THE PLATFORM OF REVOLUTION.

Attention has been so largely directed upon the financial plank of the Chicago platform that its other revolutionary deliverances have been partly overlooked. It is well, however, and it will be necessary many times in the course of the campaign to bring these forth in their true light. The public should be taught that lawless dealing with the currency goes naturally hand in hand with proposals to defy the courts, to break down the rights of private contract, to encourage riot, and to debase and degrade the public service. All these proposals are in the Chicago platform, and they were put there deliberately. They are clothed in circumstantial language, but their intent and effect are unmistakable. The Altgelds and Tillmans who insisted upon the adoption of these revolutionary planks as the price of their support, did not care much for the form so long as they got the substance. The result upon the authority and integrity of the courts, particularly of the Supreme Court, is thinly veiled. In condemning that court for its decision in the income-tax case, which it affirms was against both precedent and law, the platform has a phrase about a reversal by "the court as it may hereafter be constituted." This has been explained as only an innocent expression, referring merely to normal changes in the court through death or resignation or superannuation.

But the Chicago revolutionists were not holding out vague hopes of that kind. They undoubtedly meant, and intended their followers to understand, by their language was a threat to prevent the courts from doing, as far as in their power, to uphold the sanctity of private contracts all round. No State can pass "such legislation"—it is explicitly forbidden by the Constitution; but Congress undoubtedly may, and that is what the Chicago platform means. The Constitution did not forbid Congress to pass laws impairing the obligation of contracts, mainly because, we suppose, nobody dreamed that Congress would ever do such a thing. The danger was on the side of the States, and precisely in the line of debtors' confiscating legislation such as the Chicago revolutionists have in mind. Against that danger the Constitution erected an insurmountable barrier. As Judge Story says: The great object of the framers of the Constitution undoubtedly was to secure the inviolability of contracts." Could they have contemplated for a moment that Congress would commit a monstrous injustice which they effectually debarred the States from doing? However that may be, this new revolutionary attack on the right of private contract in kinds of money, carries with it a clear threat to private contracts of all kinds, and proposes to put all property at the mercy of the caprice or passion of legislators.

The chief Altgeld plank is the one denouncing the "interference by federal authorities in local affairs." We cannot follow the twists and windings of this delivery, but everybody knows what it means. "The silver men" are revolutionists. It is a promise to them that the strong arm of the central Government shall not again be stretched out against them as it was in 1894 in Illinois. It impies that if such a crisis shall again occur, with an anarchist Governor in control of the local authorities, no step shall be taken to protect, from the fury of the mob, life or property or laborers in their right to work. Such action by the federal authorities the platform is pleased to declare "a violation of the Constitution of the United States," despite the fact that the whole case, in all its bearings, was elaborately argued before the Supreme Court, which decided that there had been no violation of the Constitution whatever. This fulfills the needed air of burlesque to the preliminary protest of the platform that it is devoted to the "faithful observance of constitutional limitations."

The civil-service plank, besides threatening the stability of the courts, undoubtedly proposes to undo all that has been done in rescuing the public service from the spoils system. Nothing else can be intended by affirming opposition to "life tenure," and favoring "fixed term of office," and such an administration of the civil-service laws as will afford equal opportunities to all citizens of ascertained fitness. Thus we have a complete and harmonious scheme of revolution, all the way from the destruction of private property up to the debauching of the public service. The platform is truly all of a piece in its innovating planks. Repudiation goes well with attacks on the courts and contracts, advocacy of riots, and the reincarnation of the spoils system. Free silver is alone enough to call for the defeat of the Chicago ticket and platform; with lawlessness, anarchy, and the mob in office added, its defeat becomes the paramount duty of every citizen who values life and property still to be secured in this country.

ENGLAND AND THE GOLD STANDARD.

The opinion undoubtedly prevails, among the more ardent advocates of the silver standard, that Great Britain is somehow greatly interested in having this country, if not all others, adopt and adhere to gold as the measure of values. Perhaps this opinion is not entirely incorrect, but some of those who profess it would say that it is the British Government that feels this interest, while others would attribute it only to a combination of great bankers. All would of course acquit the common people of England of the charge. It may seem incredible to those outside of the excitement of the silver propaganda that any one should really think that a number of wealthy bankers had entered into a conspiracy to lend money with the purpose of forcing general prices down so that their debtors might be ruined and unable to pay them back. This belief, however, is openly professed by many, and sincerely held by not a few.

It is undoubtedly true that Englishmen who have lent money in this country, expecting to be repaid in money of the same value, object to the adoption of the silver standard. But the number of our own citizens who have so lent money is immeasurably greater than the number of Englishmen, and the sums that they have lent are incomparably larger. Were it not for the existence of this class, the Englishmen would have lent much of their money here in the first place, and, as compared with the influence of this class, the influence of Englishmen on our policy is insignificant. Doubtless English investors would have the laws in this country protect their investments, but they elect no representatives to Congress, and if it be seriously believed that Congressmen have been bribed to maintain the gold standard, it is obviously proba-