

# Democratic Newspapers on Plutocratic Organization

## ABOUT BRYAN

One kind of democrat would like to see Mr. Bryan eliminated from democratic councils and his influence become nil.

Mr. Bryan is not likely to gratify his democratic enemies by withdrawing himself from his party's councils of war. He has announced repeatedly that he expects to devote the remainder of his life to politics. He is the most influential man in his party. He can lead millions of his fellow democrats to the support of any man he may choose, except somebody who has sought to humiliate him. These millions will not follow him when he endeavors to lead them to support a Parker. Their resentment of slights put upon Mr. Bryan are deeper than are his own. Bryan may forgive, but they will not.

With Bryan the most influential figure in his party, what are his enemies going to do? They have a hard job ahead. Bryan is the champion of the common people and their spokesman in convention. He is not a dictator. He is not a boss. He is the one prominent man in politics who has always scorned to build a political machine. He apparently never considers such a thing. His appeal is always to the reason and conscience of his hearers. If these methods are not sufficient, he fails. Since running for the house in 1894 he has uniformly failed. But in spite of all that, he has millions as faithful to him as Mohammedans to the Prophet.

What, then, are the democrats who want to bury Bryan, going to do? How can they get rid of him? The answer is, they can't. They must figure on his being with them for a generation or so, and always having a following sufficient to defeat any of their machinations.

The reactionary democratic enemies of Bryan are certainly in a bad way. They might solve the difficulty with satisfaction to the masses of the party by going permanently to the stand-pat element of the republican party. These elements of the two great parties are in full sympathy and have purposes identical. The obvious thing for them to do, in the circumstances, is to get together and stay there.—Darlington (Wis.) Democrat.

## BRYAN'S SERVICE TO THE PARTY

Bryan's position at the present time is unique. There is no doubt that in the three campaigns he made for the presidency he succeeded in establishing the democratic party in the minds and hearts of the American people as the popular party, devoted to the interests of the common people, as opposed to the interests of the plutocracy. It is true that all three elections were lost, but the fruit of his splendid fighting is seen in the democratic house just elected. When Mr. Bryan began his leadership the party was very much in the wilderness on account of the Wilson tariff bill fiasco, which President Cleveland denounced as "party perfidy and dishonor." Mr. Bryan was the democratic Moses, and in fourteen years, instead of the forty years taken by the great Jewish leader, has led his party within sight of the Promised Land. It is too early yet to select the man who is to be the democratic Joshua.

"Party perfidy and dishonor" was a strong statement as to the principal measure of a democratic congress from a democratic president. This is the reproach Mr. Bryan had to wipe out from the democratic party, and with splendid courage and fortitude he has accomplished the task. When Bryan began, the American people had reason to distrust the democratic party. They had commissioned it to put an end to plutocracy, by the tariff for revenue only method, and for this purpose had entrusted it with power. Instead of proving faithful, the democratic party proved faithless, and from the party of the people, out of office, transformed itself in office, to the party of the plutocracy, to the just displeasure and disgust of the American people.

It must not be forgotten that the renewed confidence the American people now have in the democratic party, as expressed in the election last month, is in great measure due not only to the great ability of the commoner as a campaigner, to the breadth and wisdom of his statesmanship expounded by gifts of eloquence which have placed him in the first rank as an orator, but also to his sterling character, which in three fierce presidential campaigns could not be assailed by his bitterest enemies. The unfaithful democratic party has now come to be regarded nationally as the faithful democratic

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.

party largely because of the fidelity of William Jennings Bryan. In the party's councils this will not be forgotten, nor will it be forgotten by the democratic rank and file. In all sorts of political weather the commoner has been the true friend of the common people, an American statesman standing firmly for the American people.—Houston (Texas) Chronicle.

## A CELEBRATION, NOT A CONFERENCE

The announcement that the proposed national democratic conference will be called a celebration instead, and that the gathering to be held in Baltimore, probably on Jackson day, will be "free, open and devoted solely to the promotion of party unity and harmony," is interesting. Norman E. Mack, national chairman, and Champ Clark, minority leader of the house, who will probably be chosen speaker when the democratic house, the election of which is to be celebrated, assembled, acted wisely in recommending to the committee in charge that the word "conference" be omitted from the invitations and the word "celebration" be substituted.

When the conference was first proposed the Chronicle objected thereto, and this paper has been glad to see its opinion shared by other papers of influence in the south and the country at large.

The objection to the conference idea is, in brief, that no national gathering of democrats can have authority except the regular national convention, which will not assemble until 1912. The platform of the convention of 1908 is the party law until a new platform is framed. It is true that Mr. Bryan lost on the 1908 platform, but even if the 1910 election had been another defeat it would still be the party law unrevoked. The 1910 election, however, was not a defeat, but a glorious victory, won on the 1908 platform.

It is important to insist on the platform and to oppose any attempts to formulate a policy different therefrom, for the reason that the platform framed by their duly elected delegates represents the will of the democratic rank and file. The democratic party is the party of the people. It cares for the masses, including the classes, but not for the classes excluding the masses. True democrats everywhere will fight any attempt at ascendancy on the part of the plutocratic element in the party, each man in which must count for one democrat and no more. "Eternal vigilance," the father of the democratic party taught, "is the price of liberty." Thomas Jefferson was right. We must be vigilant, if we would be free. We must see to it that no step aside is taken from the straight and narrow path that leads to tariff reform and the enforcement of the anti-trust law.

The tariff and the trusts are the two great issues.—Houston (Texas) Chronicle.

## BRYAN AND ROOSEVELT

Eastern newspapers that have always opposed Mr. Bryan and everything he represents pursue a favorite pastime nowadays in comparing Mr. Roosevelt to the Nebraska leader, pre-

sumably to the discredit of the former. Mr. Roosevelt is said to resemble in his personal qualities and public policy the Bryan of 1896 and 1900. The comparison is intended to be entirely uncomplimentary to the African lion hunter, but in the opinion of many intelligent observers of the careers of both men it fails to do justice to Mr. Bryan and pays Mr. Roosevelt an undeserved tribute.

Mr. Roosevelt undoubtedly owes a great deal to the gentleman from Nebraska, although he shows little disposition to acknowledge the debt. Every principle and policy identified with the ex-president's popularity has been taken bodily from the code of morals and system of government advocated by William J. Bryan. This applies to such generalities as common honesty, as well as principles in detail, such as the control of corporations. Mr. Roosevelt has not adopted all of the things advocated by Mr. Bryan, but he has kidnapped enough to gain the approval of a large personal following—largely the same following that Mr. Bryan had in three presidential campaigns.

But this does not constitute a personal similarity of the two men. It must be indeed an enemy of Mr. Bryan who compares him with Roosevelt. When did he ever lack courtesy? He was never emphatic without being kind. When did he ever prefer the "short, ugly term" to language couched in decency? When did he ever devote his energies to the organization of Ananias clubs? In all he has said regarding the supreme court and other courts, when did he ever refer to judges on the bench as "fossils?"

In Mr. Bryan's record there are no victims of his ill will. He has never manifested ill will toward any individual, but has dealt entirely with conditions and institutions. There are no fake naturalists in his creation, no great figures in American history subjected to his contempt, and no women involved with him in questions of veracity. His course, even though it may have been mistaken at times, has been plain and true, and to compare Mr. Roosevelt to him is to give the ex-president a place in the annals of the nation which the historian of the future will deny to him.—Toledo (Ohio) Times.

## REORGANIZATION

We believe The Commoner's declaration is the truest gospel.

These statements are true and must be adhered to by the democrats if there is to be a future for the democracy.

The next democratic house must make Champ Clark speaker and that house with Champ Clark's approval and assistance must do away for ever with Cannonism in the house. The recent victory of the democracy was on the issue of Cannonism more than anything else. The people asked of the democratic party opportunity to rule and if the democratic party does not give them that opportunity there will be no democratic victory in 1912.

The democracy of the new house must reform itself and must show that it is progressive and not re-actionary. It must go in the opposite direction from that pointed out by the message of President Taft. "No more corporation regulation" must not be its slogan.

And while we have the Commoner's ear, if they are listening to this, we wish to say that the militant democracy, the democracy that wishes to be progressive and headed toward the right, is looking to Mr. Bryan of all other men in this country for leadership. The democrats of this country wish Mr. Bryan to go on ahead and say: "Men, here is the man to make president in 1912. This man is the democrat who is not allied with Wall Street. This man is pure and undefiled. This is the friend of true democracy."

Mr. Bryan should take the lead. He should name the candidate in 1912. If he does not Wall Street will and the people have no other hope than Mr. Bryan.

Mr. Bryan can do as Roosevelt did in 1908 except that Bryan will get a man that will pan out better than did Mr. Taft.

Which shall it be, Mr. Bryan? Folk? Clark? Wilson? For whom shall we be? We look to you for our guidance. We have heretofore looked to you for our platform with fourteen years of good faith. Now we look for the platform and the man to stand upon it.—Twice-a-Week Press, Mt. Ayr, Iowa.