

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Vol. 4, No. 45.

Lincoln, Nebraska, November 25, 1904.

Whole Number 201

DEMOCRACY MUST ADVANCE

A democrat of prominence in the nation who openly and earnestly opposed the ticket in 1896 writes as follows:

"I have read your article on the election and I believe you are nearly right. If there is a lesson to be drawn from this last election it is that the people want something radical and something that they can rely upon. There is no chance for a conservative democratic party. We have forgotten the traditions of Jefferson and Jackson—they were positive and pushing, we are slow and apologetic. This country has got to have a better system of taxation or there will be trouble—and taxation to my mind includes the tariff question as well as an income tax, which I am heartily in favor of. We must not give up, either, the question of the Philippines. If something is not done there the country is lost."

This is a sample of the letters that have been received since the election. The writer of the above letter is now convinced that the democratic party can not hope to win the confidence of the masses unless it goes forward and takes up the questions in which the people are interested.

At St. Louis every member of the resolutions committee except one expressed himself in favor of the income tax, but it was omitted from the platform because those who controlled the convention did not want to offend the moneyed element. It was pointed out in the committee by those who favored the tax that even upon the low plane of expediency the party could not afford to ignore the injustice that our present tax systems bring to the masses.

The income tax is a just tax. If the rank and file of the people were as alert to protect their interests as the corporations are to protect their interests, the sentiment in favor of the income tax would be overwhelming, but enough understand the situation to make it folly for the democratic party to dodge or evade the issue.

The late campaign lacked life and enthusiasm, and these were lacking because the voters did not feel that there was as much difference as there ought to be between the republican and democratic parties.

The democratic party can not hope to be popular with organized wealth unless it is willing to surrender itself completely to the dictation of organized wealth, and even then it could not hope to win the monopolists away from the republican party. If, however, the democratic party will convince the masses that it is going to stand for their interests, guard their rights and promote their welfare it can become a powerful and effective influence in politics.

The fact that many who opposed the party in 1896 now realize the necessity for an active and progressive democracy, is one of the crumbs of comfort to be gathered from the late lamentable defeat.

Peabodyism Overthrown

One of the most significant, as well as one of the most encouraging, incidents of the recent election was the overthrow of Peabodyism in Colorado. This is the more remarkable in view of the fact that Governor Peabody's repudiation occurred at a national election when the democratic presidential candidate was overwhelmingly defeated and when that candidate's position on the money question was diametrically opposed to the position taken by Colorado in 1896. Eight years ago Colorado, formerly a republican state, gave to the democratic ticket the largest percentage of her

total vote of any state in the north and this year, when even Missouri went republican, the republican majority would doubtless have been enormous but for the fight that the democrats made against the arbitrary and despotic methods of Governor Peabody.

Even in the city of Denver, where the wealth of the state is largely centered, the democratic candidate for governor, ex-Governor Alva Adams, received a majority of something like five thousand, and he carried the rest of the state by about the same majority.

Governor Peabody gave to the laboring men of Colorado a sample of imperialism. Encouraged by the fact that the national administration was denying constitutional government to the Filipinos he suspended the constitution when he dealt with the miners. The rebuke which he has received at the polls will have a salutary influence upon executive officers and to this extent retard the application of imperialistic principles to our home affairs. The people will thus have more time to reflect upon the effects of a colonial policy, and it is to be hoped that they will return to the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence before we have any more samples of executive lawlessness such as Colorado has witnessed.

The "Real Politicians"

"Because those things—right and wrong—are really what do govern politics and save or destroy states, therefore the few philosophers who alone keep insisting on the good of righteousness and the unprofitableness of iniquity are the only real politicians."

The sentiment so well expressed in the lines just quoted is commended to the democracy of the country. It is a common belief that the politician is a shifty sort of an individual who is successful in laying cunningly contrived plans to catch the unwary voter. He is called a practical politician because he is working for immediate advantage and because he prides himself on not being bothered by theories. He is usually represented as having no compunctions of conscience to interfere with his plans for success. Late Speaker Reed defined a statesman as "a successful politician who is dead." There is more wit than truth in the definition. While it is true that death often compels a recognition that opponents deny in life, yet it is not safe to form an opinion of men from post-mortem eulogies, for they often magnify virtue and throw the mantle of charity over short-comings. The statesman is to be judged by his work and his work is not always appreciated during his life or immediately after his death. Neither can we estimate the influence that a statesman exerts by examining contemporaneous criticism or praise. The fame of really great men grows with the years and the influence of their lives increases in ever widening circles. No house can stand long unless the foundation is good, and so no lasting reputation can be built except upon the solid rock of principle. Those who "keep insisting on the good of righteousness and the unprofitableness of iniquity" are the only "real politicians," because they build upon a sure foundation and their work endures.

The principle applies to parties as well as to men. The party that keeps insisting upon "the good of righteousness and the unprofitableness of iniquity" is building for the future; to insure success it has only to keep along with the procession of events and apply its moral precepts to each new question as it arises. The party that lightly prizes "the good of righteousness" or is tempted from the right course by the seeming profitableness of iniquity meets at last the fate that overtakes the criminal.

THE INDEPENDENT VOTER

The independent voter is abroad in the land. No national election in recent years has presented such conclusive evidence that the voter is doing his own thinking, and it is a good omen for the future. Folk, a democrat, is elected in Missouri by a plurality of about 30,000, notwithstanding the fact that Roosevelt carried the state by about the same plurality. Johnson, a democrat, is elected in Minnesota in spite of the overwhelming majority received by Roosevelt in that state. Douglas, a democrat, is elected in Massachusetts by a large majority, although the president received something like 85,000 plurality. Alva Adams, a democrat, is elected in Colorado as a rebuke to Peabodyism, although Roosevelt carried the state. Toole, a democrat, is successful in Montana, although Roosevelt carried that state also. LaFollette, a republican, wins in Wisconsin against the opposition of both senators and all the republican members of congress. In Michigan the democratic candidate ran far ahead of the democratic national ticket, while Governor Garvin, the democratic candidate in Rhode Island, is barely defeated. Berge, the fusion candidate, runs some 30,000 ahead of the combined vote of Parker and Watson, in Nebraska, and Kern, in Indiana, Osborne in Wyoming and Dale of Kansas cut down the pluralities given in their respective states for the head of the republican ticket.

The returns in these states indicate that the voters are acting independently and are scratching their tickets to suit their own judgments. Even the vote upon the national ticket, disadvantageous as it is at this time to the democrats, presents an encouraging feature. There was no organized protest against Mr. Parker's nomination. Nearly all of those who had been prominent in the campaigns of 1896 and 1900 gave him cordial support. Mr. Cleveland and those intimately associated with his administration urged the gold democrats to vote for Judge Parker because of his gold telegram. Mr. Bryan and those intimately associated with him urged the silver democrats to vote for Judge Parker in spite of his gold telegram; with a view to securing relief from imperialism which in 1900 was declared by the platform and by the presidential candidate to be a greater menace to the country than any financial system. But in spite of the earnest appeals of the most conspicuous men in both factions, a large number of democrats refused to vote for Judge Parker and some even went so far as to vote for President Roosevelt—not out of admiration for him or to endorse his policies, but as a protest against the reorganization of the democratic party. While Mr. Bryan believes that it was a mistake for democrats to contribute to the election of President Roosevelt; while he thinks that they were not justified in assuming responsibility for what Mr. Roosevelt may do, yet he recognizes in the independence of these democrats a promise for the future. It is a good thing for the country when voters reason for themselves and do not rely upon the advice of any one. The more we have of such men the better. The democratic party has cultivated independence of thought and independence of action; it has emphasized the individual's part and the individual's responsibility.

The republicans do not lay so much stress upon the individual's part, but a great many republicans left the republican party when the republican party abandoned bimetallicism; others left the republican party when the republican party entered upon a career of imperialism. Still others will abandon the republican party when convinced—as they must soon be—of its subser-