

him, not because he is the man Bryan, but because he is the conscience of the Democratic party.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), July 23.—Mr. Bryan's plan of campaign for the future might have gone further without running ahead of the real sentiment of the American people. . . . If Mr. Bryan will look around him he will see that the radicalism of the country—the intelligent and effective radicalism—is ready for even a broader platform than that which he promulgates. Yet Mr. Bryan's platform is good enough for a beginning. His friends will not quarrel with him for having failed to go further. He has started right; and that is the main point. The rest is merely a matter of keeping on. The logic of his declaration that a monopoly in private hands is intolerable involves the monopoly of natural opportunity; and there is no means of destroying this monopoly so simple and so ready at hand as a tax on the value of land without regard to improvements. . . . It is to be hoped that Mr. Bryan will see his way clear to an enlargement of his programme. The time is ripe for it. The interests of Democratic Democracy demand it. A powerful and a growing minority in the party feels that longer to ignore the patent monopoly of all is not only inexpedient but cowardly and almost criminal. And this minority which Mr. Bryan cannot but respect and whose fidelity he has every reason to trust will not be content to have so vital a matter kept forever in the background without formal recognition.

DEMOCRATIC POLITICS.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), July 21.—Grover Cleveland and his approval to the Parker ticket. It is just such streaks of hard luck that often discourage good men going into politics.

Chicago Chronicle (Rep.), July 26.—But suppose Uncle Sam Davis were suddenly to break loose with his telegraph, whooping it up for silver—wouldn't that be still braver because still later, than the Judge's heroic effort?

San Francisco Star (Dem.), July 23.—Tom L. Johnson returned to his home at Cleveland, Ohio, enthusiastic for the Democratic ticket and platform. . . . A ticket that is good enough for Tom L. Johnson ought to be democratic enough for all the rest of us, and he is.

Goodhue County (Minn.) News (Dem.), July 23.—America is now blessed with two putrefactive parties, and both Presidential candidates are "safe" men. The eight years of weary wandering in the desert is over, and the Democratic party is at last—not in Canaan, oh, no—back at the flesh pots of Egypt!

Chicago Chronicle (Rep.), July 26.—Mr. Cleveland might know without making a very careful analysis of the interchanges between Judge Parker and the convention that there is much more of congratulation and hope for Mr. Bryan than for himself in a survey of the situation. If he himself does not know it the conservative, sane, thoughtful people of whom he is supposed to be the most eminent representative either know it or will find it out before election.

Hearst's Chicago Examiner (Dem.), July 27.—To obtain his party's undivided support Judge Parker has only to show in his letter of acceptance that he is in hearty accord with the St. Louis platform declarations on the tariff and the trusts and then surround himself with counselors whose antecedents and associations are not at war with the platform's spirit. This course would cause to disappear the dissatisfaction with which his nomination was received by the radical and progressive elements of the party.

(Cleveland) Waechter und Anzeiger (Ger. Dem.), July 2.—Senator Gorman positively declared that he could not accept the chairmanship of the Democratic national committee for which he had been mentioned. This must have been for one of two reasons. Either Gorman does not care to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for a man whom he considers to have much less claim to the presidential nomination than he himself; or Gorman, who has always been able to scart trouble from afar, and already sees sure defeat in November, would rather the responsibility for the crash should rest upon some one else.

Manchester (Eng.) Guardian (Lib.), July 11.—To party managers and to what Americans especially call "politicians"—that is, men who devote their lives to capturing and enjoying the fruits of office through numerous candidates like Judge Parker are pearls beyond price; in a campaign they are good figureheads, and after it, if they attain office, they are sufficiently compliant chiefs. When the Democratic party adopted Mr. Bryan in 1896 it went wholly outside this tradition. It chose a man of strong personal will, of impetuous and even eccentric originality, brimful of convictions and principles and scruples, who simply swept party managers off their feet by the torrent of his eloquence and his sheer physical energy. The experiment was not electorally a success. Tradition, in the person of Mr. McKinley, gave innovation, in the person of Mr. Bryan, two severe beatings at the polls. Innovation, of course, was handicapped by the bimetallic platform on which it stood; and there was the further fact that Mr. Bryan represented a faith much more democratic in our sense than any previous Democratic candidate. But the party managers were not content with rejecting bimetallicism and making their peace with the trusts; they had to consider that Mr. Roosevelt, a non-traditional candidate of remarkable power, was opposed to them. Unless the convention revealed a dark horse—as that of 1896 revealed Mr. Bryan—they had no non-traditional candidate with any chance of exceeding Mr. Roosevelt on his own ground. Their painest course was to oppose his over-mastering candidature with one of the strictly traditional type, appealing to the cautious, respectable instincts and pacifying all the doves who which Mr. Roosevelt flutters. This course they have taken, and have chosen. It would seem, the right candidate for it. The politician behind Judge Parker is Mr. Hill of New York, and if Mr. Parker reigns Mr. Hill will rule just as Senator Hanna ruled during the reign of Mr. McKinley.

ILLINOIS DEMOCRATIC POLITICS.

Chicago Daily News (Ind.), July 25.—Naturally train robbers, political or otherwise, want by-gones as long as they are allowed to remain in peaceful possession of the swag.

BRITISH POLITICS.

The London Speaker (Lib.), July 16.—Let the next Government take into account the new forces in political life; let it try to deserve the confidence of the democracy and not merely try to reassure the governing classes; let it aim at winning support by serious reform and not at maintaining a precarious hold on the affection of men who want nothing so little as serious reform. We argued some months ago that if the next Liberal Government does not really grapple with the accumulated mischiefs of the state, its place will be taken by another party. What is wanted is not a moderate, cautious, concentration of free traders of all parties, nor bureaucracy and expenditure for the sake of bureaucracy and expenditure. What is wanted is to let England try democracy.

JOURNALISM.

(Chicago) Unity (rel.), July 21.—The cause of the Republican party received a serious set-back, in the estimation of the progressive and the ethical, when the Chicago Chronicle by formal announcement transferred its allegiance from the Democratic party and declared that henceforth it will work for the reelection of Theodore Roosevelt. The Chicago Chronicle represents an able corps of writers. It is abundantly backed by the capital of one of Chicago's noted millionaires. But it has been for a long time painfully on the wrong side of nearly every question.

CHICAGO STREET CAR FRANCHISES.

Hearst's Chicago Examiner (Dem.), July 26.—If it is really necessary that, as the Transportation Committee proposes, the interests of two or three men shall take precedence of the interests of the entire community, we urge in all seriousness that a way be found to give these men the money they want without overturning the foundations of our government and without the miserable fraud and preterse involved in the South Side franchise. If these men are to have the public money let us give it to

them openly; let us make a grant for them from the city treasury; let us frankly declare that for some reason unknown they are better than the rest of us and entitled to have their private fortunes increased at the public expense, and let us appropriate every year for them as much as they would squeeze out of the stock they own in the street car company. That would be immensely better for many reasons, as it would be honest, for one thing; and what the Transportation Committee is trying to do is most dishonest.

MISCELLANY

HENRY GEORGE.

I, too, acclaimed him: "Deathless!"—
sought to feel
Nought but that our Elisha, Prophet,
Saint,
Was, living, rapt from earth, so Glory did
conceal
Him from my yearning gaze—without at-
tainment
Of that sweet Life I loved—the Man, my
Friend!
Anon—anon! Use shall yet harden me
Truly to feel that true, and comfort lend—
But now—as yet—look you! It cannot be
But that my heart bleed bitterness, and
woe
Shadow my hours—for I—miss him so!
CHARLES FREDERIC ADAMS.
Nov. 18, 1897.

A RECENT INTERVIEW WITH TOLSTOY.

From the London Speaker of July 9.
The Freeman's Journal published on Monday an account by Mr. Michael Davitt of a visit he had paid to Tolstoy at his home at Yasnia. The conversation naturally ran a good deal on Irish subjects. Tolstoy rejoiced in the Irish land revolution, but he thought the peasants had paid too much; and he argued that "Henry George was right and that compensation to landlords was morally wrong, rewarding a class for the successful robbery of the people." He had been so much impressed by "Progress and Poverty" that he had written to the last tsar urging him to apply George's principles to Russia. He promised Mr. Davitt to say something for the Irish cause, and prophesied that Englishmen would come round to the Irish view of home rule. Mr. Davitt described how two peasants came to see Tolstoy while he was with him to consult him about going to the front. Tolstoy told them that if they had a conscientious repugnance to shedding blood they would be quite right to refuse to serve, but that they would bring some punishment on themselves, and unless they would inflict a greater suffering on their souls by acting contrary to their consciences they would be wise to obey the law. Mr. Davitt says Tolstoy rides into Toula frequently to hear the latest war news. His opinions are well sum-

marized in an answer he gave to some American newspaper. "When the war with Japan broke out a New York paper sent me a prepaid cable for 30 words in which message I was asked to say with which side I sympathized. I replied that my sympathies were with both the Russians and Japanese peoples, who would be the sufferers, and not with either of the governments responsible for the war."

HENRY GEORGE.

For The Public.

We saw the clouds, and Fate upbraided
With lamentations loud;
He saw, ere yet the night had faded,
The stars behind the cloud.

Oh, blessed vision, unrevealing
To hearts that pause and doubt;
He questioned not, and, unconcealing,
To him the stars came out.

These are the seers whose divination
Permits them thus to look
On Nature, as a revelation,
On God, as in a book.

And if sometimes we doubt God liveth
We know Him by His own;
And through a type of man He giveth,
Reach out and touch His Throne.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

LOOK ON THIS PICTURE AND THEN ON THAT.

The recent remarkable reversal of opinion in regard to Mr. Bryan's relation to the St. Louis convention is vividly presented in the two following contrasting editorials which appeared in the Philadelphia North American only four days apart. We reprint them from the columns of that excellent paper, the World-Herald, of Omaha, which presented them side by side in its issue of July 14.

"DOWN AND OUT."

The Philadelphia North American, in its issue of Thursday, July 7, printed the following editorial:

William J. Bryan has been repeatedly written of as a political corpse. Both Republicans and Democrats have chanted more or less joyful dirges over him at odd intervals. Yet, in every instance, the funeral services have been premature. The Nebraskan has persisted in galvanizing himself into a life that was always sufficiently virile to make it necessary to begin the work of burying him all over.

But the job has been done again at St. Louis, and this time the undertakers appear to know their business. They went about the matter systematically, and the result is unmistakable. The man who, for eight years, has done with the Democratic party as he saw fit, to-day stands alone, deserted by those who called themselves his friends, and the object of the contemptuous scorn of those who encompassed his overthrow.

There is more of pathos than anything

else in the central figure of this picture. Mr. Bryan has played a remarkable part in the making of recent political history. Few men have seemed to possess more fully the devotion of a large, if not very thoughtful, section of the American people. He seized hold of his party at the psychological moment when it realized that the course upon which it was then bent was toward inevitable defeat, and when it was ready to grasp at any straw pointing to victory. And he has held that party to his own path by the sheer force of a strong personality and an equally strong will.

We need not here discuss the wisdom of his doctrines. The North American's condemnation of them has been expressed frequently and forcibly. But we, in common with the great majority of his critics, gave Mr. Bryan credit for absolute sincerity. That is why he has been able to sway the Democratic masses as has no other man since the days of Andrew Jackson, and that is why his complete eclipse at St. Louis is pathetic. For he has maintained that reputation for sincerity to the end and has gone down fighting desperately for his mistaken notions of political economy and statesmanship.

But just as his power over his party was testimony to American admiration for honesty, so his downfall is testimony to American common sense. It shows that wrong-headed ideas, no matter how right-headed, cannot long prevail with any large number of our citizens. Mr. Bryan's political end comes because the party that twice made him its presidential candidate has realized that he is a visionary and dangerous leader.

For its own sake, it is a pity that its whole time appears to have been taken up with achieving this realization. Otherwise there might have been a more inspiring demonstration of what Democracy means at this year's national convention.

"A GALLANT FIGHT."

The Philadelphia North American, in its issue of Monday, July 11, printed the following editorial:

Shorn though he be of the plumes of leadership, and overwhelmed by a hostile faction within his own party, William J. Bryan emerges from the political chaos at St. Louis the biggest man and the best fighter in the Democracy. He went into the convention seemingly certain of ignominious defeat; achieved a temporary victory, and, while eventually defeated because his foes were reinforced from an unexpected quarter, no ignominy attaches to the result so far as he is concerned.

It was a foregone conclusion that he could not hope for indorsement of the

ideas of which he is the chief exponent. Such a possibility was hardly considered, even by Mr. Bryan. The question seemed to be, how absolute should be the repudiation of those ideas, and, as a consequence, of himself? Confronting this question, he fought a battle which must excite admiration, irrespective of political bias.

The mere physical endurance of the man was almost superhuman. He was grit to the core. And, beset on all sides by men who count themselves shrewd politicians, and oppressed with the knowledge that the drift of party sentiment was strongly away from him, he displayed a quickness of intellect, a depth of resource and a power of oratory that were simply amazing.

Single-handed he fought his opponents to a standstill in the committee on resolutions. It was solely due to his efforts that the platform failed to incorse the gold standard, and left him in a position to preserve both his consistency and his regularity. And the convention ratified this negative but—**to him—**very material triumph.

It is true that Judge Parker's eleventh hour interference took from Mr. Bryan the fruit of his labor. But it could not take from him the credit for a splendid display of courage, nor make larger the antagonists who appeared beside him as pygmies.

MR. BAKER'S USE OF THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

A letter from Congressman Robert Baker to the editor of the New York Tribune, published in the Tribune of Sunday, July 3.

Sir: My attention has just been called to the article in Sunday's Tribune, headed "Criticism of 'Anti-Pass' Baker's Use of Franking Privilege." So much space having been given to the article, and as many of your readers may deduce therefrom the conclusion that the circulation of my speeches in this manner is an abuse of the franking privilege, it would seem only fair that an opportunity should be accorded me to state how and why this speech is thus sent out.

Some fifteen months ago I received through the mails, under the frank of Congressman Littlefield, what purported to be a list of "trusts," on which, stamped with a rubber stamp, appeared an advertisement of the "Congressional Information Bureau," a private concern located in Washington.

I at once sought Postmaster Roberts, calling his attention to what I then regarded as a violation of the franking privilege. I pointed out that if such a document could be mailed under a frank, there would seem to be no reason why