane" result with indifference. One-fourth of \$15,000,000, the amount they are reported to have disbursed to defeat Bryan in 1896, might seem to them a reasonable business investment, the amount to be about equally divided, but they are not likely to go much

deeper into their pockets than that. Having "a sure thing" they are unlikely to see any reason for spending money except to keep the politicians in good humor. Yet they may count without their host when they presume upon Roosevelt's good humor over a divided campaign fund and feeble plutocratic support. He is not the silent man that Judge Parker is. On the contrary he is just the man who would show his teeth and break silence if overtures to him by the plutocratic rings were distasteful. In that case they would be exposed as sure as fate, and that would be disastrous to their hopes for "safety" and "sanity."

#### ANALYSIS OF THE ST. LOUIS PLATFORM.

Considered simply as a party creed, framed by representative men from all sections of the country, who were moved by strong diverse opinions and many conflicting prejudices, the St. Louis platform appeals to us as one of the best, if not the very best, the Democratic party of the nation has ever sanctioned.

It is far from perfect, both in generals and in details. Few thoughtful men, whatever their opinions, would be willing to accept it without reservation or modification. But no platform that any thoughtful man would accept unreservedly and unconditionally is ever likely to be adopted by a large deliberative body, representative of the people of a country as varied in the character of its inhabitants as ours, if its members act in freedom. Platforms promulgated by such bodies are necessarily resultants not only of conference and conversion, but also of compromise—more of compromise, perhaps, than of anything else.

With this understanding we unhesitatingly pronounce the platform good. But for the bad taste in the mouth left by the manipulators of the convention and the plutocratic and pro-slavery atmosphere of the occasion, one might foresee an ideal campaign upon it, and look hopefully forward to success at the election.

Even the Negro question is dealt with considerably. Taken

in connection with the declaration on that subject of the Republican platform, to which it refers as its own reason for being, and ignoring the pro-slavery spirit which called it forth, this plank is unobjectionable.

No one can deny that "the race question has brought countless woes on this country." No one would deny that "the calm wisdom of the American people should see to it that it brings no more." We should all deplore the revival of "the dead and hateful race and sectional animosity in any part of our common country." Moreover, upon reflection we may all "deprecate and condemn the Bourbon-like, selfish, and narrow spirit of the recent Republican convention at Chicago" in demanding that representatives in Congress and in the electoral colleges shall be reduced in proportion to discriminations in the Southern States against voting by illiterate Negroes, if such reductions are not also made in proportion to like discriminations in Northern States against voting by illiterate whites.

The Constitutional provision on this subject is very clear, and it is entirely fair if fairly enforced. It is part of the Fourteenth Amendment and reads as follows:

When the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

The objection to that clause is not that it authorizes reduction of representation, but that it does not authorize it for enough causes. It is incomplete, not obnoxious. There should be no exception for denial of suffrage to women; none for its denial to children under age; none for its denial to aliens; none for its denial to rebels; none for its denial to criminals; none for its denial to anybody. The basis of every State's representation in Federal affairs should in

fairness be its voting population and only its voting population. But this Constitutional provision, even if not complete, is fair as far as it goes. It ought to be enforced, but enforced without sectional discriminations.

If a Southern State disfranchises its male Negro population, whether frankly for race reasons or indirectly on grounds of illiteracy or pauperism, that State should not be allowed to estimate this disfranchised Negro population in the basis for its representation in Congress and its numerical power in the Presidential electoral college. To allow it to do that is unfair to States which do not disfranchise. It enables the governing class of the disfranchising State not merely to disfranchise, but in effect to vote in behalf of the disfranchised upon Federal questions. Whether disfranchisement be excusable or not, there is no excuse for giving political power to the disfranchised and then allowing others to exercise that power.

But this is no more true of disfranchised Negroes in the South than of disfranchised whites in the North. If any State has an educational qualification, or a property qualification, the illiterate and the propertyless who are thereby disfranchised, whether white and in the North or black and in the South, ought not to be estimated in fixing the basis of Federal representation. If, then, the Republicans do not propose to discriminate against Southern States nor with reference to the race question in enforcing the Constitution in this particular, their condemnation by the Democratic platform is unjust. But if they are proposing such discrimination—and their platform certainly implies it—then the Democratic platform condemns them justly.

When this plank is considered in connection with the plank on American citizenship, there is nothing serious to complain of from the point of view of race rights, for the latter pledges the party "to insist upon the just and lawful protection of our citizens at home and abroad, and to use all proper measures to secure for them, whether native born or naturalized, and without distinction of race or creed, the equal protec-

tion of laws and the enjoyment of all rights and privileges open to them under the covenants of our treaties," etc. This may seem like a pledge with reference only to travelers or foreigners abroad, but "the just and lawful protection of our citizens at home and abroad," is a phrase that will not bear that limited interpretation.

The Philippine plank of the St. Louis platform is all that could be desired. It is an unqualified and uncompromising demand for Filipino independence. There are no "weasel" words in this plank. It is a straight-forward, manly declaration which the party, if it comes into power, must either execute by arranging for immediate independence, or flatly repudiate. It cannot excuse practical repudiation by reference to qualifying clauses, for there are none.

There were such clauses, however, in the sub-committee's report. That report filled the plank with "weasel" words, making Philippine independence to depend upon some future time when it can be granted "wisely and safely for the Filipinos themselves, and after amicable arrangements with them concerning naval stations, coaling stations and trade relations, and upon suitable guarantees of protection to all national and international interests." The striking out of this deceptive verbiage was Mr. Bryan's work. He made the pledge one which cannot be evaded.

Whatever opinion may be held regarding the efficacy of the specific remedies proposed for trusts, the statement of principle in connection with the trust question, which denounces "private monopoly" and demands "individual equality of opportunity and free competition," is fundamental and sound. By that standard the trust question can be settled and settled right.

Here again we are indebted to Mr. Bryan's democratic impulses and his master hand, for the sub-committee had dealt very gingerly with the trust question, and Bryan induced the resolutions committee to be courageous.

On the tariff question also the

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