

days prior to the meeting of the national convention.

The Democratic call, signed by James K. Jones as chairman of the national committee and C. A. Walsh as secretary, was issued on the 18th. It announces that the committee has appointed (p. 647) July 6 as the time and chosen St. Louis as the place for the convention, and declares:

Each State is entitled to representation therein equal to the number of its senators and representatives in the Congress of the United States, and each Territory, Alaska, Indian Territory and the District of Columbia shall have six delegates. All Democratic citizens of the United States who can unite with us in the effort for a pure and economical Constitutional government are cordially invited to join us in sending delegates to the convention.

Mr. Bryan, since his return from Europe (p. 647), has again come into prominence as a Democratic leader whose large following must be reckoned with. On the 18th he was given a great and enthusiastic reception at a banquet in his home city, Lincoln, at which he spoke on "The Moral Issue," in the same spirit as in his New Haven speech (p. 647); but on this occasion he was more specific, and, what was most significant, he broadly intimated to the "reorganizing" Democrats that the battle they will have to fight in the convention will be one of principles and platform rather than one of candidates. On this point he said:

The Kansas City platform is sound in every plank, and the first act of the next Democratic convention should be to reaffirm it in its entirety, and its next act should be the addition of new planks in harmony with it and covering such new questions as demand consideration.

But he did not ignore the question of candidates. He merely made it secondary to the question of platform, for he continued:

Then the convention should select candidates who believe in the platform—candidates whose Democracy will not be an issue in the campaign and whose fidelity to Democratic principles will not be doubted at the election.

Regarding Democratic candidates, the movement for the nomination of William Randolph Hearst has now assumed large

proportions and is being apprehensively considered by other candidates. Until the current week Mr. Hearst's views have found few channels for expression outside of his own papers, published in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco; but the press generally is now exploiting him, and on the 19th the Chicago Tribune (Republican) published an extended interview with him, in which he outlined his idea of national issues. Referring to the conservative sentiment of the country Mr. Hearst said:

I should define conservatism as the preservation of those qualities, rights, and principles of proved value to the American people. I think that the fundamental American ideas which have developed this country, making its national wealth and greatness, while fostering the individual happiness and prosperity of its citizens should be conserved. I am conservative in the sense that I believe in the spirit and in the letter of the United States Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and in the characters and purposes of such men as Washington, Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln. Too often, unfortunately, those that call themselves the conservative element are endeavoring to introduce radical departures from these old conservative principles. I do not think my views are in conflict with those of any citizen, however conservative, if his conservatism takes the form of an earnest desire to preserve and perpetuate the original American form of government, and the liberty, equality, independence, and opportunity guaranteed under it. But I am in conflict with those so-called conservatives that are reverting to the ideas of former centuries and of other nations, seeking to exploit the mass of the people for their own profit. Such men are reactionary, they are not conservative.

Following these views on conservatism, Mr. Hearst discussed the trust question, regarding which he said:

I am in favor of organization and combination whenever the people are allowed to participate fully in the economies and advantages which result from combination. I am opposed to the combinations that establish virtual monopolies, and instead of making the people partners in the improved industrial conditions inflate their stock, increase the cost of the product, reduce wages through a monopoly of the employing power, interfere with the creation and distribution of wealth.

Asked what issues he considered paramount, he replied:

The main issue of a party of the peo-

ple is to attend to the main business before the people. The universal tendency of to-day is toward industrial combination and organization. The great issue of the day, therefore, is the regulation and control of that tendency to organization—in other words, the trust issue. In a mining region, the chief issue is the mining laws. In a cattle country, the chief issue is the laws affecting cattle and pasture. In this country of sudden trust development, the one dominating issue—made so by the trusts themselves—is the trust issue. The growth of the new industrial system on lines of wide combination cannot and should not be checked. But it can be kept within lines that will benefit the whole community and entirely suppressed along lines dangerous to public welfare. The trusts must be kept within the law, and if there are no laws strong enough to control them, then such laws must be made. The people are determined to dominate and direct the trusts and not to be dominated by them. They will find a way to bring that about.

Other points on which Mr. Hearst replied to the reporter's inquiries were the tariff, the Isthmian canal, the labor question and the money question. He favors protection "in order to promote any industry of which the full development will benefit all," but opposes it "when it becomes obvious that an enterprise protected by the tariff is a menace instead of a benefit to the country." Regarding the Isthmian canal, he prefers the Nicaragua route, but "if the party in power has positively determined to build no canal but the Panama canal, then it would not become the Democratic party to block what may be for the present the only obtainable solution of the canal problem." While "the demands of trade unions are not always just or wise," Mr. Hearst sympathizes with unionism as against trusts because "the unions at least ask pay for labor which they actually perform," and in illustration of his opinion on this point he narrates the following interesting and suggestive personal experience:

In my business, the producing of newspapers, there came simultaneously two demands. The trust demanded an increased price for paper and one of the unions demanded an increased price for labor. A number of my brother newspaper owners gathered in my office and suggested a union of newspapers to prevent an increase in the wages of the workers. I asked them why it would not be better to combine to prevent the trust from getting its arbitrary increase

in the price of paper. But I could not interest them in that. They seemed to think it all right for a great trust to ask for more money arbitrarily—but all wrong for men that work to ask for more money to meet the constantly increasing cost of living.

The financial question is coupled by Mr. Hearst with the labor and trust questions. He does not discuss the economic principles of finance, but addresses an argument ad hominum to the "gold Democrats," of whom he says that if they are sincere they—

should be in hearty opposition to the trust. Their chief objection to free silver, you remember, was their dread that it would diminish the value of the dollar and decrease constantly the purchasing power of wages. What has become of that tender solicitude concerning the workers' dollar? The decrease in the purchasing power of wages can be brought about just as effectively through increased cost of living as through the diminished value of the dollar. Personally, I have supported the Democratic party because I am a Democrat and for other reasons than the free coinage of silver. But those gentlemen who bolted the party and those who were so particularly concerned about the welfare of the laborer when it was proposed to make money more plentiful should be equally concerned now that they see as an accomplished fact an increase in the price of life's necessities and a decrease in the buying strength of the workers' dollar. They should unite again with the Democratic party in its warfare against criminal trusts.

On the Republican side, Gov. Cummins of Iowa has revived the "Iowa idea" (iv. pp. 280, 660; v. 354, 385; vi. 201, 404) in such a way as to accentuate what now appears to be a rapidly widening breach between the friends of President Roosevelt and those of Senator Hanna. In the political part of his inaugural address, delivered at Des Moines on the 14th, Gov. Cummins denounced the protection principle to which Mr. Hanna has approvingly given the names of "let well enough alone" and "stand pat." Said he:

I have never been a disciple of the doctrine expressed in a phrase that has now become famous, "Let well enough alone." Abstractly viewed, the maxim is beyond criticism, but its fatal weakness lies in the fact that there never was nor will be a day in which it was or will be well enough with any community, with any State, or with any nation.

When society ceases to grow better it has begun to grow worse. There is no such thing as rest in the economy of the universe, and no such thing as "stand pat" in the order of the living world. The dead may heed the injunction; no others can.

As he proceeded with his address Gov. Cummins became more specific, declaring:

It has been possible to make, and in my judgment it is still possible to make a treaty with Canada which would for years to come make us practically masters of the imports into that Dominion. In the last ten years American manufacturers have expended \$100,000,000 in the establishment of plants in Canada which would have been kept at home with all the labor which that implies, if there had been a fair and permanent relation existing between the two countries. Not only so, but every student of affairs knows that the chance we now have across the border will be completely destroyed unless we treat with our neighbors upon a fair reciprocal basis. The farmers of Iowa have lost something in the foreclosure of the opportunity to feed the men who are operating the plants to which I have referred, and they will lose more when Canada raises the barrier so that England, France, and Germany will supply the material for the wonderful development upon which she is just entering, and which we are so well prepared to supply. Which would you prefer to do, lose the market which would be created by our vast imports into Canada, or meet Canada in competition in the things which you produce? I assert confidently that in the sharp struggle with Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri you would never be able to discern the influence of Canada in corn, oats, barley, hay, cattle, horses, hogs, butter, and eggs. I go further. We can make treaties with Canada and South America, with France, Germany, Spain, and Italy, that will immensely increase our exports of manufactures to those countries so that for every man deprived of employment here we can put to work ten. You ought to have the chance to feed these added nine men, and why is it not given you? Simply because of the inertia which seems to prohibit the profane foot from planting itself within the sacred precincts of the tariff schedules. . . . Iowa has been faithful to the policy of protection, and she is still as true as the needle to the pole. The benefits she has derived have been great, but largely incidental. The time has come for her to raise high into the political heavens the twin flag, reciprocity. Let us for a lesson take the direct advantages and also the incidental blessings to fall upon others. Let us have the reciprocity demanded in the Republican platform of 1903.

That it was Gov. Cummins's intention in this inaugural address to throw down the Roosevelt gauntlet before Senator Hanna is fairly evident from the reports of his visit to Washington a few days later. A Washington special to the Chicago Tribune (Republican), appearing in that paper on the 20th, announces that—

Gov. Cummins, of Iowa, has thrown down the gauntlet to the "stand-patters" and there will be a fight to a finish in his state for the "Iowa idea." If the Governor and his followers win, the Iowa delegation will stand for the Iowa idea in the national convention. Gov. Cummins had a long and important conference with the President to-day, and in formed the chief executive of his determination to fight. This decision is important, as Gov. Cummins considers the contest being made against him on account of his tariff revision views as an indirect way of introducing into Iowa the anti-Roosevelt campaign. Notice was served on the "stand-patters" as soon as the Governor arrived here that he was well aware the fight is on and he is fully prepared to meet it. Regarding the stories that he had made an attempt to compromise with his opponents, Gov. Cummins said: "I have nothing to compromise and will not enter into any arrangement to divide the delegation to the national convention. That delegation will be made up as the people of Iowa want it, and I have no doubt it will be a Cummins delegation. It will also be for Roosevelt." Gov. Cummins was asked as to his views of the Presidential nomination. He said it was hardly necessary for him to reiterate them and he was unequivocally for Roosevelt. Inasmuch as the fight against Gov. Cummins is being led by J. W. Blythe, the friends of the Governor do not hesitate to declare they regard it as the beginning of an anti-Roosevelt fight in Iowa, instigated by the J. J. Hill interests.

The significance of this report was confirmed by a New York Herald dispatch of the 20th from Washington which announced that—

friends of the administration have suddenly decided to assume the aggressive in the fight for delegates to the national convention in Chicago. They believe they have waited long enough, and are going to combat the efforts which they are now convinced will be made to prevent instructions for the President, with a view of defeating him in convention by a stampede to some other Republican. There is to be lively fighting, not only in Ohio, where Senator Foraker is laying his plans for a campaign for the President, and against Senator Hanna, but in New York, Indiana, Illinois and Kentucky, where the noninstruc-