

ernment controlled by the people and favor political and legal equality."

Jefferson was born of refined and well-to-do parents; he was even rich for one of that period, and he was educated far above the most of his associates; he was a lawyer and his social connections were favorable to aristocratic ideas, but he was a democrat. He believed in the brotherhood of man; he asked for no privileges that could not be granted to all; he claimed no rights that all did not enjoy, and he sought for himself no governmental care that he did not demand for others. He believed in the rule of the people, in their capacity for self-government and in their right to the control of their own affairs. He did not doubt that they would make mistakes, but he knew that they would bear punishment for their own mistakes with more complacency than they would endure punishment for the mistakes of others, and he was certain that their errors would be unintentional ones. He knew that, as they found no profit in bad laws, they would strive to correct them and would profit by experience. He was a friend of everything that helped the people, and the unrelenting foe of everything that injured them. He was identified with the masses, and considered that insofar as by inheritance or by his own efforts he possessed any advantage over others he held that advantage as a trustee for those less fortunate. The people "loved him because he first loved them." He organized a party that has lived for more than a century, and he so impressed his ideas upon the party that no defeat, however overwhelming, has been able to crush its spirit or disintegrate it.

There can always be harmony among democrats who have the purpose that Jefferson had and are willing to employ the methods that Jefferson employed. There can always be harmony among democrats who believe in a government of the people and are willing that all the departments of the government shall be operated by the people and for the benefit of the people. Differences of the mind can be reconciled; differences of purpose cannot. Between one who is at heart an aristocrat and one who is in reality a democrat there is a great gulf fixed. And, it may be added, among the aristocrats there will be found the same division that exists among the beasts of prey—some have the courage of the lion, and others the cunning and treachery of the fox, but they can hunt together if their object is spoil, whether it be avowed or concealed. Between those really democratic in purpose there can be no personal or permanent alienation, because having no ulterior motives they are open to arguments and amenable to reason; being honest in purpose, they have confidence in the triumph of their cause, and are content to employ honest methods. They will neither conspire against others nor against each other. If they make mistakes in judgment, as all are liable to do, they are not only willing, but anxious to correct their mistakes. In politics, as in religion, there is an essential difference between a doubt of the head and a doubt of the heart.

It is impossible to secure harmony between people of opposite sympathies and it is a difficult thing to change a man's sympathies; it requires a political regeneration to make a democrat out of an aristocrat. It is a much easier task to show a man that the principles he has been advocating and the policies which he has been supporting are aristocratic in their present effect or in their tendencies. The republican party of today is aristocratic in its policies and tendencies for it is controlled by a few in the interest of a few, but there are many republicans who remain with their party only because they do not understand the change which has taken place in that party within the last few years. When the policy of a party is controlled by its voters, then the party stands for the will of the majority, but when the party is dominated by a small minority, then the

organization stands not for the will of the majority, but for the will of those who dominate it. There can be no doubt of the democratic instincts of a large majority of the members of the republican party, but that party today is so controlled by organized wealth that the rank and file of the party are not consulted about its policies nor are the interests of the rank and file considered by the leaders. With the exception of the tariff question the republican party has not in recent years honestly submitted a single important issue to the arbitrament of the ballot or even to the judgment of the members of its own party. It has written ambiguous platforms and forced its policies through congress after elections. In 1896 it used a promise of international bimetallism to conceal its real purpose to fasten the gold standard on the country. In 1900 it practiced the same deception on imperialism and on the trust question. Even within a month it has refused to announce its purpose in regard to the Philippines, and has put off until after November the passage of the subsidy bill and the consideration of the trust question. The leaders of the party show their lack of vital faith in the doctrine of self-government by their unwillingness to take the people of the country, or even the voters of their own party, into their confidence. The hope of the democratic party lies in bringing this fact to the knowledge of those who have been in the habit of voting the republican ticket. One aristocratic party in the country is enough. Democratic success must be won, not by imitating the republican party, but by exposing it—not by making the democratic party aristocratic, but by convincing the people that it is really democratic and can be trusted to defend democratic ideas and to cultivate democratic ideals. As there are many in the republican party who have adhered to the party notwithstanding the change that the organization has undergone, so there are some who call themselves democrats who have themselves undergone a change which has alienated them from the democratic party or from any party worthy of the name.

To attempt to patch up an apparent harmony between those who are not in sympathy with democratic purposes is not only a waste of time, but would prove disastrous. The men who deserted the party in 1896 may be divided into two classes. Those who left because they understood the issue presented and those who left because they did not understand the real nature of the contest. Until the former are completely changed in their sympathies they cannot return to the party without injuring it. The latter will be reconciled to the party when they themselves become aware of the real character of the life and death struggle now being waged between plutocracy and democracy. I say plutocracy, because the aristocracy of today is one of wealth rather than of birth, and it includes not only those who have been alienated from the common people by the possession of great wealth, but those who, although without wealth, pander to it and measure all things by a money standard. Organized wealth has become so potent in governmental affairs that some even now despair of applying any effective remedy. But such underestimate the patriotism of the people and the strength of the public conscience. The people have a remedy within their power, namely, the ballot, and with it they can and will right every wrong and remedy every grievance.

The democratic party must have a controlling purpose, unchanged by victory or defeat; it must stand for that purpose at all times and everywhere, unmoved by threats of disaster and uninfluenced by promise of temporary gain. It must have a character, for character is as essential in a party as it is in an individual. No one will trust an unstable man or one so without principle that his position upon any moral question cannot be guessed in advance. Neither will the people trust a party that is willing to write into its plat-

form today anything that promises to catch a few votes or strike out of its platform tomorrow anything that will alienate a few votes. Even if it desired to do so our party could not compete with the republican party in the use of money in campaigns or in the deception or coercion of voters, because large campaign funds can only be secured in return for the promise of favoritism, and our people are not in a position to coerce. Our party must have principles and proclaim them; it must stand by them and defend them, relying upon its faith in the righteousness of those principles and upon its faith in the intelligence and patriotism of the people.

The struggle between human rights on the one side and greed on the other is an unending one. Our party must take part in the struggle, but that struggle cannot be permanently settled by this generation or by any future one. As the children of Israel, wandering in the wilderness, could not store bread for the morrow but were compelled to gather manna each day, so the citizen finds it impossible to rest upon the achievements of yesterday or to frame a government that will run itself. He must labor today, tomorrow and while life lasts if he would be secure. He must meet each new problem and examine each new proposition that is submitted to the people, but in doing so he will employ the same purposes and apply the same general rules. He cannot tell what temptations he may have or of what immediate gain he may have the promise if he will but surrender his manhood, but he knows, if he is an upright man, that he will endeavor to resist every temptation, and he will determine to forgo every advantage that requires a surrender of his manhood.

So with our party. We cannot tell what issues we may have to meet; we can only determine to meet them in a democratic spirit, to apply to them democratic principles and to take the people's side always. In 1892 the paramount issue was tariff reform and the democratic party boldly asserted its demand for a tariff for revenue only. It fought the campaign and it won, but its majority was so narrow that a few senators, disloyal to the party on this subject, defeated the verdict of the people rendered at the polls. But the failure of the party to do all that it promised would not have been so disastrous but for the fact that the Wilson bill, unsatisfactory as it was to tariff reformers, had to bear the sins of a republican financial system which was supported by our administration against the protest of an overwhelming majority of the voters of the party. The defeat of 1894 was more disastrous than any that the party has experienced since, and it was due to the fact that the administration deserted the people on the money question. In 1896 the money question had forged to the front, made paramount not by the action of the majority of the democratic party, but by the attempt of a minority of the party to aid the republican party to chain the country to an appreciating dollar. Without abandoning its position on the tariff question the party met this issue and took the side of the people. In spite of the desertion of many formerly conspicuous in its councils the democratic party polled a million more votes than it had ever polled before, and would have won but for the indefensible methods of the republican party, whose leaders held nearly all the protectionist republicans by declaring the tariff issue to be paramount, mollified the wrath of most of the free silver republicans by promising international bimetallism, and won all the advocates of the gold standard by revealing to them the secret purpose of the party to adopt a European financial system. But even then we would have won but for the fact that borrowers were coerced and employes intimidated.

In 1900 the action of the republican party in turning a war commenced for humanity into a war of conquest compelled the consideration of another question—a question so far-reaching in its conse-