The Sun.

FRIDAY, JULY 29, 1892.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

An Important Year in New Jersey.

The political calendar for the next five months is chock full of interest for the Democrats of New Jersey. Outside of the Presidential canvass, they have a Democratic Governor to elect, a Legislature which will choose another Democrat to succeed RUFUS BLODGETT in the United States Senate next March, and Democratic Congressmen in at least six of the eight districts under the new apportionment.

At present, New Jersey has five Democrats and two Republicans in the House of Representatives. The effect of the redistricting of the State by the Legislature of 1891 is to enable the party, with ordinary prudence in its nominations and energy in its campaign, to send six Democrats to Congress instead of five; and beside this gain, it has a fighting chance in the Second district, where a change of six hundred votes at the next election would upset the Republican plurality of 1890.

The conjunction of so many important elections in a single year, with so many private interests and personal ambitions pulling in different directions, increases and emphasizes the duty of the party leaders and of the rank and file of loyal Democratic voters to shape the nominations with a view to the general result, and to a harmonious and successful campaign throughout the State. The Senatorship question, the nomination of a Governor to succeed the Hon. LEON ABBETT, who is ineligible under the Constitution for re-election for the next three years' term, and the selection of winning candidates in the six Congress districts, which the party ought to carry, all involve considerations of policy and expediency which are closely interwoven. They must all be taken into account if the Democracy is to lose no points when it goes to the polls.

For this reason we regret to observe on the part of some of the leaders in Hudson county and its outlying provinces a disposition to force an issue at once on the Governorship question, and for the benefit of a Hudson county candidate. We are sorry, for instance, to see that accomplished and wily statesman, the Hon. JOHN RODERIC MCPHERSON of Jersey City, lending his countenance, at least seven weeks in advance of the State Convention, to the proposition that there is something in the leadership of the present splendid and efficient State organization, which needs to be overturned; and that the proper way to introduce "new blood" is to introduce it in the person of a Hudson county candidate for Governor: Judge JOB LIPPINCOTT for talk, Mr. EDMUND F. C. YOUNG of Jersey City for business. Mr. YOUNG is probably a worthy gentleman, and he enjoys the immense advantage of Senator MCPHERSON'S personal friendship; but at this distance from the Jersey shore we have never heard him ranked, as an organizer of Democratic victory, with such leaders as LEON ABBETT and JAMES SMITH, Jr., of Essex. At this distance, indeed, the premature Hudson county movement looks less like "reform" than like selfish politics, anti-Democratic in its tendency; and the suspicion as to the motive and probable effect is not lessened by the eagerness with which the Hudson county movement is commended by the Mugwump newspapers of New York.

In view of the importance of this year's canvass in New Jersey, and of the broad considerations already recited, it would be particularly unfortunate if anything in the attitude of Hudson should provoke in other parts of the State the idea that the county which now has one of the two United States Senators, and which has had the Governor for six years out of the nine years past, is excessive in its pretensions or claims. Such is likely to be the effect in Essex especially, where the feeling is strong that fairness requires that the Democratic candidate for Governor, at least, should be an Essex county man this year. Under able leadership the development of Democratic strength in Essex has been extraordinary; and at the Congress elections of 1890 it took its place at the head, casting more Democratic votes by nearly two thousand than any other county in the State.

We believe that in Hudson and elsewhere, reasonable Democrats who can see beyond the ends of their respective noses will perceive the danger of a permanent centralization of the important offices in any one county, and will recognize the bearing of the Governorship question on the other important considerations involved in the canvass now beginning.

Vote Against All Republican Candidates, and Why.

Some Republican journals have been publishing a statement to the effect that the interest-bearing debt of the United States has been reduced since the inauguration of President HARRISON in the sum of over $275,000,000, and that the annual interest charge, which, when he was inaugurated, amounted to $34,578,459.80, was on June 30, 1892, $22,893,881.20, a decrease of $11,684,578.60, or about one-third.

Some Republican journals have been publishing a statement of our foreign commerce, from which it appears that the exports of American commodities, cereals, and manufactured goods, for the last year reported, exceeded all previous records, the total value of such exports having been more than one billion dollars, while the value of foreign goods imported was $827,000,000, or two hundred million dollars less. These Republican journals quote, too, the recent declaration of Senator HALE: "It is quite apparent, at this time, from the financial reports received abroad, that of the leading nations of the world prosperity alone exists in the United States."

Some Republican journals have much more to say just now about harvests than is usually the case, and they are devoting much time to a discussion of agricultural themes. The wheat and oat crops, they tell us, are both full and of good grading quality. The corn crop, they predict, will yield not less than 1,600,000,000 bushels. The hay crop is the largest ever harvested in the United States; barley and buckwheat are in good condition; castor beans look promising; plums and berries were never better. Even the Delaware peach crop, according to Republican authorities, has not failed. The yield of raspberries is beyond the average.

Some Republican journals have recently evinced a lively concern in the trading possibilities of South America and the Central American republics, and figures are not lacking to show how there will be a better market for American utensils in Nicaragua and for petroleum in Honduras.

The reduction in the cost of the necessaries of life as shown in Senator ALDRICH'S report engages the attention of many Republican journals, too, while others appear to be more concerned with the growth and development of new American industries, as tin plating and pearl button manufacture.

The consideration of these subjects, which mark and accentuate the general prosperity of the country, toward which Democrats have contributed quite as much as Republicans, and in which they share quite as generously, is very interesting and instructive, but it furnishes no warrant for believing that the liberties of the republic, the imperishable glories of freedom and self-government under safeguards of the Constitution, are safe in the hands of the party responsible for the Force bill.

Material prosperity and industrial progress are much to be desired and are diligently to be preserved and extended, but they are no dearer to freemen than are liberty of political action and the right of an untrammelled choice of public servants. Without liberty, protected from the menace of centralization and of an odious race rule, the fruits of thrift, industry, and plentitude are elusive and uncertain. They may wither before our eyes.

Law and justice before all; preservation of the Constitution; no Force bill.

Our Republican friends are right in ranging themselves on the side of the country's prosperity, and in defending the Government against the wallings and lamentations of its critics and censors; but the Democracy stands for all these things, and for liberty and majority rule besides.

The only secure way to prevent Force bill legislation is to defeat candidates of the party responsible for its introduction and still committed to its support and defence.

Political Miscegenation.

An effort is now going forward in Minnesota to induce the Democrats of that State to repeat the folly of the Democrats of Kansas, and unite with the Farmers' Alliance upon a fusion ticket. The Minnesota Democratic Convention meets on Aug. 3. The Executive Committee of the Minnesota Alliance had a meeting last Tuesday, but adjourned for the purpose of arranging for a fusion ticket. The Alliance has been very bitter against the politicians and severe against deals. It showed its sincerity and honesty by nominating a candidate for Governor, and intrusting to the Executive Committee the task of naming the electoral ticket and the rest of the State ticket.

What has the Democratic party of Minnesota to gain by making an alliance with the Alliance? We suppose that the Alliance has something to gain or it wouldn't make the proposition. In fact, it would be glory enough for the Alliance to be able to boast that it had made of the party most opposed in theory, tradition, and practice to the Alliance platform a supporter of that platform. But what of the Democrats of Minnesota? What do they believe in? What are their principles? If they have no belief or principle beyond the blind credulity that is expected to lead them to join hands with the hayseed Socialists in the hope of beating the Republicans, still they ought to have some regard for the Democrats of the East. If the Democrats of Minnesota, like the Democrats of Kansas, commit themselves to union with a party that out-Republicans the Republicans, and believes in Government railroads and telegraphs and telephones, Government pawn shops, Government land banks, and heaven knows what other crazy schemes of nationalism and grangerism, with what face can the Democrats in other States pretend that the Democratic party represents opposition to the aggrandizement of the Federal authority? When the Free Trade fanatics are licking the hands of Anarchy, must the Democrats of the Northwest turn up as copartners in the socialistic enterprises of the Farmers' Alliance and the People's party?

No good can come to the national Democracy from such political miscegenation.

Literature as a Means of Support.

The well-known novelist, Mr. WALTER BESANT, has an article in the August number of the *Forum* in which he discusses literature considered as a career. He points out that as compared with the members of the so-called liberal professions, men of letters are underpaid and unsocially valued in England, and he thinks that such disabilities might be remedied by assuring to authors a larger share of the profits accruing from their books, and by the institution of a society analogous to the French Academy. We do not purpose at this time to examine the feasibility of these suggestions, but we would mark some statements of fact which are both interesting in themselves and indicative of the revolution brought about by newspapers in the relations of writers to the reading public.

Mr. BESANT recognizes that the number of men who actually live by the production of original literary compositions, apart from journalism in one or another of its branches, is comparatively small. There are, he says, in England half a dozen dramatists, about a hundred novelists, a few successful writers of educational books which are mines of wealth to the successful, and a few publishers' hacks. The greatest prizes are those of the dramatists; but these are few and very hard to win. Of the English novelists it is asserted that fifty of them make over five thousand dollars a year. As for magazine writing, this at best is ancillary and cannot furnish an adequate means of support. An analysis of the contents of the seven leading English magazines for the last three years has convinced Mr. BESANT that one cannot live by writing for the monthlies. If we except, therefore, some fifty novelists and a few producers of educational books, the English literature which reaches the public in bound volumes is still what it used to be, a crutch and not a staff.

When we pass, however, to the literature which reaches the public through the newspapers, we encounter a very different state of things. This kind of literature is, in truth, a staff. Mr. BESANT dwells with the emphasis which the subject deserves on the immense enlargement of opportunity and independence which those who live by writing have of late years received by the development of journalism. The editorial articles of the great journals in London and in the provinces are written by scholars and gentlemen, and it is reckoned a fortunate as well as a most honorable thing to occupy the position of leader-writer on a great daily. The time, moreover, has gone by when newspapers relied almost exclusively upon a staff of regular leader-writers; now the editors welcome contributions of special papers from men who can speak with authority on particular topics. This innovation opens up to writers a wide field of employment. The number of English newspapers is enormous and is constantly increasing, and the circulation of the weekly penny papers may be computed at many millions. All these journals vie with each other in obtaining the best fiction and the most striking articles possible. The result is that they offer a means of subsistence—no longer a mere pittance, but a handsome income—to hundreds of writers. At the present day in England a competent man of letters can obtain enough journalistic work to render him independent of a book publisher. This Mr. BESANT recognizes as an immense gain. To those who object that newspapers become exacting, and may so absorb a contributor that he will produce little beyond ephemeral compositions, he replies with serene philosophy that the men are very few whose deliberate and original work would be so precious that its loss cannot be made good.

What is true of London is quite as true of New York and other large American cities. Our great daily newspapers are rapidly tending to absorb the literary talent of the country, and the tendency has been signally increased by the publication of the Sunday editions, which are really unique combinations of the newspaper and the magazine, sold at a price which brings them within reach of the great mass of the community. As regards remuneration and the social consequence resulting from an assured and considerable income, the improvement of a literary man's position in the United States is almost entirely due to the acceptance of the newspaper as the best channel of communication between writers and the reading public.

A Grateful Diversion.

It is pleasant to turn for a moment from the savage strife of greed and selfishness to admire the beautiful consideration of this good and tender-hearted girl:

"The following proposition is respectfully submitted to you for your decision:

"A man and woman have known each other for a long time, and might reasonably be called very intimate. As time goes by, the man discovers that he is rapidly falling in love with the woman. The latter, with true feminine intuition, discovers this fact, also, but at the same time realizes that, apart from a certain friendly feeling, she does not love him, and would not marry him. She sees that in the course of time he will be led to make a proposal of marriage to her. Now, what ought she to do? Should she tell the man that his attentions are in vain, and thus run the risk of compromising herself by speaking out without apparent reason; or shou'd she let the affair run its natural course, and then when the time arrives for the fatal question, flat'y refuse one who has been a lifelong friend? In other words, what should the girl do under the circumstances?"

This is not a case for arbitration. No umpire has any power to settle it. If the pair were already married, a difference of opinion between them as to the interpretation of a matrimonial agreement might be arbitrated, but no arbitrator and no umpire can force anybody into an agreement to which he has not consented and into which he is unwilling to enter. He is a free agent.

It is for this girl to say whether she will marry this man, she being legally qualified to make the contract. Nobody has any right or any power to make her marry him. We can accordingly only go so far as to advise her in the matter, and she can take our advice or not, as she thinks best.

It is a great mystery that a woman may know and like many men as companions, and yet have an attraction for only one of them as a husband. She is doubtless acting under the law of natural selection, as modified by the artificial tests and requirements of civilization; but why she makes the particular selection may be incomprehensible to everybody else and even to herself. In the long run, and, as a whole, marriages made in accordance with this mysterious law of nature, or from love only, are the happiest for the individual pairs and the best for society.

At this period, however, when the destruction of all individualism is demanded by some philosophers, it is proposed to take away from a woman the right to make her own selection of a husband and to transfer the authority to the State. They would have a commission of doctors and sociologists, as they call them, to decide whether a woman should be allowed to marry, and to pick out a husband for her on alleged scientific principles. They would have the marriage laws framed in imitation of the usages of a stock farm for the raising of animals.

In substance, they would compel every woman to join a matrimonial union, and to submit to its dictation instead of yielding to the beautiful sentiment of love, which gives romance to life, and humanizes and refines the race of men naturally savage in their instincts. They want society to treat men and women merely as machines, leaving them none of the freedom of individuality. They would have everybody compelled to do what he is told to do by the majority.

Women are not likely to favor any such arrangement as that, nor are men anxious for such slavery. It is a crazy theory. Its execution would send the human race back where it began, and a new fight for liberty would have to be made.

But this is not answering our fair friend's question. We suggest to her that she "let the affair run its natural course." Probably she likes the man very much better than she supposes. Having been accustomed to look upon him as a friend, it is not easy for her to regard him as a lover. That very often happens in such cases. When the time comes when he proposes the momentous question, if the time ever comes, the situation will be changed radically. As a lover laying his heart at her feet he will appear to her in a new character, and, seeing him thus, it may suddenly dawn on her that the real basis of their friendship is love in both. When a girl has admitted a man to such intimate friendship long continued, she is apt to be in love with him without knowing it. She has the best foundation for such a sentiment in her respect for him.

Hence we advise our fair correspondent to give the man and to give herself the chance of letting the friendship drift to its natural end; that is, of course, on the assumption that she is not in love with some other fellow, in which case she should at once put the poor man of her story out of his misery by announcing the fact to him. She is a good girl manifestly, and she will make a good wife. Our advice to this man, therefore, is to persist until he wins the prize. Ten to one he can do it.

The Question of a Treasurer.

The substitution as Treasurer of the Democratic National Committee of the Hon. ROBERT B. ROOSEVELT, a newcomer in the arena of national politics, for the Hon. CHARLES J. CANDA, who has filled the place capably for many years, has caused no end of surprise among those adversaries of the Democracy who are always on the alert for evidences of misunderstanding, strife, and inharmoniousness, and who sometimes imagine that they discern such dissensions where none exist to the vision of any one else.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, the new Treasurer, in addition to being rotund and jocular, has served an excellent political apprenticeship for the arduous duties which he will now be called upon to fill. To start with, he was one of the Fishery Commission of this State, was appointed in 1868, and held the post for twenty years. An adept in piscatorial knowledge, and an amateur in the sport, full opportunities will be given him to secure the contributions so needed by a political party in a national campaign. Certainly, a man skilled in the science of angling, mute whenever a bite or a haul is in prospect, alert for the first nibble and prompt in landing the catch, is just the sort of citizen required in the post of Treasurer.

Besides his record and services, officially tested, as a fisherman, Mr. ROOSEVELT has been a member of Congress, a New York Alderman, a club President, a trust company President, and the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Court of the Hague. Such a record in the field of diplomacy, of financial life, of city politics, and in Washington, fitly and fully equips an aspirant for the treasurership of a National Committee, even a non-fisherman.

It is certainly no disparagement to Mr. CANDA to say that his solid qualifications as a business man and Democrat of earnestness, activity, and discretion cannot for a moment be compared with the ornate and varied prepossessions and qualifications of Mr. ROOSEVELT, his successor. Besides this, both gentlemen were delegates to the Chicago Convention, Mr. ROOSEVELT as a regular, and Mr. CANDA as a contestant. As a result of the clash for precedence Mr. ROOSEVELT occupied a seat on the floor; Mr. CANDA had one reserved for him in the gallery. Under these circumstances the reason of the change is plain enough, and very simple, but it furnishes no cause for excitement or apprehension. The Democratic party is its own Treasurer.

For Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals:
CHARLES H. VAN BRUNT of New York.

You Can't Dodge the Issue.

The Hon. NELSON WILMARTH ALDRICH, a Senator in Congress from Rhode Island and the Providence Plantations, made a speech on the tariff last Tuesday, a speech of great ability and many metres in length. Mr. ALDRICH is reputed to be the most competent man in the Republican party to talk about the tariff from the protection side. Governor MCKINLEY is good, of course, but he is not various. When you have read one of his tariff speeches, you have read them all. He may be like NAPOLEON, but he isn't like SHAKESPEARE. Mr. ALDRICH, on the other hand, is charged and surcharged with the subject, and considers it from many sides. In his speech of Tuesday, for instance, he declined, and without much evident regret, to enter into a discussion of the poetical or humorous idea which Mr. HENRY WATTERSON has succeeded in having inserted into the Democratic platform in regard to the unconstitutionality of protective taxes. Mr. ALDRICH refrained from going into that temple of poetry and economic devotion. In gratitude we shall refrain from going beyond the first sentence of his speech:

"It is evident that the tariff question is to be by common consent the leading issue in the approaching Presidential campaign."

By the common consent of whom, Mr. ALDRICH? You would like to have the tariff made the linchpin of the canvass because you are a great expert on the subject, and because you hope it will withdraw the attention of the country from the question of the Force bill. You were the real head of the Force bill gang in the Senate in the winter of 1890-91. Mr. FRISBIE HOAR was the ostensible boss, but you were the brain of the effort. You don't think it's an issue now, do you? You don't want it to be an issue now, do you? You would like to orate and perorate about the tariff, wouldn't you?

The game won't work, Mr. ALDRICH. The bayonets of the Force bill pierce through your statistical papers on the tariff. You can't gull the country this time.

There is no room in this country for Anarchists.—*World.*

Where can the *World* go then? What boat will it take?

The Hon. THOMAS COLLIER PLATT was heard to say in the hottest of the heat yesterday, "Oh, for an hour of BENJAMIN HARRISON!" In Washington the Hon. EDWARD OLIVER WOLCOTT put a HARRISON badge on the head of a herdic driver overcome with the heat, and brought him to at once, so that the ungrateful chap complained of the cold. The Hon. THOMAS BRACKETT REED sat in a cloak room of the House reading LEW WALLACE'S "Life of BENJAMIN HARRISON," and shivering under a fur overcoat as if his bones would snap with the cold.

A sensation was caused at one of our fashionable bathing beaches the other day by the appearance of a beautiful and stately foreigner of unquestionable distinction in a bathing dress more convenient than is ordinarily worn by our belles. Its most remarkable feature was the entire absence of stockings; moreover, the body of the dress was without a skirt. A similar style seems to prevail in Utah, for a number of pictures of the fair swimmers at the Garfield Beach in Great Salt Lake represent them as devoid of stockings. On the bathing beaches of France, also, ladies appear without stockings, though there they wear short skirts, with trousers that come a little below the knee. These are points of mere detail, however, and the fashion which prevails in France and Utah is not likely to be far from the right style.

We find in our highly interesting contemporary, the *Oregonian*, a poem upon "Mr. LEASE of Kansas," attributed as to its authorship to one JOHN M. QUINN and as to its origin to the *Butte Miner*, a journal of the Wild West; which leads us to remark that the true author of this interesting poem is Mr. W. J. LAMPTON of Washington, and that its first revelation to public knowledge took place in the columns of THE SUN, which shines for all. We are shocked that the *Oregonian* should have been deluded by such an imposture.

Veracious narratives relate that frogs have rained and rained heavily in various parts of the country recently. What strange commotion to our State does this bode? Has old DYBERNFORTH tapped some cloud tank where Chicago water is kept, a tank full of uncleanness and bacilli dire? Any way, 'tis good news if frogs' legs are falling, for that amphibian chicken is monstrous fine eating.

In Persia and other Mohammedan countries in which the cholera has been prevalent the worshippers of ALLAH have striven to avert its ravages by prayer, by holy ceremonies, and by impressive services in the mosques. In Russia the authorities of the Greek Church are now trying to stop the progress of the cholera by religious processions and by commanding the faithful to prostrate themselves many times daily before the sacred images. Russia, however, is in advance of Persia. The Russian Government, while encouraging the use of religious preventives, is at the same time encouraging the use of disinfectants. In the United States pious people pray for safety when threatened with danger, but our health authorities give their whole time to the application of those sanitary laws which, under Heaven's blessing, are useful for the protection of the community.

Deceived by His Own Metaphor.

From the Washington Evening Star.

If the officeholder would study the average domestic he wouldn't feel nearly so humble when he declares that he is the servant of the people.

Out of the Tailor-made.

From the Washington Evening Star.

When in her bathing suit she trod
The ocean's sandy bed,
Young Cupid, without smile or nod,
Just turned his back and fled.

IS THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE A FREE TRADER?

A Highly Interesting Statement from a Very Distinguished Supporter of Mr. Cleveland Through Three Campaigns.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Mr. Cleveland's real tariff views are just now the subject of a great deal of quiet discussion among politicians in and out of Congress. It is plain that the Chicago platform does not express them. His friends opposed the adoption of the platform, and his Madison Square Garden speech repudiated it. Just as he sent Senator Gorman and the late William L. Scott with a carefully prepared conservative platform, approved by Mr. Randall, to St. Louis, so his recognized friends, Vilas, Dickerson, Harrity, and Whitney, stood up in a body against the radical deliverance at Chicago. It is no longer a matter of doubt that they represented him in this as they did in everything else.

The truth is, Mr. Cleveland never intended the message of 1887 to be taken as a free trade slogan. He believed that a fight for free raw materials would be a winning one, and that some of the abuses of the tariff needed correction. But he made no assault on the principle of protection, and whenever he has been confronted with the doctrine laid down in the Chicago platform, he has recoiled. The Republican press and politicians have sedulously held him up as a free trader and denounced the message of 1887 as a free trade message. They were adroit enough to join the issue there, and in so doing they made the issue for themselves. But Mr. Cleveland never did. He was baffled and disappointed by the popular acceptance of the message as a challenge to a free trade battle. He tried to impose his own interpretation on the St. Louis Convention, and again on the Chicago Convention, but in each was defeated by the sentiment aroused among the masses of the party by the crusade which had been preached in his own name, and of which they were determined he should be the leader.

Never was anything more interesting and curious than his effort on the notification occasion to modify the tariff issue and to magnify the Force bill, which he hopes may elect him, provided reasonable moderation shall prevail in presenting the other question.

A leading Democrat, who knows the inside of the National Committee as well as any man, said to me only a day or two after the demonstration in New York:

"Cleveland, like Lincoln, gets the credit of great candor and straightforwardness, but is, notwithstanding, a most practical politician. It was one thing to get the Democratic nomination; it is another thing to be elected. He had an instinct in '88, just as he has in '92, that a free trader cannot be elected. He never was a free trader; but the notion that he was radical on the tariff question and would lead a revolution of some kind was necessary to his nomination both times; and he let it run the first time until too late to correct it. Henry Watterson believed he was fighting Cleveland's battle when he defeated Senator Gorman for Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, when the latter had Cleveland's platform in his pocket, typewritten in the White House, and agreed to by all sides, including such opponents as Randall and Carlisle, who had weighed every word! William L. Scott was to convey the hint to Mr. Cleveland's friends that Senator Gorman was Cleveland's spokesman; but Mr. Scott failed to do so until it was too late. Had Mr. Cleveland employed more direct methods, he would have succeeded, and might have been redicted, for he had no opposition, and his wish would have sufficed.

"At Chicago it was different. There he had to face a stern opposition, protesting to the last. His friends were routed when it came to the platform, and their consternation was manifest. Mr. Cleveland, as before, had talked generalities on the tariff. In the absence of a definite and practical statement of his meaning, the free traders secured the adoption of their own, and Mr. Cleveland is in the remarkable position of a candidate whose friends were strong enough to nominate him, but were not strong enough to protect him against a platform upon which he thinks no man can stand and be elected!

"But Mr. Cleveland intends to be elected. He has had all he wants of the '88 style of politics. The Henry Georges, and the Henry Wattersons, and the Frank Hurds, and the Millses, and the Breckinridges will not run this campaign. Cleveland will do the great Hancock act. But he will do it in his own way, and win on it. He won't repudiate the platform in a single hasty and panicky letter. But he will gradually lead thought and discussion away from the plank which he regards as fatal, and substitute for it himself and his own utterances. The campaign has not begun, and yet he has already planted one of his feet on THE SUN'S platform, and is perceptibly lifting the other. He has given the Force bill its proper place in the foreground, while, as to the tariff, he says: 'We need not base our attack upon questions of constitutional permission or legislative power, but content ourselves with exposing its inequalities and favoritism in the present conditions.'

"This is consistent with the message of '87, and with every word Mr. Cleveland has ever spoken. But it is not the Chicago platform! Some politicians imagine that Whitney, who was angered by the '87 message, and Harrity are the authors of this policy. But that is not the case. They approve it naturally, but it is Cleveland's own, who sees in it the certainty of his election. He is looking to the operatives for the support he requires, and he believes that a denial of the right to levy tariff duties sufficient to cover the difference between the cost of labor here and abroad would sacrifice that support, and leave him where he was left in 1888. Mr. Whitney agrees with him. So does Mr. Harrity, and that is one reason why Mr. Whitney picked the Pennsylvanian and had him made Chairman."

A DEMOCRAT NOT FOR REVENUE.
WASHINGTON, July 27.

The Misplaced Sympathy for Iams.

From the Philadelphia Times.

The severe punishment of Private Iams by the commander of his regiment for having cheered the would-be assassin of Mr. Frick, and refusing to retract it when advised to do so by his commander, has provoked considerable criticism, and much of it is of the sentimental character that ever overlooks the supreme necessities which often dictate severe punishment. The man who would cheer the assassin in his cowardly work is quite as much an assassin at heart as he who fires the pistol or draws the deadly knife into his victim. He differs only in the cowardice that prevents him from executing his devilish will; and when he is a soldier, wearing the uniform of the Government, employed and paid to suppress the assassin and the lawless, he puts himself beyond the pale of sympathy, and there is no punishment known in military authority that can be regarded as too severe.

We dismiss all question of sympathy for Private Iams himself. He is entitled to none. Granted that his cheer of the assassin may have been the impulse of a boy, but when he was brought into line with his brother soldiers, admonished of his serious breach of discipline and requested to recall it, he defiantly proclaimed his sympathy with the assassin, and thereby made it impossible for him to command any charitable consideration whatever, and exposed himself to the severest punishment known to military authority short of death.

Many soldiers have been tried and shot for a much less grave offence than Private Iams committed, and the punishment, although brutally severe, is one of the recognized methods of punishment by military authority. The buck and the gag, the ball and the chain, the thumbscrew, and various other methods of severe punishment are recognized as military law, and the only question to consider in the case of Private Iams is whether the punishment inflicted upon him will be promotive or subversive of discipline in the military command. Beyond that there is no question involved in it worthy of consideration.

A Clear Case.

From Life.

Superintendent of Lunatic Asylum—That, ladies, is a summer hotel clerk recently thrown out of employment.

The Ladies—Why was he brought here?

Superintendent—He got to thinking he was no better than the guests of the hotel.

Easily Tracked.

From Truth.

She (reading)—Joe, this paper says that out in Oregon they have just discovered footprints three feet long, supposed to belong to a lost race.

He—I don't see how a race of people that made footprints three feet long could ever get lost.

THE ANARCHISTS AT HOMESTEAD.

Honest Workingmen Have No Sympathy with Them and Their Murderous Methods.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I want to thank you in behalf of thousands of honest workmen for the straightforward course you have taken in relation to the Homestead matter. What is to become of our country if crimes like that recently committed are to be sanctioned by the press all over our land, and all for the sake of political influence? I have been a Republican since my first ballot was cast for John C. Fremont, and I am a red hot one today, but the paper that sides with or sympathizes with those ruffians down there is not wanted in my house, be it Democrat or Republican. I am an American, first, last, and all the time.

I am a mechanic who has worked for my living ever since I was born, and I expect to the rest of my days, and I never have found it necessary to join any union in order to find employment, and I never wish to see the time come when I will not be free to work when and for whom I please. And I have never yet seen the time when a good honest workman, who worked for the interest of his employer as well as for himself, was not in demand, and could command good pay anywhere. You cannot separate labor and capital. One is essential to the other, and they can and will work in perfect harmony if we can remove all agitators from this land.

They are the worst specimens of humanity, and we can trace all our labor troubles to them. Of what good are the labor organizations to the laboring masses? They are a curse to this or any other country. They make the poor poorer to maintain a score of walking delegates who, in order to retain their power, must order some strike once in about so often somewhere.

The time has never come and never will come when capital will not seek labor at fair prices. It is a necessity and always will be, but so long as the press, for political reasons, will wink at murder, arson, and every other crime known to our laws, and cry out each day for arbitration between honest men and murderers, just so long may we expect such scenes as have been enacted at Homestead lately. Let my labor politics for the present and let the honest, laboring men of this country take hold in earnest and cleanse our ranks of such men as Hugh O'Donnell, and if one of them shows his head hit it with public sentiment in such a way as to show them they are not wanted. Stop this agitation of the poor laboring men and they will soon show to the world that labor and capital can and will go hand in hand. Think of living in a town run and owned by such men in free America! Take away those cutthroats, and open the doors of Carnegie's mills and they will be filled inside of twenty-four hours with men only too glad to work there and mind their own business.

Keep on in the good work. A LABORER.
STAMFORD, July 27.

Have Strikers the Right to Obstruct Work for National Defence?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Labor demonstrations like the late uprising in Homestead suggest to thinking men in every department of business in this country and abroad many new subjects, which, in the near future, will call for intelligent solution both by the people at large and the law makers of the nation. One new complication which has arisen by reason of the Homestead strike, and which seems worthy of comment, is the inability of Government contractors to furnish armor plates for war vessels, and the delay incident therefrom in the completion of the work in hand. At the present time the country is at peace with all foreign powers, and consequently the immediate and pressing necessity for rapid work does not exist that would if we were at war, or if there was imminent danger of any hostile demonstration; but this fact does not alter the existing state of affairs or change in any way the responsibility resting upon individuals in their character of contractors or the obligations under which they rest.

It is a significant fact that owing to the penalties imposed upon all who may in any way interfere by violence with the transportation of the United States mail, that during all the railroad strikes, and total suspension of freight traffic, owing to the illegal acts of mobs and wrongdoers, the trains carrying the mail have been let alone and allowed to proceed to their destinations, and those carrying freight and general merchandise have been tied up, employers and directors terrorized and browbeaten, threats of death indulged in, and vast quantities of valuable property destroyed, and the business, both of great corporations and private individuals, delayed and, in many instances, ruined.

Why this distinction? Simply because the majesty of the law as laid down by the Congress of the United States and built around the structure of government, overawes and subjugates even the turbulent mob. People who may openly defy the civil authorities, have a wholesome fear of the Government under which they live, and are exceedingly careful not to interfere with it in any way, either through its personal representative or the destruction of inanimate things belonging to or in any way appertaining thereto. The Government has made it a felony for any person or persons to obstruct the carrying of the mails in any way, and has laid down the law upon the subject and has designated the punishment that will follow its violation. Mail contractors and their employees rest secure in the protection guaranteed them, and the greatest and most perfect business of the Government is run with simplicity and ease.

The question now arises, why not apply the same principle to other branches of Government work? Why not protect by rigid laws all men who are bound by contract to furnish to the Government material or supplies, by which the Government, and thus the people, are directly benefited? The Government demands of its contractors bonds with ample sureties to oblige the individuals risking their money, backed by intelligence and industry, to comply with the conditions of their agreements. It insists that, where a contract is let to an individual, that individual shall carry out its provisions or suffer the consequences. Why, then, should not the individual receive some consideration and be protected in the discharge of his duties? This because the individual there represents the Government, and so the people, and any interference with him in the discharge of his duties is an interference with the workings of the Government, and as such should not be permitted. An individual is powerless as against the combined wrongdoing of a mob or laborers' union, and cannot protect himself, but if the law of the land was such that men engaged in carrying out contracts with the Government would be protected in their business by their employer, i. e., the Government, there would be no suspension of work as at the present time, because of the inability of the contractor to carry out his agreement, the interests of the nation would not suffer, nor would the corporation or individual engaged upon the work in hand be terrorized, capital paralyzed, murder committed, the wheels of industry clogged, and the entire people of an industrious, peaceful community interfered with.

Possibly the Solons who make our laws might find food for reflection in the foregoing suggestions, and in the near future take action, intelligent action, upon a matter that, had circumstances been different from what they are at present, might have given rise to many and serious complications. E. O. W.

No Place for Anarchy Here.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Hurrah for THE SUN! Its Americanism is of the right stamp. Give the Anarchists and their sympathizers another broadside, Mr. Editor, and another and another, for the American people are surely behind you, and you but give utterance to their sentiments in expressing their determination to stamp out this greatest of all crimes in the sight of God and man. The loafer that cried three cheers for the assassin of Mr. Frick would doubtless have shot his own officer had the opportunity presented itself, and the armed forces of the State and nation must be purged of every vestige of sympathy with these fiends in human shape. W. H. S.
NEW YORK, July 27, 1892.

The Case of the Punished Soldier.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Thanks, a thousand thanks, for your intelligent and earnest editorial of to-day on "The Case of the Punished Soldier." With officers like Snowden and Streator, the State of Pennsylvania is safe from the foreign Anarchists and Socialists who think it right to murder any one who happens to disagree with them. I had the honor to serve in the Union army as a volunteer from this State, and know that the discipline maintained in Homestead by Gen. Snowden and his fellow officers is the right kind. ZOUAVE.
MOUNT VERNON, July 27.

Homestead as Pictured in Paris.

Here is the way Mr. Jacques St. Cère of the *New York Herald* records in a Paris newspaper the history of the great strike in Pennsylvania:

"The strikes began in Homestead. The employees of the Carnegie mills determined to prevent the employment of non-union men who were willing to work for wages lower than those that gave rise to the strike. Messrs. Carnegie & Co., not wishing to let their furnaces go out, brought in troops of police to protect the hired workmen. They did not call upon the regular police authorities, because any assistance from that quarter would have been refused. They simply ordered a few hundred men from a private agency, known as the Pinkerton agency, which supplied them with armed policemen, just as they might supply them with so many hams. The strikers received these agents with bullets.

"The battle raged all day long, and at last the private policemen were obliged to surrender. The strikers burned the workshops and blew up houses with dynamite while preachers paraded the streets declaring that Jesus himself was protesting against Carnegie. It became necessary to send on troops, to proclaim martial law, and to shoot a few of the rioters in order to establish order."

We congratulate the *Herald* on the possession of such a reporter as Mr. Jacques St. Cère.

THE PRESS AND THE ANARCHISTS.

The Sun and the Striker Sovereigns of Homestead.

From the Seville Post-Intelligencer.

The *Philadelphia Press* renders nothing but justice when it says, under the caption "All Honor to THE SUN":

"THE NEW YORK SUN deserves special honor for its bold, manly, fearless deliverance during the present crisis of labor and law. Its voice has rung out over all the land like a clarion. Every friend of truth, justice and right owes it a vote of thanks for its courageous and inspiring utterances.

"It is easy at such a time to play the demagogue. The blatherskites and the conscienceless eagerly seize such opportunities to mislead the unthinking and to cater to the depraved. It is easy, too, to palter and parley and play on both sides. THE SUN has been neither a demagogue nor a trimmer. It has had the courage of its convictions, and it has struck right out from the shoulder with a virile, muscular force that has been exhilarating. Its judgment has been as clear as crystal, and its good Anglo-Saxon has been as robust as Horace Greeley's in his palmiest days.

"All honor to THE SUN."

The great merit of THE SUN'S utterances has been that it has unflinchingly insisted upon the vindication of the right of property to be protected against illegal invasion and the fundamental right of the individual man to labor on his own terms. THE SUN has eloquently stood up for all that makes the American flag mean anything more than a mere bit of gaudy bunting; it has stood up for society, for law, and order; for the Constitution and the laws. It has called things by the right names; it has said, without a but or an if, that when a body of striking workmen undertake to prevent other workmen by force and murderous violence from accepting work that these rioters have refused, these riotous strikers, when they are too strong for the Sheriff, should be instantly suppressed by the military of the State.

The American flag is trailed in the dust when Government for a moment upholds strikers who declare that other workmen shall not take work the strikers have rejected, and propose to kill them if they do, and THE SUN has without any qualification insisted that it was the fundamental right of a property holder to protect his property from invasion; that it was the first duty of the State to protect men in their right to work as firmly as in their right to strike.

The issue presented by the Homestead rioters was simple enough, but the shameful condonation of the riot by the press in certain parts of the country; the advocacy of State socialism in its defence by certain Democrats on the floor of the United States Senate, befogged the true situation and the criminal enormity of the action of the strikers, and the stern, patriotic bugle notes blown by THE SUN brought every true friend of American law and order to his feet without distinction of party. No service of equal magnitude has been rendered by any great newspaper since the *New York Times* attacked the Tweed ring and upset it.

In these days of cowardly demagogical newspapers that never dare speak up for law and order, lest they lose a subscriber or vote at the next election, it is something to thank God for that THE SUN'S courage and patriotism rose above party cries and petty personal interests and spoke out sternly in denunciation of rioters and land pirates seeking to rob law-abiding citizens of their right to have, to hold, and to lawfully use their property, and seeking to prevent by violence other law-abiding citizens from taking work on their own terms.

THE SUN'S vindication of the right of property to protection and the individual right to labor under our flag, has been presented with so much simplicity, strength, and patri