

and the Federation," says a newspaper report, "it was declared that the censure and criticism of the members of the latter organization would have the effect of clarifying the atmosphere and bringing the two closer together in the movement for universal law and order." There is truly a hopeful ring about that. But the resulting letter of the Association to the county commissioners is not reassuring. It is reported as follows:

On behalf of the Citizens' Association of Chicago, I wish to urge upon your honorable body the publication of the real estate assessment list, including valuations, description of property and names of owners. It is the view of the Citizens' Association that inasmuch as the law provides for such publication its requirements should be fully complied with.

Considering that the county commissioners are required by the law to do what this Association demurely requests, the Association "sings small" indeed.

At the recent meeting of the Illinois committee of the Democratic party, Mr. James H. Eckels appeared with a proxy, and made a speech. One of the papers reported him as saying in this speech that—

the Democrats who voted for Weaver and others are dead and in hell.

A denial of the use of this language was hardly necessary. Mr. Eckels has not the personal manners of a blackguard. It has been denied, however, by Mr. Eckels himself, who makes an explanation which goes to show that he may possibly have been guilty of a worse offense than blackguardly manners. He says:

That which I did say was, "I have no quarrel with Mr. Bryan, but why have his friends the right to dictate the Democratic nomination when their candidate voted for J. B. Weaver and did not vote the Democratic ticket?" At this point I was interrupted, and somebody in the rear of the hall called out about the issues of 1896 and 1900, and I replied: "Those are past issues, dead, damned in hell. Let us turn to the living for what the Democracy may be in this year of our Lord.

Mr. Eckels's opinion of political is-

suess, past or present, is of little importance except as it reflects the views of the bi-partisan group of financiers to which he belongs. But his assertion that Mr. Bryan "bolted" the Democratic ticket when he voted for Weaver instead of Cleveland in 1892 is made either in ignorance of the truth or in defiance of it.

Mr. Bryan's explanation of the circumstances to which Mr. Eckels either ignorantly or mendaciously alludes, has been recently published, accompanied by proof. Mr. Bryan writes:

In 1892, many Democrats in Nebraska voted for the Weaver electors at the request of the Democratic national committee. That request was delivered in a confidential letter sent out by James E. Boyd, then governor of the State of Nebraska, and since then one of the prominent members of the gold contingent. Gov. Boyd's letter follows:

"Lincoln, Neb., Oct. 17, 1892.—(Personal and confidential.)—Dear Sir: I have just returned from the East where I was honored by a consultation with the national committee and leading men of our party, with regard to the best policy to be pursued in Nebraska this fall in dealing with the electoral ticket; and they agreed with me that the wisest course would be for Democrats to support the Weaver electors; the object being to take Nebraska out of her accustomed place in the Republican column. Information has reached me that a number of Independents who were formerly Republicans contemplate voting for the Harrison electors. With the Republican strength thus augmented it would be impossible for the Democrats to carry their own electors' ticket to victory. It is therefore the part of good judgment and wise action for Democrats to support the Weaver electors in as large numbers as possible. For Democrats to do this is no abandonment of principle; on the contrary, it is a definite step toward victory, and the ultimate triumph of Cleveland and Stevenson, and the principles they represent.

Thus it appears beyond dispute that Mr. Bryan's so-called "bolt" was made by request of the highest authority in the Democratic party, and through the medium of the very faction that did "bolt" four years later. That the arrangement Gov. Boyd mentions had been made by the national committee was so well known in New York at the time, that it is hardly possible Mr. Eckels should not have heard of it.

This arrangement was not confined to Nebraska. It was the committee's general policy with reference to Republican States which had become Populistic. In

Colorado (vol. v, p. 258) the Democratic convention nominated Weaver electors, and the minority left the hall and nominated a straight Democratic ticket. The national committee thereupon instructed the State committee of Colorado to ignore the action of the minority and to put the Weaver electors on the Democratic ballot. A similar course was followed by the national committee with reference to Nevada. Here is the story as related a year or more ago by W. L. Knox, a lawyer of Reno, Nevada. Referring to the above-described action in Colorado, Mr. Knox writes:

I will call your attention to my own State, Nevada, where this wise policy was pursued, and its vote cast for Weaver, when, had a different policy been carried out, its vote would have gone to the Republican candidate. After the nomination at Chicago in 1892, the member for Nevada of the Democratic National Committee, R. P. Keating, and other leaders of the party, had a conference with Mr. Cleveland, and knowing that there was no hope of carrying the State of Nevada for the Democratic candidates, it was arranged that an effort should be made to carry it for Weaver, who was very strong in the State. It was also agreed that Democrats should not lose status in the party in consequence of their voting for the Populist candidates, but should be considered in good standing and eligible to appointment to office. The Democratic State Central Committee of Nevada, by a vote of 18 to 9, voted not to put a Democratic electoral ticket in the field, but the minority revolted and met as a State Central Committee and nominated an electoral ticket. It received less than 7 per cent. of the votes, to 66 per cent. for Weaver and 26 for Harrison. After the inauguration in 1893 Mr. Cleveland inclined to repudiate the arrangement entered into before election, and to consider only the claims of those Democrats who voted for the Cleveland electors. It required some vigorous remonstrances from Wm. C. Whitney, who was a party to the arrangement, to induce Cleveland to keep his word. He did eventually appoint to office in Nevada some Democrats who had voted for the Populist candidate; but he also appointed some of the "bolters" whose factious opposition endangered the movement to carry the State against the Republicans. R. P. Keating is dead, but these facts are known to many prominent Democrats of Nevada. I think J. W. Adams, ex-governor of Nevada, was one of the persons present with Keating when the conference was had with Cleveland and Whitney in 1892.

Mr. Cleveland was more responsive to the pledge with reference to Oregon. There, too (vol. v, p. 322), the same arrangement was made. Harrison got only 3 of the 4 electoral votes of Oregon. Weaver got the other. Harrison would have lost all four had the arrangement been fully carried out. But orders did not come from the national committee until the Democratic electors had been chosen. When they came, one of the electors, R. O. Miller, obeyed by resigning in favor of the Populist. But the other three refused to resign. They were beaten at the polls, while the Populist was elected. The three recalcitrants got no political rewards from Mr. Cleveland. But Mr. Miller, he who had resigned in favor of the Weaver man, was faithfully rewarded by Mr. Cleveland with the registership of the Oregon city land office.

In view of these facts, which none of the Bryan haters dispute, would it not be the part of decency for them to cease their clamor about Bryan as a "bolter"? They cannot be ignorant of the truth of the matter, and one dislikes to draw the only other inference. If they wish to defend their own "bolt," well and good. "Bolting" is not a crime, though over anxiety on the part of "bolters" to boss the organization from which they "bolt" is not the best of form. Let them revel bravely in the enjoyment of their own "bolt;" but in the name of all that is manly, not to say veracious, let them stop apologizing for themselves by calling Bryan "another" when he isn't.

Another of the malicious slants at Bryan relates to the bequest by his friend Bennett, of New Haven. Envious politicians and boozy editors find in this episode an excuse for senseless attack. Yet the facts, perfectly well known to all who care to know them, wholly relieve Bryan from everything but the malice of those who hate him for the good morals he teaches.

His own statement succinctly and truly presents all the facts:

Philo S. Bennett died, leaving an estate valued at about \$300,000. He bequeathed \$100,000 to his widow, who is past 60 years of age and without children. He allowed her more than the Connecticut law requires. He left \$30,000 to a sister of about the same age. He left \$28,000 to a half-brother. He left about \$30,000 to various colleges and charitable institutions in New Haven. He left me \$50,000, with a suggestion as to its division. He left \$30,000 to be distributed, \$20,000 by me and \$10,000 by Mrs. Bryan, among colleges and charitable institutions. He left to other relatives and friends an amount over \$80,000. Had I accepted the \$50,000 direct, as he requested, there could have been no contest, but I told him that perhaps the time would come when I would not need the sum. He then gave me the alternative of distributing it among institutions as I saw fit. He left a letter of instructions accordingly for his widow.

While the will was written at my house, it was not signed by him until he reached New York, 1,500 miles away, where he signed it in the presence of witnesses summoned by himself. He placed it in a vault, where it lay three years and a half, during which time he could have altered it had he seen fit. During that time he was constantly with relatives and friends, while I saw him only once or twice a year. He felt that I could accomplish more toward the public work in which I am engaged if I wrote and lectured without compensation, whereas it is necessary to me at present to receive compensation. I am willing that my political opponents shall have the facts, but it is only fair that they should state the facts.

Another illustration of the necessary disintegration of trusts not thoroughly grounded in monopoly is afforded by the glass trust. This combination finds that its large aggregation of detail work has reached a point at which the trust is uneconomical. So the constituent properties are leased to separate companies for independent management. That is the beginning of the end of the glass trust.

Extraordinary almost beyond belief is the explanation President Hadly, of Yale, is reported to have made for declining to join in the Panama memorial (p. 641) of several of his colleagues. This memorial was a protest, in the name of international law and

morals, against President Roosevelt's conduct relative to the secession of Panama. Mr. Hadly did not sign it, and was supposed to have been absent. But here is his explanation as vouched for editorially by the Philadelphia Public Ledger:

I was unwilling to call attention to a point important in itself, but injurious to the party with which, on the whole, I was anxious to vote.

A land speculator of Chicago predicts a "famine in lots." Why predict what Chicago already has? Anything which is so scarce that, although it costs nothing, it commands a high price, has reached the famine stage; and that is the truth about Chicago lots.

Is that highly civilized mob of the superior race in Mississippi, which burned a Negro and his wife at the stake last week, to be considered as another missionary society for the regulation of Negro morals? Or will law-respecting people be graciously allowed to regard its members as the cowardly and cruel assassins they really are? The race question is so complex and subtle that one is never quite sure whether a crime is a crime or not when its victims are Negroes.

Where was President Roosevelt when the last American flag in Cuba was hauled down? How brief the time since he assured an applauding audience of jingoes that the American flag will never be hauled down from any place where it has once been put up! What did he mean? Or didn't he mean anything? Or if he did mean something, why does he make an exception of Cuba? Maybe Mr. Roosevelt is something of a demagogue.

Is it true that "order is Heaven's first law?" Not if coercive order is meant. Order in the sense of harmony is, indeed, Heaven's first law, but coercion is not harmony. The first law of Heaven is equity. Coercive order is the first law of Hell.