

them. He was doubtless, as he says, a victim of his environment; a victim of that vicious public sentiment which sets up success in the place of righteousness as its moral standard. Had sound moral principles been inculcated by the "men of light and leading" in his community, Mr. Murrell would have seen the hideousness of the crime of bribery as soon as it showed its head. He might have embraced it, but he would then have done so as a conscious criminal. His conscience would not have slumbered until the boodle investigations awoke it. His crime is attributable no more to his own weakness and cupidity than to those leaders of public opinion in St. Louis and elsewhere, in church and college, in newspaper and drawing room, who teach that there is no such thing as moral principle; but that righteousness is determined by success, principle by policy, duty by destiny. When we learn to do right for righteousness' sake, we shall have fewer crimes like that which Mr. Murrell has just discovered to be hideous. Our nation, too, will have cleaner hands; for its crimes, like those of Murrell, are committed because we as a people do not realize their hideousness while they seem to pay

"BRYANISM" IN STATE CONVENTIONS.

Now that the political field may be scanned, the "reorganizers," who have been scheming to throw the Democratic party back into the embraces of Hill, Cleveland, Whitney, Lamont and the other old-time tribesmen of Democratic professions but plutocratic faith, do not appear to have met with flattering success. They were so weak that they could not carry on a candid contest anywhere. They could do nothing but urge the State conventions, on one local plea or another, to make no reference to the last national platform, and then use the plutocratic press of both parties to herald the fact of this mere silence as evidence of reaction.

It was a game of political thimble-rig. But even at that game they have lost.

Only in Wisconsin can the "reorganizers" be regarded as having scored a victory. And such a victory! The hand of the Federal administration and the maneuverings of the local monopoly rings, are so plainly in evidence there that no genuine democrat can afford to support the ticket. Every vote for the Democratic candidate in Wisconsin this year is in reality a vote for the very worst elements of the Republican party of that State.

The situation may be easily understood.

Gov. La Follette is a democratic Republican. He is trying to do in Wisconsin what Gov. Pingree tried to do in Michigan, and what Gov. Cummins is trying to do in Iowa—rescue his party and his State from the grasp of sordid monopolists.

His two leading principles are equal taxation and primary nominations. The latter threatens political machines; the former threatens railroad monopolies. Consequently he has had to contend against all the political and monopoly corruption that seethes in his party in Wisconsin, and incidentally against such power as the Roosevelt administration could exert by means of the spoils of Federal office.

At the beginning of his long fight, Gov. La Follette was beaten; but two years ago he won the nomination and election for governor, and secured the adoption by his party convention of the two principles for which he contends—equal taxation and primary nominations.

But the political and monopoly machines did not despair. Through faithless public officials, they effectively obstructed the La Follette policy in both particulars, and planned to retire La Follette from public life and to put a quietus upon his policy, when the next State convention should meet.

In this they were strenuously supported by President Roosevelt, who placed the Federal patronage at their disposal with a view to building up a Roosevelt machine in Wisconsin, and was conveniently blind to the "pernicious activity" of Federal office holders in State politics. Mr. Roosevelt's first overt act in the conspiracy was his selection for an important place in his cabinet—im-

portant with reference to railroad connections and official patronage,—of the very head center of the Wisconsin monopoly ring. He appointed Henry C. Payne to the office of postmaster general. The evident object of this appointment was to break down "La Folletteism," which savored altogether too much of "Bryanism" to please the political palate of the monopoly rings in general and the Milwaukee ring in particular.

Payne was seconded by Senator Spooner, also one of the monopoly ring of which Payne is chief; and under cover of a movement to "induce" Spooner to accept a second term in the United States Senate, a vicious campaign was waged in the Republican party of Wisconsin against "La Follette and "La Folletteism." How vicious this campaign was, and how significantly it reflects upon the civil service reform pretensions of the Roosevelt administration, may be fairly inferred from the following editorial comment of the Duluth News-Tribune, an uncompromisingly orthodox Republican paper of a neighboring State. In its issue of July 23, 1902, the News-Tribune said that—

men appointed to Federal office by the influence of Senator Spooner went to the State capital a year ago last winter and made a bitter and persistent fight on the La Follette programme, which had been unanimously adopted by the Republican State convention in 1900, and on which he had been elected governor by the greatest majority ever given a candidate for that office in Wisconsin. These Federal office holders have since carried on war against La Follette personally, as well as against the principles for which he specially stands.

But the Payne-Spooner ring of monopoly manipulators and beneficiaries, ably supported though it was by the notorious misuse of Federal patronage, came to grief in the Republican State convention. La Follette had made the fight before the masses of the party at the primaries, and they had sent up delegates whom the ring was unable to seduce. By a large majority, consequently, La Follette was renominated and "La Folletteism" was reindorsed.

Beaten in the Republican convention, the Payne ring now turned for help to the Democratic convention. Their leader here was ex-Senator Vilas, a "reorganizing" Democrat.

Vilas, also, is in his business affiliations one of the Payne ring; and, like Senator Hanna, he never allows his politics to interfere with his business. He undertook to line up the Democratic party to the support of the Payne ring, when the Republican party had abandoned it; and as Spooner's reelection had been the cover under which the ring worked with the Republicans, "harmony" was the cover under which Vilas worked with the Democrats. His efforts were crowned with success. The Democratic convention lined up against the La Follette programme and in favor of that of the Payne-Vilas-Spooner ring. And to cinch matters it nominated for governor against La Follette, Mayor David R. Rose, of Milwaukee, a Democrat who has turned out to be one of the most pliant tools of the Payne ring that ever held office in Wisconsin.

That Rose's nomination was closely related to Payne's interests was ludicrously disclosed by Rose himself a few days before his nomination. We quote the report of the occurrence as it appeared in the Milwaukee correspondence of the Chicago Record-Herald (Republican) under date of August 26:

Mayor Rose tossed so many nice bouquets at Senator Spooner and Postmaster General Payne when making his welcoming address to the postmasters, who opened their convention to-day, that he was suspected of belonging to the dominant party in the State. Vice President Hull, of Peoria, Ill., who was called upon to respond to the address of welcome, suggested that the many good things characteristic of Milwaukee related by the Mayor were probably due to the fact that he was a member of the party which sent Senator Spooner to the Senate and furnished Henry C. Payne for the cabinet. Mr. Hull was somewhat surprised at the outburst of laughter and applause which greeted his statement, while the Mayor was almost jarred out of his usual self-possession manner.

Rose's blunder in overdoing his compliments doubtless arose from his consciousness of the support the Payne ring was giving him. It is an open secret that Rose, not La Follette, is the chosen candidate of this "combine," and that Rose is to be supported by the henchmen of the ring, including Federal office holders.

Do not these plain facts demand of the truly democratic voters of all parties in Wisconsin that they vote against Rose? The only way to vote for genuine democracy in that State

this year is to vote for La Follette. Not that he is intelligently a democrat or his programme intelligently democratic. Neither he nor it can be so regarded. But he has arrayed himself against the plutocratic policies of his party bosses, and his programme is unpalatable to its plutocratic rings. This should count for him. The Democratic leaders of that State, on the other hand, have thrown their party into the lap of the very monopoly ring that the La Follette Republicans are trying to shake off, and have nominated for the head of their ticket one of its trusted tools. This also ought to count for La Follette. With Democrats who believe in democracy and mean to have it, these considerations should not only count, but they should count decisively. It is to be hoped that La Follette will be elected by a majority larger even than the one he got two years ago.

Of course a Democratic convention that had gone into partnership with the great monopoly ring of Wisconsin of which Payne is the head, in order to defeat a Republican who is leading a revolt against that ring, could not afford to be tainted with "Bryanism." Consequently the "reorganizers" won in the Democratic convention in Wisconsin. They won because the local circumstances favored a combination of Democratic office seekers with the plundering railroad and street car rings which have their business center in Milwaukee, and their political center in the post office department at Washington.

Iowa is another state in which it is assumed that the "reorganizers" were successful. But this assumption is not well founded.

In that state also Mr. Roosevelt has been trying to construct a Roosevelt machine along the lines he adopted for Wisconsin. When the Gov. Cummins faction of Iowa Republicans, in a cleaning-out campaign within the party, had defeated the Gov. Shaw faction which had always been subservient to the railroad monopoly interests of the State, Mr. Roosevelt promptly took the defeated Shaw into his cabinet, just as he had the defeated Payne. His idea seems to have been that a minority faction of his party in those States could be turned into a majority faction by strengthening it with Federal patronage. Whether or not this combination influenced the Democratic

convention of Iowa, as the similar combination in Wisconsin influenced the Democratic convention of Wisconsin, we are unable to say. There is no indication that it did; and, judging from trustworthy information we believe that it did not.

The action of the Iowa convention with reference to indorsing the Kansas City platform appears to have been due to a feeling among a majority of the delegates that the specific question of the coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1 is obsolete as a political issue, and that the indorsement of that platform would be equivalent to exploiting this silver issue. Playing upon that feeling a small number of "reorganizers," who needed nothing but silence on the part of the convention to enable them to say that it had abandoned the principles of the Kansas City platform, succeeded by only a small majority—384 to 344—in rejecting a reaffirmation plank.

But they did not control the convention, which was not at all a reactionary body. Had it been charged with national functions, it was a convention that would have accepted the general principles and most of the specific demands of the national platform without hesitation. It was one that would have nominated Bryan himself, had he been a candidate before it, and by a large majority.

To refer to the omission of a reaffirmation plank by a small majority in such a convention as a triumph for the "reorganizers," only exposes the weakness of the "reorganizers" who claim it.

In Michigan the situation was not unlike that in Iowa. This convention, also, was a Bryanite convention. Had it been called for national purposes, the principles of the Kansas City platform would have been indorsed by it overwhelmingly; and Bryan, had he been a candidate before it, would have been nominated almost by acclamation. The gubernatorial candidate owed his nomination to the votes of pronounced Bryanites.

Its omission of any reference to the Kansas City platform had nothing to do with the sentiment of the delegates on that subject. They were approaching a bitter local fight over a railroad question, and were anxious not only to avoid dissensions in the Democratic vote, but also to do nothing to alienate so much of the Republican vote as was believed to be

in sympathy with them on the local railroad question. So, when the "reorganizers"—a minority on the committee of resolutions—proposed to ignore the Kansas City platform for those reasons, the majority of the committee replied: "Very good; but those reasons apply to all other national issues as well as to the Kansas City platform, and if you leave that out you must say nothing at all about national affairs." This was agreed to, and the party has gone into the State campaign on State issues alone, appealing to the Republicans to help them.

What encouragement for the "reorganizers" can possibly be drawn from those circumstances?

Pennsylvania is another State that ignores the Kansas City platform. But there, too, all national issues are ignored for the purpose of enabling Pattison to ask for Republican votes to divest a malodorous Republican ring of its control in State affairs. In Pennsylvania, as in Michigan, the platform, the campaign, and the candidate are absolutely colorless with reference to national affairs. Mr. Pattison wouldn't know a national issue if he met it on the street. There is no more significance, therefore, in the neglect of the Democratic convention of Pennsylvania to recognize the Kansas City platform than there is in the fact that that platform is ignored every year by thousands of school districts in elections for school trustees.

The California Democrats, too, have ignored the Kansas City platform. But the fact that in Franklin K. Lane their convention has nominated a radical free trader, who is an avowed follower of Henry George and who supported Bryan in his presidential campaigns, is a pretty good indication that in California, as in Michigan and Pennsylvania, it was the exigencies of a local controversy over local matters, and not reactionary tendencies in national affairs, that dictated the local platform.

Indiana and Illinois are the only other States of importance in which the Democratic convention has ignored the Kansas City platform. In neither is the fact significant. The Democratic organization of Indiana is a mere office-seeking machine, to which causes are only what costumes are to actors; and in Illinois the bi-partisan monopolists have se-

cured such control of the Democratic organization that if the party were to sweep the State, corporations would nevertheless control its caucuses and the Republicans would nevertheless have a majority in both houses of the legislature.

The less the "reorganizers" boast about "downing Bryanism" in Indiana and Illinois, the longer they may go on without getting found out.

Over against the States already named as having, for one reason or another, ignored the national platform in the Democratic conventions, are Texas, Tennessee, Minnesota, Missouri, South Dakota, Idaho, Colorado, Nebraska and Ohio, all of which reaffirm it. Most important of all the States that have taken a stand either way regarding this matter, is Ohio; for Ohio furnishes the only important battle ground of the year for the Democratic party. And here the principles of the Kansas City platform are not only reaffirmed, but they are emphasized in such manner as to leave the "reorganizers" speechless when asked why such principles should not be held by everyone with any reasonable pretensions to the title of Democrat. For what Democrat can object to opposition to colonialism, trusts, trust-fostering tariffs, government by injunction, financial monopolies, and all other legalized monopolies?

In Ohio, as in some of the other States named above, local issues are for the moment paramount, and the convention was elected only for local purposes. It therefore had no authority to remodel the national platform. Neither had it any right, if intending to act as part of the Democratic party of the nation, to ignore the national body and its declaration of principles. This was made clear by Tom L. Johnson, when, in his opening speech as chairman of the convention, he pointedly said:

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 councils 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 con-

ventions 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 non-partisan monopolists. Having done that, it is our duty to turn to the affairs of our own state.

This suggestion was adopted by the convention unanimously. Only three members of the resolutions committee of 21 opposed it; and they were silent in the convention, so overwhelming was the sentiment against them. As thus unanimously adopted, the Ohio platform on national matters reads as follows:

In State convention assembled, we, the Democrats of Ohio, hereby acknowledge and declare our continued allegiance to the Democratic party of the Nation, and on national issues reaffirm and endorse the principles laid down in the last national platform adopted at Kansas City and faithfully and ably represented in the presidential campaign of 1900 by William Jennings Bryan. Regarding those principles as opposed to imperialism and colonialism, as opposed to government by injunction, as opposed to trusts and trust-fostering tariffs, as opposed to financial monopoly, and as opposed to all other legalized monopolies and privileges, we condemn every effort to repudiate or ignore them.

It is a significant fact that the "reorganizers" "sing exceeding small" since the Ohio convention. They have pestered the Democratic State conventions of the country with a nettle which all were admonished not to touch because it would sting. But Tom L. Johnson and the Democratic convention of Ohio grasped that nettle boldly and firmly and proved to everybody that its sting exists only in the inventive imaginations of the "reorganizers."

If the Kansas City platform has been correctly interpreted by the Ohio Democracy, what is the objection to it? If it is opposed to imperialism, if it is opposed to government by injunction, if it is opposed to trusts and trust-fostering tariffs, if it is opposed to financial monopolies, if it is op-

posed to all other monopolies and privileges, why is it not a good platform?

Are we answered that it advocates free silver at 16 to 1? But isn't that issue dead? Is it, or is it not? If it is not dead, let us reason about it and not fall victims to prejudice. If it is dead, then how does it hurt a platform the principles of which are otherwise sound?

The free silver question really cuts no figure with the plutocratic leaders of the "reorganizers." What they object to in the Kansas City platform is not any obsolete declaration for free silver, but its living declarations against monopoly of all kinds. Mayor Johnson hit them squarely between the eyes when in his Sandusky speech he said: "It was not free silver that frightened the plutocratic leaders. What they feared was free men."

PULPIT ECONOMISTS.

A prominent clergyman in one of the large cities and on a recent Sunday:

Never has the bread and butter problem been so great to the poor man of this country as at present; never so many scantily fed people as now, with all the work they can do. It is bad enough to do nothing and go hungry; it is worse to work day in and day out and still be hungry, with the employer growing richer day by day. The situation cannot be otherwise with the cost of living increased 40 or 50 per cent. and wages of the hardest worker advanced ten per cent., and not even that much in many instances.

Those clergymen who are really pastors in their parishes know better than any other class of men the home conditions among the poorer members of the community, and many are doing good service in telling the facts of their observation. One can hardly pick up a Monday paper without seeing some such testimony as that quoted above.

We say they are doing good service, because the well-to-do need to know that the glitter of their prosperity is making contrasts of shadows all the blacker. History has shown more than once how a time of prosperity might be a time of intensest privation. We should not be permitted ever to forget the sharp lesson of the reign of Louis XVI., when, on the very eve of the French revolution,

the orthodox journals were talking of France's prosperity. There were doubtless many in France—such as got their cue of thought from reading only on one side, as most of us do—who had no idea how the other side lived. They saw the world through their own spectacles, just as we are apt to do to-day.

"How prosperous everything is," said a dear old lady, showing a letter just received; "I am offered 145 for this bank stock and it never brought more than 120 before." I told her I had had a talk with a carpenter that morning who told me that he was finding it harder to make ends meet than ever in his life, and that the thirty-odd carpenters in the town were thinking for the first time of trying to form a union to raise wages. "Dear me," she said, "I thought everybody was prosperous nowadays."

And so we repeat that the clergymen who are brave enough to tell prosperous congregations that prosperity is not as widespread as most of them perhaps think, are useful prophets in refusing to prophesy smooth things.

But when these clergymen speak further than to tell the facts, when they proceed to discuss the method of alleviation and remedy, there is hardly one in a hundred but adopts a tone that is distasteful to any self-respecting workingman. In the same sermon from which we quoted above the preacher said:

The master is to recognize the servant's humanity. The employer has the authority to command, and it is the servant's duty to obey authority, but the humanity of those in servitude appeals to and cries for mercy at the hand of the master, and it is his bounden duty to obey. . . . The master is to provide comforts and nourishment for the body of the servant according to needs. A man cannot do satisfactory work on an insufficient support or starvation wages.

Now, though clergymen have not, workingmen have, got beyond the time when the relationship expressed in such words is recognized as the true one between the laborer and the man who buys his labor. Labor is now, at least theoretically, free labor. There is no more reason for saying that the plowman, or the factoryman, or the miner is in servitude than for saying the lawyer, or the physician, or the bookkeeper is in servitude. There is no more reason for talking about the

master providing nourishment to the man who sells him labor than to the man who sells him a horse.

If clergymen will change their point of view as to the relationship between the workingman and the employer, will think of his relationship as one involving simply justice and equal rights rather than mercy and charity, and will honestly inquire whether the conditions of labor are based on justice and a law free from all privilege, then they will soon find that there will be more sympathy between the church and the masses and more workingmen in their congregations.

J. H. DILLARD.

NEWS

The old political saw, "As goes Maine so goes the Union," always excites national interest in the local elections of that State. For this reason the returns from the Maine election of the 9th are of special news importance. But full reports are not yet in, and no inference as to the general significance of the election can be drawn. Both parties are claiming a victory. As this depends, however, not upon the result (Maine being at all times a Republican State by an overwhelming majority), no such claims on either side can be considered without full returns admitting of comparisons with the votes of previous years.

The Republican candidate for governor appears to have received a plurality of about 26,000, which is nearly the same as that of 1898 and 8,000 less than that of 1900. It is also about the same percentage of the aggregate as in 1898, the last previous "off year." The Republican candidates for congress are reported to have been elected by "safe majorities," but the majorities are not given. The two houses of the State legislature will probably be divided between the parties about as before. The Democrats of the Portland county, Cumberland, have elected their candidate for sheriff, but evidently from purely local reasons. Altogether, so far as can be judged by the very indefinite election returns, neither party can claim an advantage. Maine appears to have undergone no notable change in general political sentiment.

At a session of the Wisconsin Democratic convention subsequent to that