arreed to him. It is the basis of our industrial development and it is the guaranty of our political liberty. . . . The Democratic party, if it is to be a power for good in this country, must be the defender of human rights. It must devote itself to the protection of human rights. It must declare, establish and defend the true relation between man and property, a relation recognized by both Jefferson and Lincolna relation which puts man first and his possessions afterward, a relation which makes man the master of that which he has created, a relation which puts the spiritual and moral life of the nation above its material wealth and resources. . . . The fight must go op, and must go on until victory is secured.

This exalted concept of Democratic duty is fitly coupled with an answer to the question, "Can we win?" The answer should be an inspiration to all despondent friends and captious critics "who think that a temporary victory of the conservative element ends progress in the Democratic partv." To those who do so think Mr. Bryan suggests this reply:

O ye of little faith! Go forth into the fields and see how the myriad grains, bursting forth from their prison in the earth, push upward toward the light. Watch them as under the influence of sunshine and shower they grow to maturity and furnish food for the race. Go. into the orchard and see the seed of the grafted twig grow into a great tree whose leaves furnish shade and whose fruit gives nourishment to man. Measure if you can the mighty forces behind the grain and the tree, and know ye that the forces behind the truth are as irresistible and as constantly at work. God would have been unkind, indeed, had He made such ample provision for the needs of man's body and less adequate provision for the triumph of those moral forces which mean more to the race than food or clothing or shelter. He is a political atheist who doubts the triumph of the right. He lacks faith in the purposes and the plans of God who for a moment falters in the great struggle between truth and error-between man and mammon.

In such a faith and with such a goal to strive for, under a leader who has the discernment to grasp political opportunities as they unfold and the skill to take advantage of them for his cause, is there not good work for democratic Democrats to do?

The question propounded by

in behalf of the Democratic party has lost none of its interest. now that three months have gone by and things not reckoned with by the Nation have happened. "What the party is beginning to ask," said the Nation, "is what Mr. Bryan intends after he is beaten in the drafting of the platform?" One of the things which have happened and with which the Nation did not reckon, is the fact that Mr. Bryan wasn't so very completely beaten in drafting the platform.

It is a cheerful thing to be told that imperialism is the dominant issue in this Presidential campaign, extremely cheerful when the information comes from men who voted for imperialism four years ago. Let's be fair to Roosevelt. It was not he, it was Mc-Kinley, who set the pace for American imperialism. velt has merely inherited McKinley's policy. He may like it, but he didn't invent it. To what extent imperialism is an issue in this campaign will appear more clearly when Parker's letter of acceptance sees the light. The Democratic platform on the subject is excellent, but who knows that Parker will not amend the platform again? Whether he does or not, a proper modesty should induce men who voted for McKinley in 1900, when imperialism was a vital issue, to "sing small" about imperialism in 1904, when it has almost become academic. Having then nailed the black flag of imperialism above the stars and stripes, their protests against imperialism now have a flavor.

"A sphinx or a sport, which?" "You marks your ballot and you takes your choice."

In McClure's for August Lincoln Steffens makes another valuable contribution to his exposure of the business man's "graft" in politics, his specific subject being the political conditions in Illinois. This subject enables him to suggest a significant parallel between the New York Nation of April 28 the political career and finan-

cial enemies of Deneen, the Republican prosecuting attorney of Chicago, now Republican candidate for governor of the Republican State of Illinois, and those of Folk, the Democratic prosecuting attorney of St. Louis and now Democratic candidate for governor of the Democratic State of Missouri. It is a parallel which impresses the lesson Mr. Steffens has in mindthat business "grafters" are strictly non-partisan. What makes Mr. Steffens's work especially valuable is the unmistakable fact that he is digging down below the surface. A "grafter" is to him simply a "grafter," even if he does sit in high social and business places and call his "graft" business and his methods "safe and sane." The likeness he finds between Folk and Deneen, while not perfect, is really close enough to justify the parallel he draws.

Prof. Frederick Starr's protest against a demand that the Igorrotes at the St. Louis exposition be covered with some kind of civilized clothing, is well taken. The clothing these people wear is what they are accustomed to. It is meager to the extreme of scantiness. But it is not immodest, and only innate immodesty or provincial ignorance could be shocked by it. Prof. Starr's criticism of this mock modesty is severe enough, but it is altogether just; and it is in keeping with the strong character of the man. He is a college professor who isn't satisfied with the superficial. As a sociological expert he has delved deep enough to find that man is more than an animal, and is pretty much the same in essentials wherever you come to know him. Simply through his anthropological investigations and studies, distinctly inductive or "scientific." Prof. Starr has reached democratic conclusions that are usually associated only with idealism. This is doubtless due to his human method. Others may study "inferiors," but Starr studies men, doing so in the only way in which any type or race of men