

on another page. It is a document which every truly patriotic man should read, at least once a year, with intelligent affection. For the declaration of independence is the real chart of the American ship of state.

That place has been assigned to the constitution; but the constitution is subject to amendment for the good of the republic, whereas the declaration of independence cannot be amended without destroying the republic in all but form. It gave birth to a nation which, conceived in liberty, was dedicated to those immutable truths that all men are endowed with equal rights and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Since that sacred dedication the nation has steadily advanced toward the goal of its high purpose. One by one it has been casting off the evils that in spite of its dedication have clung to it from the past. And never until now has it been forced to face the issue of repudiating its dedication.

But that issue the nation does now face. The truths of the declaration of independence are denied by powerful interests and from high places; no longer timidly in extenuation of old inequalities not yet swept away, but boldly, as obstacles to the establishment of new inequalities necessary to a splendid career of imperialism. In this emergency, universal reading and reflection upon the declaration of independence should be encouraged. It should be read next Wednesday in every household, and at every public gathering. Especially should it be read at the democratic convention at Kansas City. If the clergyman who is to pronounce the invocation at the opening of that convention should, in place of improvising a prayer of his own, simply, but with true religious fervor, repeat the Lord's prayer, and be immediately followed by an impressive reading of the declaration of independence—both democratic to their heart's core—a new inspiration would thrill the public mind and

elevate political thought. There could be no more appropriate and hopeful beginning for the elemental fight against imperialism. When democracy is assailed at the source, let democrats go to the source for inspiration and courage.

One plank in the democratic platform to be adopted at Kansas City next week will doubtless express the sympathy of the party for the struggling Boers. The republican platform sympathizes with both the Boers and Great Britain, merely expressing a—

hope that a way may soon be found, honorable alike to both contending parties, to terminate the strife between them—

and unless the democrats say more they had better say nothing. They should at least express their—

hope that a way may soon be found, honorable alike to both contending parties, to secure a permanent peace with independence to the two republics.

The difference between hoping for the end of the strife, as the republicans do, and hoping for peace with Boer independence, as the democrats should, would be worth something to the democrats in the campaign, and if the contest were close it would be worth a great deal to the Boers. For only recently Joseph Chamberlain said, at the meeting of the Woman's Liberal Unionist association, that "even a note of disapproval" from the United States "would be a matter of serious concern." But the democrats can and ought to say more than that. They ought not only to express sympathy, but also to register a promise.

But there is a notion prevalent that this country can do nothing to preserve independence for the Boers without involving itself in war with Great Britain, and therefore that no promise can be made. That is a mistake. Great Britain would not destroy the independence of the Boer republics if her ministry were authoritatively advised that such an act would be regarded with concern by the people

of the United States. The ministry now labors under the delusion, confirmed by the behavior of the republican administration and the expressions of the Philadelphia platform, that the great majority of the people of this country sympathize with the purpose the British have declared of divesting the South African republics of their independence. Mr. Chamberlain has publicly said as much. An opportunity to dispel that delusion is now open to the democrats, and all they need do to accomplish it is to insert a plank in the Kansas City platform something like this:

We cannot contemplate without serious concern the declared purpose of the present ministry of Great Britain to divest the South African republic and the Orange Free State of their independence, the more especially as that purpose has thus far been encouraged by the friendly acquiescence of our own government. If without protest from the greatest republic in the world this act of subjugation were accomplished, it would thereafter be cited as a precedent justifying the destruction by military conquerors of the independence of the nations they defeat in battle. Even the United States, with all their reserve of military strength, might, through the ill fortune of some unavoidable war, fall a victim to this most dangerous usage. It is a usage, therefore, which should be promptly discountenanced by all self-governing peoples. And that it may be discountenanced in behalf of the people of the United States, we hereby instruct our candidate for president that in the event of his election the democratic party will expect him to advise the British ministry, with friendliness and firmness, that the people of the United States would regard the destruction of the independence of the South African republic and the Orange Free State as a precedent fraught with grave danger to all republican government.

Another part of the Kansas City platform calls for boldness of purpose and directness of expression. This is true, of course, of the anti-imperial planks, but there is little danger of timidity there; the plank we have in mind is that on trusts. Upon this issue more than upon any other there is danger of timid and frivolous declarations. The principal danger, probably, will be due to a failure to

recognize a fundamental difference. It is often supposed that trust combinations make monopolies. That is the notion of the republican platform. But the truth is just the reverse. Monopolies make trust combinations. The way to abolish the trust, therefore, is to abolish monopolies. Every oppressive trust has its seat in some legalized monopoly. If, then, the democratic party would be true to democratic principles, let it—

demand, as the sovereign cure for trusts, the abolition of all legalized monopolies, by the repeal, or by other legislation neutralizing the effect, of all laws that interfere with free competition.

And that this demand may not appear to be a harmless generalization, let it be supplemented with a specific demand to the effect that—

as a first step in this direction we demand the repeal of all tariffs on trust goods.

Though such declarations would drive friends of the trusts away from the party, they would draw to it every intelligent adversary of trusts who was not absolutely party-bound. And what is of more importance intrinsically, they would help pull the democratic party out of a quagmire and put it on firm foundations. But if a mere rhetorical denunciation or some centralized scheme for regulation be adopted, it can make little difference to anybody, so far as the trust issue goes, which party he votes for. Either way he will be voting to perpetuate the evil of trusts.

Roosevelt's nomination by the Philadelphia convention, to run as vice presidential candidate with McKinley, which was a defeat for himself as well as for Boss Hanna, was a victory—the only victory for anyone in that cut-and-dried convention—for Boss Platt, of New York. Boss Platt wanted Roosevelt out of the way at home, where he was an aspirant for reelection as governor. Not that Roosevelt refuses absolutely to obey the boss. He is obedient enough, and in magazine articles he makes a virtue of being so. But he assumes such

an air of independence as to give Boss Platt the fidgets whenever a delicate combination is being worked out, even though he knows that Roosevelt will finally take the place assigned him. It is annoying also to have to humor those whims of Roosevelt's by which he tries to save his face as an independent. His refusal to appoint Boss Platt's man Payn to the New York insurance department was an example. Payn he would not and did not appoint. But he did appoint Hendricks, another of Boss Platt's men, thereby leaving the powerful insurance department under Platt's control. This suited Boss Platt's purposes well enough; but then it was irritating to Platt to have to go through a bit of gallery play like that merely to keep Roosevelt's useless reputation as a reformer furnished up. So Boss Platt set out to unload Roosevelt upon the national ticket, that the ways of the machine in New York might be smooth; and with the aid of Boss Quay he succeeded in landing his man despite Boss Hanna's opposition. Hanna pretends, now, that he was in favor of Roosevelt all along, and opposed him only far enough to get Platt and Quay committed. But that is a mental attitude which the great fable writers have portrayed much better than we can, if in this instance it needs portrayal. So Roosevelt finds himself in a position where Boss Hanna does not want him and where he did not want to be himself, but where he will be out of Boss Platt's way in New York. Should he get in Boss Hanna's way in Washington, that will not unpleasantly concern Platt. This bird's-eye view of the affair is not vouched for as accurate; but it is the way the thing looks to a man up a tree.

The chorus of a new campaign lyric, sung at the initial republican ratification meeting in Carnegie hall, New York, on the 26th, is deemed sufficiently important to telegraph over the country. Here are the lines:

Hail the name of Bill McKinley, in trouble always calm!

Hail! Rough Rider, Teddy Roosevelt, the hero of San Juan!
Up in Maine or down in Dixie forever and for aye,
Honors due to Bill and Teddy from the Blue and the Gray.

Since Roosevelt has leaped—he always leaps—to the first place in point of picturesqueness upon the ticket where his official place is second, and as he is a thorough believer, as his outpourings of magazine articles go to show, in the maxim that "in the hands of one entirely great the pen is mightier than the sword" even as an instrument of deadly warfare, a better chorus (with apologies, of course, to the author of Pinafore) would run like this:

For he himself hath said it,
And it's greatly to his credit:
He's the Hero of San Juan.
For he might have done the fightin',
And let others do the writin'
As becomes a modest man.
But, spite of all temptations,
He has published to the nations:
He's the Hero of San Juan.

THE MCKINLEY-ROOSEVELT PLATFORM.

I.

In a delicious political satire by Stewart Chaplin, published in the June Century, the subtle art of constructing party platforms is exquisitely and humorously worked out. It is there explained that they must, for example, "please civil service people and not scare the beelers, please the gold people and not scare the silverites; please the people generally that want economy and not scare the cross-roads folks that want a marble post office and a granite bridge over their creek; please the anti-trust element and not scare the capitalists, and please the free traders without scaring the protectionists;" and that they must "be written with lots of nerve, sliding over all the things the people are hot about and going in strong for what nobody disputes."

The most important element in the construction of these platforms is what the satirist calls "weasel words." They are the "words that suck all the life out of the words next to them, just as a weasel sucks an egg and leaves the shell;" so that "if you left the egg afterward, it's as light as a feather and not very filling when