

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 18, 1904.

Number 324.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

Democrats have no good reason to be proud of their Illinois convention. It was controlled not by the delegates chosen at the party primaries, but by a clique of monopoly corporation agents.

This clique was led by John P. Hopkins, of Chicago, whose only virtue in politics is the one of which high grade criminals have always been fond of boasting—that bad though he may be in all other respects, he keeps his word when he pledges it. Hopkins took advantage of his position as chairman of the old State committee to dictate to a convention in which his elected supporters were but a small minority.

Utilizing that advantage, he revised the list of delegates, and named the temporary chairman, whom he seated by sheer force of authority, backed by platoons of policemen and regardless of the wishes of the convention. Under his direction this chairman carried Hopkins's programme through with his gavel, shutting off debate and denying roll calls even to the limit of gaveling himself into authority as permanent chairman. Only one roll call was allowed—the one which a Hearst delegate demanded on the question of Presidential instructions.

The convention was farcical, and two of the aspirants for governor performed a public service by refusing it the use of their names as candidates to be either "gaveled through or gaveled down." The gentleman who allowed himself to be nominated may be worthy

enough, and we believe he would make an honest governor of the State; but he must bear the odium and suffer the natural consequences of a nomination by a convention so organized and controlled. There is no reasonable possibility of his election under these circumstances, and in all good conscience there ought not to be. Democrats who know the facts will be entirely justified in registering their protest by voting for Deneen, the Republican candidate for governor, as thousands of them doubtless will.

On the Presidency, Hearst seems to have swapped everything for his own indorsement. That was the price Hopkins paid for the submission of the Hearst faction to his high handed procedure. So long as Hearst's name is before the national convention the Illinois delegation must vote for him; but when his name drops, then, if we mistake not, a majority of the delegation will be found voting for Grover Cleveland and by the unit rule forcing the others to join them. The delegation was "stacked" by Hopkins, and Hopkins is playing the Cleveland game as well as that of the corporations—of which, indeed, the Cleveland game is part.

Bryan was cruel to the plutocratic press of both parties when, having as they say absolute control over the Nebraska convention and being the author of the platform, he made no demand in the platform for "16 to 1." True, he has been saying over and over again in his speeches, speeches that certainly were not lacking in lucidity, that the silver question is not now an issue. But as he explained that he believed it might again become one in the future, and also pointed out the fact that other phases of the money

question are issues, the plutocratic writing-machines have short-handed these expressions into 16 to 1 sentiment and woven them into their editorial products. Now, however, comes this Nebraska platform, in which even plutocratic newspaper scribblers cannot spell out any pressing demand for "16 to 1." Hence their funereal humor.

The Nebraska platform is a model for the Democratic national convention. It reaffirms the Kansas City platform. This is necessary to preserve the democracy of the party, since, if for no other reason, the plutocrats have made its abandonment the test of their resumption of power in the party. To ignore or repudiate that platform is to surrender the Democratic party to August Belmont, Grover Cleveland and J. Pierpont Morgan. But the Nebraska platform does not stop with reaffirmation. It reiterates the opposition of the party to all private monopolies, to imperialism and militarism, and to the administering of the Federal treasury by money-mongering syndicates; it demands the abolition of protective tariffs; and in addition to other sound demands it insists upon frankness and definiteness in the national platform. With such a declaration from St. Louis next month, coupled with nominations calculated to guarantee its sincerity, the Democratic party may hope to win a victory worth winning, with reasonable confidence that its 1892-95 experience of victory at the election and defeat afterward will not be repeated.

Ex-Gov. Boutwell—nomen praeclarum et venerabile—combines, as perhaps no other amongst us quite so much, the wisdom of age with that robust faith in ideals that belongs to youth. He was born in 1818, and still believes in