

it is time, for in no state in the union is the republican party more boss ridden than in Ohio—and what a boss Cox is? The self-respecting republicans are in revolt and it is estimated that in some parts of the state twenty-five per cent of the republican vote will be cast for Pattison. In fact the republican defection is so serious that the republican managers rest their hopes on the ability of the saloon interest (which is backing Governor Herrick) to deliver a part of the democratic vote. But this hope is vain.

Candidate Pattison is an excellent man and no democrat can afford to lend assistance to the republican boss who has so often used his corrupt machine against democratic candidates. Let every Ohio democrat do his duty this fall and Ohio will have a democratic governor for the next two years.

The readers of The Commoner are urged to make a special effort. Democratic sentiment is growing. A victory in Ohio would greatly help the cause.

### AN IRRECONCILABLE CONFLICT

Some of the partisan editors of Iowa are expressing fear that the controversy between Governor Cummins and Secretary Shaw may disrupt the party in that state, but what can they do about it? The Cummins-Shaw fight is not personal, it is organic. It is likely that neither is especially fond of the other but their personal differences could easily be reconciled but for the fundamental antagonism between their ideas. Secretary Shaw is plutocratic in his sympathies; he believes that legislation should take care of the rich and that the rich can safely be left to take care of the poor. Tell him the story of Dives and Lazarus and he will insist that Lazarus was a lucky man to live near enough to Dives to get the crumbs. Cummins, on the other hand, is a reformer and he naturally can have no dealings with a man who holds Mr. Shaw's views. If they were to agree to drop all their present differences they would fall out tomorrow over some new question because they view all questions from opposite standpoints.

Governor Cummins calls the secretary a "standpatter" and points out that the standpatters have always been the defenders of entrenched wrong. Secretary Shaw considers the governor a

"grandstand-patter" and thinks he is "playing to the galleries"—an accusation brought against all who try to accomplish anything for the masses.

As the leaders differ, so do their followers and the line of cleavage runs through every community. It is an irreconcilable conflict which always existed and will exist as long as society is divided into the exploiting and the exploited classes. Editors "may cry peace, but there is no peace."

The Cummins-Shaw controversy is not a disease; it is merely a symptom. The democratic party went through the same struggle upon which the republican party is entering and that struggle resulted in a platform which now furnishes planks for republican reformers. The democratic party attempted a retrograde movement last year but the chastisement which it received and the growth of reform sentiment insure the return of the reform element of the party to control. The republicans must now decide whether they will free the organization from corporate control or risk the annihilation of the party. Governor Cummins believes in surgery; Secretary Shaw wants to ignore the evils that demand a remedy. And other states besides Wisconsin and Iowa are destined to witness republican contests which while apparently personal will in reality involve underlying principles. It is nature's plan, and there is no way of avoiding it. Only through contest is progress possible.

### WITH WALL STREET INTERESTS

The appointment of Robert Bacon, until recently a business partner of J. Pierpont Morgan, as first assistant secretary of state is another evidence that the president does not appreciate the gravity of Mr. Loomis' offense against official ethics.

The New York Herald is exultant because "American diplomacy in the far east" will be "closely connected with Wall street." The Herald adds: "There is a greater game ahead. Mr. Morgan must feel sure that his interests will be safeguarded with a former business associate as assistant secretary of state." The "game" is outlined as follows, by the Herald:

The appointment is significant of the big role which American, especially J. P. Morgan's, interests are to play in the new condi-

tions the state department must face in the far east, as presaged by the Hankow railway concession development. The president knows by experience in the coal strike that Mr. Bacon has the confidence of Wall street, as well as intimate knowledge of its plans, in the transformation of China. There can be little doubt that in the Japanese development of Chinese railways American capital, as well as American products, will play a leading part. American diplomacy in the far east will therefore be closely connected with Wall street interests. Mr. Bacon may be regarded as an expert in his new field. It is not unlikely that his appointment as Mr. Root's assistant had some influence on Mr. Morgan's decision to give up the Hankow concession. There is a greater game ahead. Mr. Morgan must feel sure that his interests will be safeguarded with a former business associate as assistant secretary of state.

Mr. Loomis' appointment was urged in order to advance some enterprises in the south and now we have his successor closely connected with those who have schemes to develop in the far east. The masses will be called upon to tax themselves to keep the navy large enough to protect the exploiters—this is the program of those who believe that the government can properly be made a private asset in business. How are we to stop graft in cities and states if the federal government is used to promote great financial enterprises? Mr. Root says it is "a capital appointment." If this is a sample of the influence he is to exert over the president he will prove as much a burden to the administration as Morton was.

### ENCOURAGING

In Illinois considerable opposition is developing to the hard road movement. In De Witt county, the farmers are insisting that hard roads are not so good for the horses feet and that the farmers can better endure mud during a part of the year than risk the effect of hard roads on horses during the entire year. They also suspect the disinterestedness of automobile manufacturers in advocating the hard roads. The fact that both sides are being presented is encouraging because only when all sides are presented is there promise of wise action. Out of the conflict of opinions comes truth.

## MR. BRYAN'S OMAHA LABOR-DAY SPEECH

At the Labor Day celebration at Omaha Mr. Bryan spoke as follows:

"Instead of delivering a set speech, I desire to submit a few suggestions which seem to me appropriate to the day. In the first place, I am glad to participate in a labor day celebration because I believe it to be the duty of all of us to emphasize in every possible way the dignity of labor. No sentiment is more dangerous to the nation or more destructive to the morals of the people generally than the belief that labor is a dishonorable thing from which men should seek to divorce themselves and their families. We should lose no opportunity to propagate the idea that labor is respectable and that idleness ought to be despised. The young man who, with brain and muscle, adds something to the wealth of the country and contributes to the welfare of his fellows is engaged in a worthier work than the young man whose only ambition is to spend the money that some one else has left him. Our schools have sometimes lent themselves to the theory that education ought to lead one away from manual labor. The result has been that many have gone out from school ashamed to come into contact with dirt and dust and have sought only that kind of work which enables them to wear good clothes all the time. A contempt for manual labor is naturally followed by indifference toward those who engage in manual labor. The establishment of classes in society is largely due to this antipathy toward labor. Carl Hilty, an eminent Swiss statesman, in a book recently published presents the theory that labor is necessary to health; and Tolstoy is a champion of the doctrine that bread labor—actual contact with the soil—is necessary to restore sympathy between man and man. The first suggestion, therefore, that I desire to leave with you is that the doing of something useful ought to be the ambition of every life and that the idler should be shunned rather than envied.

"I am also glad to take part in your exercises today because I believe in organized labor. I do not mean to say that organized labor will

always abstain from mistakes or will always be wise in its decisions." To expect that would be to expect perfection, and perfection is not within the reach of any of us. But I believe that organization is not only necessary for the protection of labor's rights but useful for the advancement of the interests of those who toil. While it may be the primary object of members of labor organizations to secure benefits for themselves, it is impossible for them to confine the benefits of their organization to themselves. Those outside of the labor organization, even these laboring men who most bitterly oppose the labor organization, profit by the organization. When an organized body of laboring men secure better wages, shorter hours or improved conditions for themselves, they secure them, as a rule, for those engaged in the same work outside of the organization. This point was brought out in the Chicago street car strike. The union men insisted that only union men should be employed and the employers insisted that they ought to be allowed to employ non-union men. The union men replied that they would consent to the employment of non-union men provided the non-union men were employed at the former rate of wages, while the union men received the advanced rate which the strike had secured. The employers said that that was impossible because they could not get non-union men to work at a less rate than that received by the union workers.

"There are certain things which the laboring man has a right to ask of society. Let me enumerate a few of these. First he has the right to ask for reasonable hours, and I believe that the eight-hour day is a reasonable request. When we remember that eight hours are required for sleep and something like an hour and a half for eating, and a considerable time for going to and from labor and removing from the person the stains of labor, it will be seen that an eight-hour day does not, after all, give a man an unreasonable amount of time with his family. The wage earner is not a beast of burden; he is a human being. He has his family and time must

be given for association with his family. Besides, he is an intelligent being and time must be allowed for mental recreation. He is a political factor also and time must be allowed him for preparation for the proper discharge of his political duties. He is also a moral being and a member of society and he has the right to claim a sufficient time for the discharge of his obligations to his fellow man and to his Creator. We cannot expect the laboring man to be what he ought to be physically, mentally, morally, socially and politically if he is driven from his couch to the shop and from the shop back to his couch. While this question primarily affects the laboring man, it, in a broader sense, affects us all, for we are so knit together that we cannot separate ourselves from each other or, without danger to ourselves, subject any portion of the community to injustice.

"The laboring man has the right to ask for arbitration of differences between labor and capital. This phase of the labor question is not fully appreciated on the farms and in the smaller towns, for the reason that there is a sympathy between employer and employe which regulates the conduct of both, where the number of employed is so small that there can be personal acquaintance. But where one man employs a thousand or ten thousand, personal acquaintance is impossible and the sympathy that rests upon acquaintances is likely to be absent. There must be some way of establishing justice between employer and employe and arbitration is the only method that has been proposed. The employer who arbitrarily insists that he has the right to run his own business without consulting his employes does not state all of the case. So long as in running his business he does not attempt to regulate the lives and the conditions that shall surround his employes, nobody will question his right, but when he includes in the running of his business the right to determine the material, the social, the intellectual, and the political standing of his employes, he is claiming that which he cannot defend. There ought to