

Democratic Newspapers on Plutocratic Organization

"BRYAN IS RIGHT"

South Bend (Ind.) New Era: Bryan is right. When it comes to reorganizing the democratic party that important work shall not be entrusted to the men who helped elect Mr. Taft two years ago. The Baltimore Sun is the force behind the present movement to have a conference of democrats to prepare for the campaign of 1912. The Sun was a strong supporter of the republican candidate in 1908.

NOT ALL ONE WAY

Dallas (Texas) News: The implication that Mr. Bryan's taste in this matter (the nomination of the democratic candidate) will have to be considered will perhaps not be relished by a great many. But we regard it as one of those very hard and palpable facts which are not dissolved in wishes. It will have to be taken account of if the democratic party is not to ruin the best opportunity it has had in twenty years. We think it doubtful if Mr. Bryan himself could be nominated; we feel almost convinced that he himself could not be elected. But we account it a "copper-riveted cinch" that no one whom Mr. Bryan pronounces unfit can be elected, if the convention should be so fatuous and defiant as to nominate such a man. Indeed, we credit Mr. Bryan with more influence among the democratic masses than that suggests. He will not need to exert his frown to blight the hope of the democratic nominee; he will only have to withhold the warmth of his approving smile to render it fairly certain that the democratic hope will never fruit. Probably the most eligible man, from the standpoint of party expedience, will be, not Mr. Bryan's first choice, whoever he may turn out to be, but Mr. Bryan's second choice.

BRYAN WILL FIGHT

Johnstown (Pa.) Daily Democrat: Mr. Bryan leaves no doubt as to where he will stand in the coming contest within his party.

He says in the plainest possible terms that he will fight.

He has no more toleration for standpattery in the democratic party than for standpattery in the republican party and he declares that democratic "conservatism" is only another name for republican "standpattism."

And Mr. Bryan is right.

He is also right in saying that there is today a more formidable movement to swerve the democratic party from the line of progress than there was in 1903. The interests are preparing to capture it and to prostitute it to the service of Big Business. That is beyond any reasonable dispute.

But can this plot be carried to success? Can another Parker nomination be forced in 1912? Will the progressives in the democratic party again stand aside to give the reactionaries a chance to show what they can do?

In 1904 there was a disposition on the part of the progressive democrats to allow the conservatives to demonstrate the power they claimed. It will be recalled that the "safe and saners" insisted that the party had been wrecked by Bryan and that if they were given a free hand they could restore it to its ancient prestige. Many of Mr. Bryan's most ardent friends felt that it would be good politics to put the matter to a practical test. And this in fact was done. But never before in the history of the party was its discomfiture so complete and so humiliating as in this ignoble campaign.

It can hardly be expected that the progressives will show a like complaisance in 1912. The one experiment was enough to convince them that the democratic party is not reactionary and that its voters will not follow the flag unless it is carried in proper hands in the right direction. They will not give way a second time to powers and influences which in 1904 were believed to be and are now known to have been directly allied with the predatory interests; and if the worst should come to the worst, means will be found for carrying forward the democratic idea although the democratic party may be straying far afield in the service of plutocracy.

We are unaffectedly glad that Mr. Bryan has so promptly and decisively declared himself. We still regard him as the great tribune of the people. He is still the trusted leader of the rank and file. He still possesses in full measure the confidence and the affection of the unpriv-

Believing that democrats do not desire to engage in a sham battle The Commoner confidently lays down these propositions:

The democratic party must be progressive.

No Wall Street candidate can hope to hold the democratic vote.

Democracy must go forward and meet present day problems boldly in the spirit of Jefferson and Jackson.

The democratic victory of 1910 is the result of fourteen years of democratic fight for reforms.

The party cannot retire now. It must go forward.

What do the democratic editors of the country think about The Commoner's position. The Commoner will be glad to reproduce extracts from democratic editorials on this line. Let the weekly newspaper as well as the daily speak out. Send clipping of editorial in sealed envelope, addressed Exchange Editor, The Commoner, Lincoln, Neb.

ileged hosts who have thrice followed him to glorious defeat. The conservatives may lay the flattering unction to their souls that Bryan has "passed" and that Bryanism is "passing." But let them make no mistake: Bryan is as much a force in American politics as ever. He will probably never again be called upon to stand for office. But that does not dispose of Bryan nor does it dispose of the progressive policies for which he has stood and for which he still stands unshaken and unshakable. The war will go on and democratic standpattery must be prepared to face democratic progressivism in a final struggle the issue of which can hardly be considered doubtful. For reaction has never yet been able to measure swords with progress.

A DANGEROUS VICTORY

Edgar Howard, who has spent a life time in serving the democratic party, writes in his Columbus (Neb.) Telegram as follows:

"At first glance it would appear that a great victory for democratic principles had been won in many states at the late election. It is true that in many states the republican legislatures have been swept away, and this means that the democrats will send ten new democratic senators to Washington in place of ten republicans.

"The victory would be glorious, were it not for the danger which attends it, and the danger lies in the fact that in many states the very worst types of corporationists are coming forward to claim the new democratic senatorships. The understanding was that the late campaign was fought out along progressive lines, the democratic shibboleth being 'Down with Aldrichism.' Now let us look at the probable democratic senators from those states where democratic legislatures were chosen at the recent election.

"In Ohio the leading democratic aspirant for the senate is the notorious John R. McLean, many times a millionaire. Is there an honest democrat in the nation who can safely say that John R. McLean has even a speaking acquaintance with democratic principles? Can any democrat hope that such a corporationist would sit in the senate and overthrow one vote against Aldrichism?

"In Montana the most prominent aspirant for the new senatorial toga is none other than Millionaire Clark. How can any real democrat hope to see Millionaire Clark line up against Millionaire Aldrich?

"In New Jersey the common democrats are hoping to send some decent democrat to the senate. But they have nothing better than a hope. Millionaire Smith has said that he wants the place, and millionaires usually get what they want in New Jersey. Can any real democrat believe that the election of this notorious trust manipulator will promote any genuine democratic principles?

"In New York a dozen democratic millionaires are sparring for the senatorial fight, and one of them, probably Sheehan, will be agreed upon by the Wall Street influences. Where is the

democrat with bravery to believe that the democrats will give the senatorship to Gassaway Davis, sixteen times a millionaire. He is associated with many of the great criminal corporations, and his election to the senate would make glad the heart of Aldrich and all the criminal rich who have become rich through the operations of Aldrichism. Certainly no real democrat on earth dares hope for democratic results from the creation of senators out of such material as Gassaway Davis.

"The situation is not pleasing. It means that, instead of helping the insurgent republicans in their fight against Aldrichism, every one of the probable new democratic senators will be allied directly with the Aldrichites. What will that mean to the fortunes of the democratic party? It will mean that the people will lean to the belief that they were never more smoothly buncoed than when they started that democratic landslide in those states which are now preparing to send ten millionaires to seats in the national senate.

"The situation is worthy the serious attention of every democrat who honestly believes that his party should be the champion of the rights of the masses, rather than a plaything for the millionaire."

The following letters are printed in the Baltimore Sun, the newspaper which called the conference to be held January 17:

To the Editor of the Sun: Apropos of Colonel Bryan's guarded response to the Sun's proposal for a "Baltimore conference" of leading democrats:

The Sun is now very zealous in behalf of the democratic party, against which its efforts were exerted in 1908—efforts attended with little or no success as Maryland's electoral vote that year shows. But is not the Sun assuming a good deal in essaying to lead where it so lately refused to follow?

Mr. Bryan is right. We regular democrats, now that our constant efforts for renewed Jeffersonian progressivism have leavened alike the party and the country, are willing to meet all—even these occasional democrats—in a broad spirit of mutual concession. But the eleventh hour laborers, though receiving, indeed, like pay with those who had borne the burdens and heat of the day, were not put in charge of the treasury and disbursements, nor are late returned deserters at once intrusted with the watch towers. The Sun would do well to stop writing get-together editorials long enough to read its cut-asunder preachments of the recent past, also to study the facts and figures of the 1904 campaign. Many Maryland democrats, in view of the Sun's frequent apostasies to black republicanism, are disposed to discount its advice during its occasional visits to the fold about 100 per cent.

By the way, did the Sun note the election results in the close and important state of Missouri? The democrats carried the legislature, which elects a federal senator to succeed the republican Warner; and they indorsed for senator, by a wholesome majority, Mr. Reed—a friend of Mr. Bryan's—over one of the Sun's ideal "safe" democrats, Mr. Francis.

MONTGOMERY VOTER.

Chevy Chase, Md., November 17.

Virginian Wants Bryan

Messrs. Editors: In reference to the proposed democratic conference in Baltimore a seventy-year-old democrat begs to suggest: William Jennings Bryan commands a democratic following larger than any other living American. To not have him in said conference it would be a "Hamlet without a ghost."

JOHN E. HOPKINS.

New Market, Va., November 19.

THE DEMOCRATS' DUTY

Houston (Texas) Chronicle: The proposition for a democratic conference at the present time is not a wise one. The Baltimore Sun urges it, but that paper supported Taft in 1908. It is true that the democrats now have a golden opportunity, but the principles and policies formulated by the national convention at Denver, Colo., July 10, 1908, are the party law until a new national convention assembles. It is contrary to all precedent to hold a national convention or bring together anything resembling such an assemblage before the regular time. The propo-