

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 16, 1904.

Number 328.

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.

When William Jennings Bryan, democratic Democrat, fraternally advised the Kansas City convention four years ago that he would not accept its nomination on any platform inconsistent with his convictions upon living political issues, doing so before his nomination, before the adoption of a platform, and after advising the country fully as to his convictions regarding what he held to be living issues, the Republicans and their pluto-Democratic allies denounced him as a dictator and warned him that "no man is big enough to be bigger than his party." But when Alton Brooks Parker, plutocratic Democrat, imperiously demands of the St. Louis convention this year, that it violate the terms of a harmony-platform compromise made in his behalf by his own political managers, with reference not to what he holds to be a living political issue but what he declares to be a dead one, doing so after the adoption of the platform, after his nomination, and as the climax to a sphinx-like silence regarding his convictions on all political issues, living and dead, a silence maintained throughout his long canvass for the nomination, the same Republicans and their same pluto-Democratic allies laud him as an honorable man and praise him for being "bigger than his party." What does this contrast mean?

Judge Parker asserts that the gold standard is permanently established. That is not true, for no policy can be permanently established so long as popular opinions alter and political power

shifts. But if Judge Parker believes it to be permanently established, why has he insisted upon resurrecting the issue? Until the convention met, Bryan was held up to public odium in the party upon charges of endeavoring to prevent harmony by injecting the "by-gone silver issue" into the campaign. The charges were untrue, and were frequently so denounced by Mr. Bryan; but that does not affect the present question. When Bryan came to the convention he came as a harmonizer. Appreciating the overshadowing dangers to the country of advancing militarism, he declared his willingness to subordinate all differences for the purpose of uniting the party on this and other issues over which its counsels are undisturbed. And he made his declaration good. He agreed with Judge Parker's managers to treat the money question as not an issue in this campaign. He agreed to omit all reference to income taxation, to asset banking, and to contraction of the currency by melting down the silver dollars and retiring the greenbacks. Everything was conceded by him to secure that harmony which the plutocratic Democrats insisted could not be secured so far as their faction was concerned, if the money question were allowed to enter into the campaign. But after all these concessions had been made and harmony thereby secured, Judge Parker himself injected the "by-gone silver question" into the campaign and disrupted the party harmony for which his friends and the plutocratic Democrats generally have pretended to be solicitous and which Mr. Bryan secured. Why did he do it?

Another question arises. Judge Parker selected his own "running mate." There were at the convention numerous candidates for Vice

President, but Senator Davis was not one of them. Neither had he been thought of in connection with the Presidency. Beckwith of Kentucky, Williams of Mississippi, Williams of Illinois, Hearst of New York, Bailey of Texas, Olney of Massachusetts, Pattison of Pennsylvania, Kern of Indiana, Wall of Wisconsin, Cockrell of Missouri, Gray of Delaware, Nelson A. Miles were all Vice Presidential "possibilities" in the party sense. In that sense Davis was not a "possibility." But when the convention in effect referred this nomination to its candidate for President by referring it to his instructed delegation in the convention, his delegation, speaking for him, selected Davis. Why? Davis is a "free-silver" man. Did Judge Parker and his friends select him in order to restore the harmony he had disturbed, or to intensify the disturbance?

While a "free-silver" man, as is Bryan, Davis is not a democratic Democrat, as Bryan is. He is a plutocratic Democrat, with all that implies—possessor of a vast fortune in monopolized lands, in his case coal-mining lands; close affiliations and responsive sympathies with the votaries of "frenied finance;" and a predisposition to the timidity, so characteristic of capitalists and sheep, which makes the fears of one the fears of all and thereby lends plausibility to the socialist concept of "class consciousness." Mr. Davis, moreover, has a son-in-law, Stephen B. Elkins, who is the plutocratic boss of the State in which both of them live. Added to all this, Mr. Davis is 81 years of age. In choosing him other reasons may have prevailed than Davis's willingness to swell the campaign fund and his ability to reach the plutocratic corruption funds that have for the past two campaigns gone to the party of his masterful son-in-