

conviction upon the altar of patriotism and politics. He was a silver coinage man who gave up his monetary convictions to save the "honor of the nation" by becoming president. Long a strenuous advocate of the "home market" for American products, he has now assumed the task of prying open foreign markets for the sake of the great trusts upon which the prosperity of his country depends. Denouncing "forcible annexation" of alien territory as "criminal aggression" within the purview of the American "code of morals," he nevertheless suppressed this ethical conviction to promote a policy of forcible annexation to the extent of dictating a treaty of cession from Spain and carrying on an unauthorized war of conquest against the friendly Philippines. And though he formally and impressively described the concession of free trade to Puerto Rico as a "plain duty," yet he used the influence of his office and the power of its patronage to protect the industries of his country from the ravages of Puerto Rican imports. Mr. McKinley is nothing if he has not been self-sacrificing. His record proves him incapable of shrinking from the sacrifice even of "long-settled convictions," when the occasion demands it.

A candidate for renomination he assuredly will not be. But if the body of the republican party were to rise up and demand his nomination as the originator and protector of American prosperity; if the great modern chevaliers d'industrie who furnish Mr. Hanna with campaign funds upon the basis of their confidence in Mr. McKinley as a "safe man," were to second and foster this demand; and if in response to these pressing mandates the republican convention were with virtual unanimity to tender Mr. McKinley the unparalleled honor of a third nomination, he would no doubt be constrained to sacrifice his "long-settled conviction" against a third presidential term. The sacrifice would be no greater than the others he has made. It could cost

him no more pain than his abandonment of the "home market" theory for the project of forcible entry into foreign markets, or his disinterested and patient shifting from the platform of silver coinage to that of the gold standard; it would cost him less than his divergence from the path of "plain duty" toward Puerto Rico, or his "criminal aggression" in the Philippines. He may be depended upon to do his part if his party calls him. And that it will call him is almost as certain as human prophecy can possibly be. Should the present gaseous prosperity survive until the republican convention of 1904, and continue to deceive the masses of the people with its elusive promises, its association with Mr. McKinley's name will almost inevitably move the rank and file of his party to demand his retention in office as the only person of any party who can prevent its collapse. In that event the demand will come with the spontaneity and resistless force of a political avalanche. It is not altogether improbable that Senator Depew, whose advocacy of a third term nomination culminated in Mr. McKinley's protest, and whose hopes and expectations have other aims than Mr. McKinley's renomination, foresaw this contingency, and started a third term discussion thus prematurely with the shrewd design of forcing just such a disclaimer as Mr. McKinley has made. But if Senator Depew thinks he has ruled Mr. McKinley off the presidential track, by causing him to proclaim a "long settled" conviction against a third term and an ardent personal desire and firm intention to return to private citizenship, then Senator Depew misreads Mr. McKinley's fluctuating record and miscalculates his ability to make sacrifices of personal comfort and convictions.

For a degree of impudence, which nothing but supreme confidence in the assinine stupidity of the people can account for, a recent editorial in the New York Sun, said to be under the control of J. Pierpont Morgan, ex-

cells. After attributing Bryan's defeat to his making opposition to plutocracy the keynote of his presidential canvass, the editorial referred to exclaims:

War upon plutocracy is hopeless. The democracy will never prevail until it satisfies the country that the democrats, not the republican party, are the real friends and instruments of plutocracy. They must offer more favorable conditions for money-making than the republicans can furnish, or they will remain indefinitely as poor in political strength as they are to-day.

Since plutocracy means government by the rich, the comment upon that Sun editorial and its context, made by the City and State, of Philadelphia, one of the few real organs of public opinion that are left to fight the battles of democracy against the plutocracy which raises its head in both the democratic and the republican parties, commends itself to calm consideration. Says City and State, referring to the editorial—

It openly and with all assurance throws down the gage of battle in the issue before the country of "the Dollar or the Man." Those who have asserted that the real fight going on in the country is precisely about that, have been accused of demagoguery. Let not the appearance of Mr. Bryan's name prejudice any so that they cannot see the significance of what is here uttered so vauntingly. Commercialism, according to this, and in its grossest and hugest shape, is in the saddle, and is bound to ride us just where it will. It is well to have what is central and supreme in the conflict acknowledged to be just what it is, and not have it treacherously obscured.

Senator McLaurin, the senatorial representative in South Carolina of the McKinley administration—the senator who claims to be a democrat while advocating republican policies and voting with the republican party—does not shine as a man of superabundant veracity. One of the things he has ventured to say for the purpose of exciting southern prejudice against the national leader of the democracy is that Mr. Bryan, when a member of congress, refused in the democratic caucus to support Crisp, of Georgia, for speaker, because Crisp