

The speaker's conduct in connection with this bill furnishes an extraordinary instance of official usurpation. To effect his purpose he has refused to listen to demands of many members, both from the floor and in writing; yet the constitution of the State in terms requires him to call the roll upon every vote when five members demand it. The speaker's action in this respect has been criminal in a high degree,—if not legally so, at any rate morally; and the wonder is that a respectable community will tolerate such flagrant and brazen disregard of its fundamental law by one of its principal officers. The members to whom the speaker thus refuses to accord their constitutional rights are fully justified in their policy of blocking the passage of the appropriation bills.

The real object of the collusive law suit in the Federal Courts in Chicago, between the New York Guarantee company and certain Chicago traction companies, and in which receivers have been appointed, is not as deep down in the well as Truth is supposed to be. The design is to put the Federal government in possession, through receivers, of a local public service which concerns the people of the city of Chicago. Here is another argument, if one were needed, for public ownership and operation of all municipal functions. The moment they are farmed out to private companies, interests outside the State acquire power to divest the city of self-governing rights by carrying disputes into the Federal courts. A Federal law suit, a Federal receivership, and ipso facto the local government of a city is transferred to Federal officers—often hostile partisans—who are appointed for life by the central power at Washington.

This process of centralization would have been impossible before the Fourteenth amendment. Then no corporation of one State could rule in another State. It had no standing in Federal courts; and its standing even in local courts outside of its own State was by comity and

not by right. But now, under a forced construction of the Fourteenth amendment, though the Negro, for whose protection this amendment was designed, gets no protection from it, the corporations, which were not thought of by its framers, get not only protection but dangerous power in overflowing measure.

The "honor of the army" is again in the balance. Gen. Corbin having had his application for membership in a Washington club rejected, one of the governors of the club, a military officer, has resigned. Not because he might in that way resent the exclusion of a personal friend from his club, but because he regarded the exclusion of an army officer as a reflection upon "the honor of the army."

Army honor is a curious thing. Hard and strong as steel when disturbed only by guilt, it is as fragile as glass when the guilty are to be punished. Drunkenness, debauchery, corruption, atrocious cruelty, wanton murder have characterized the advance of the army in its march along the path of Duty toward Destiny, but without in the least affecting its "honor;" yet the bare suggestion of a fair investigation wrings tears of solicitude for "the honor of the army" from every guilty officer who wants to escape. This is one of the reasons why the administration will not allow the people to see Gen. Miles's report of his investigation in the Philippines. Gen. Miles has little regard for "the honor of the army;" he is more solicitous to have the army honorable.

Could there be a more pitiable example of the loathsomeness of militarism, a more grewsome burlesque upon army ideals of "army honor," than the cold-blooded murder this week of a German artilleryman by a German naval cadet, and the pride of this criminal boy over his fatal success?

As witnesses narrate the circumstances, his crime is no worse than the conflicting story of the boastful

murderer himself. He says that the artilleryman, an old schoolmate of his, meeting him casually, offered his hand as an equal instead of saluting as an inferior. For this he ordered the artilleryman to a police station, and on the way murdered him with his sword. One of the witnesses says that the artilleryman was about to enter a beer hall in Essen with the witness when the cadet encountered him. The artilleryman was slightly inebriated. Neither he nor the witness saw the cadet until the cadet approached in a hectoring manner and said to the artilleryman: "You failed in your duty by not saluting me; accompany me to the police station." The artilleryman was surprised, but said nothing, and attempted to pass along the street. The cadet pursued with drawn sword, easily overtook him, struck him flat on the head, making him reel, and then drove the blade into his back. The artilleryman fell in a heap, bleeding both from the head and back. It all happened in an instant. There was no provocation whatever. The cadet was perfectly cool and seemed to feel proud when he saw the artilleryman fall. When a noncommissioned officer came, the cadet said vauntingly: "I did this. When I draw my sword blood must flow. This man insulted me by refusing to salute and endeavored to escape arrest. I had to defend an officer's honor at all costs." And the cadet appears to have been surprised that the officials did not applaud the deed. He strutted about the station with a martial air, still flourishing his sword, which was streaked half way up the blade with the artilleryman's blood. How revolting all this is. One is tempted to wonder from what order of low browed beast or decadent savage that young criminal must have sprung, by what processes of natural selection his moral sense was degenerated.

Yet there is evidently no peculiar wickedness in the boy's nature. He writes the mother of his victim a consolatory letter which testifies

with strange contradictoriness to a gentle disposition made savage by the atmosphere of "military honor" which he has breathed. Listen to this message of his to that heartbroken mother of his murdered school mate:

It is in the deepest distress and sorrow that I address myself to you, to give you proof of my heartfelt sympathy for the loss you have sustained through my action. Be assured that I did not act out of hatred or ill will against your son. It was my hard duty as a soldier. I was obliged to enforce obedience; and to my bitter regret, fate directed my steel in this unfortunate manner. A word of forgiveness from you, honored madam, would be incomparable consolation, for if the mother forgives no honorably minded person can continue to bear a grudge.

There you have militarism in the germ. It has turned a boy of generous instincts into what is worse than savagery—a remorseless human mechanism of death. This is what it is to develop the strenuous military life. This is what it means to American children, if we go on gathering them a legacy of "military honor" to displace the simple code of morality that was our own inheritance. Is it not a pretty picture! If there is anything divine about it, what could you suggest as an example of the satanic?

Mr. Bryan has again notified the "reorganizers" of the Democratic party that their room is preferable to their company. His notification makes good reading for at least two reasons. First, because it is true in its summary of facts; second, because it is wise in political policy. It was embodied in his speech at Kansas City on the 20th, and as telegraphed was in these words:

We have had enough of Clevelandism in the Democratic party. We had four years of Cleveland, and after his administration was over we found ourselves weaker than we had ever been before, because we had been betrayed. These so-called harmonizers, Cleveland and his followers, showed their nearness to Republicanism by deserting us in our hour of greatest need and supporting the Republican party. The Democratic party won a great victory in 1892, which gave our party a great opportunity; but Grover Cleveland betrayed the Democratic party, and as

the Democratic candidate to succeed him I carried the burden of his administration through two national campaigns. There was not a plank in either platform that was such a detriment to me in those campaigns as that burden was. Cleveland had the best opportunity to redeem the Democratic party ever offered to any man since the time of Andrew Jackson, but instead of being true to his party he disgraced himself.

We may now expect to see many editorials in the Republican and the brevet-Republican papers, snarling at Bryan as an "irreconcilable." But the expanding and improving democratic sentiment of the country will find in Bryan's words an assurance that the most effective individual force in the Democratic party to-day is not to be bought out, nor wheedled over, nor scolded into the plutocratic camp. Even the deluded followers of such leaders as Cleveland and Hill will begin to realize that the Democratic label is not enough to make a Democrat. Democracy means something more and something different from what it meant half a century ago. The fact that a man was a Democrat when the Democratic party was a pro-slavery party is no test of his democracy now. A new era began with the campaign of 1896. And regardless of one's economic opinions on the money question, or his political attitude at that time, unless he is in accord with the spirit of the revolt then begun against plutocratic influences and power, he is no democrat now, even though he call himself a Democrat. If he is not a democratic-Democrat he is not wanted either to lead the party or to vote with it. His affiliation with it frightens off democratic-Republicans whose faces are turning toward it from the cave of bones in which leaders like Hanna have buried the democratic principles of Lincoln.

If Chauncey F. Black, a son of the old Democratic leader in Pennsylvania, Jeremiah Black, and formerly lieutenant governor of that State, had written a letter bemoaning the "blight of Bryanism" and approving "reorganization" of the Democratic

party, the Associated Press would have exploited it, and every Republican-Democratic paper in the land would have found room for it. But as Gov. Black's letter to the Crescent Democratic club of Philadelphia at the celebration of Jefferson's birthday this week had a different story to tell, it was not "newsy" enough for extended publication. Yet the letter was important, for Gov. Black is a democratic-Democrat; and interesting, for he is a clear thinker and forcible writer. This is his word to the "reorganizers":

We read a good deal in Republican newspapers about a variety of schemes for the "reorganization" of the Democratic party. We never see in connection with these remarkable projects the names of any regular and reliable Democrats. The engineers are all well-known Republicans, who helped, directly or indirectly, to beat down the Democracy and put the trusts in power in 1896, and to keep them in in 1900. They are insignificant in numbers. They describe themselves as "leaders," but point to no followers. Now it strikes me that where a hundred Democrats disagree in sentiment, and 99 are found on one side and one only on the other side, the 99 ought to have their way. But if besides it appears that the one obstinate fellow is not a Democrat at all, but an interloping Republican, who has come back simply to boss matters, on the ground that at some remote period he pretended to be a Democrat, but deserted at the pinch, the claim of the 99 just Democrats to run their own party, as against this self-sufficient agent of the enemy, detailed to regulate Democratic affairs for the time being, would seem to be pretty clear.

Venturing upon political prophecy Gov. Black has this to say regarding the action of the next Democratic convention and its effect upon the voters of the country:

The Democratic party on the national field is at present very well and satisfactorily organized. The masses who voted its tickets in 1896 and 1900, are more than content with it, and have no desire to have it Republicanized or reorganized in the interest of the trusts. And the plans with that object in view are pure wind. They have no substance. There will be no reorganization. The Democratic national convention will be Democratic; it will nominate a Democrat on a Democratic platform. He will poll the Democratic vote, with its natural in-