

tional government, freedom of speech and liberty of press.

But for the world's acquaintance with the influences that surround a king it would seem strange that the czar of Russia could have so long been blind to the advantages of constitutional government. Self-government is the panacea for discontent. The people will bear with patience evils for which they are themselves responsible, but will complain bitterly of evils of no greater magnitude when those evils are brought upon them by the arbitrary action of a monarch. Paradoxical as it may seem, a monarch increases his authority as he shares it with the people. The fear that the people may not be capable of participation is ungrounded. The very desire to participate indicates capacity, and that capacity is still further developed by exercise. A ruler is likewise short-sighted if he imagines that he

can increase his own security by silencing criticism. Opposition expressed is less dangerous than opposition suppressed, just as powder is less harmful loose than when its pent up force must break its way out. Then, too, a public official needs assistance in the discharge of his duties—even the assistance of his enemies. They point out mistakes and utter warnings against errors. An enemy is often more frank than a friend, and therefore is often more useful. "Oh, that mine enemy would write a book!" is the greatest tribute ever paid to the value of free speech, and it is at the same time a tribute to the wisdom and sincerity of the one who uttered the sentiment. A ruler usually has to pay his friends for their assistance, but with free speech and a free press, he secures the service of his enemies without compensation or promise of reward.

Russia has her face to the light, and all the

people of that country from czar to peasant will share the blessings which will flow from the reforms just instituted.

The effects of this revolution in Russian affairs will be felt the world over. While to the downtrodden people of Russia these reforms will provide relief from an acute situation, this pronounced tendency toward popular government will discourage imperialism and encourage republicanism in whatever form and in whatever section imperialism and republicanism may be struggling. The effect upon the American people will be advantageous because it will remind them that when the people of "Darkest Russia" can make such progress toward the American ideals, there is every reason that the American people should adhere to those ideals more strenuously than ever and should vigorously protest against every effort to compromise them.

## IS THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY DYING?

The New York World intimates that the democratic party is dying and the reasons for this impression are stated as follows:

A Tammany city convention adopts resolutions praising President Roosevelt for "the surprising courage, remarkable tact, distinguished ability and commanding influence displayed by him as the central figure in the greatest peace triumph of the age."

William Jennings Bryan, twice candidate for president on the democratic ticket, tenders to Mr. Roosevelt his sympathetic support in the campaign of regulating corporations in general and railway rates in particular.

The Massachusetts democrats commend Mr. Roosevelt for his services in establishing peace between Russia and Japan.

The Rhode Island democrats indorse Mr. Roosevelt's rate-regulation policy.

The republicans of Massachusetts are demanding a revision of the tariff.

Former Senator Caffery, of Louisiana, says the southern democrats are protectionists, and predicts the organization of a new party.

When a president elected as a republican moves for reform upon the lines proposed in three successive democratic national platforms, it would be strange if he did not have the support of democrats. The failure of democrats to support him in that proposed reform would provide better proof that the democratic party is dying than the New York World is able to cite in the patriotic, democratic and consistent attitude taken by democrats generally with respect to Mr. Roosevelt's efforts to enlarge the powers of the interstate commerce commission.

Former Senator Caffery of Louisiana has not for many years been an authority on democratic opinion, and that the republicans of Massachusetts are approaching the democratic position on the tariff question gives no reason for the belief that the democratic party is dying.

Democratic principles as they were presented in 1896 and in 1900 are, admittedly, more popular today than ever before. And when we see distinguished republicans advocating democratic methods in the effort to provide the people with relief—and prevented from establishing reforms because their party is wedded to its corporation idols—it is absurd for any one to contend that "the democratic party is dying."

More and more the American people are coming to realize that the democratic party represents the real conservatism of the country—that it stands between the radicalism of the republican party on the one hand and the radicalism of the socialist on the other. More and more the people are coming to understand the evils of monopoly as described by democrats in 1896 and in 1900, and more and more they are coming to believe that the democratic methods for reform along these lines must be adopted if popular government is to be preserved.

The Washington Times, in an editorial printed in its issue of September 21, while displaying its gratitude for republican victory in 1896 and 1900 on account of the money question, added: "Now it is clear to us that practically every other notable feature of those two demagogic platforms was fully justified." And the Times further expresses regret that the opponents of the democratic party in those two campaigns were too "pig-headed" to perceive that while that party's deductions might be all awry its "premises might in the main be sound." Also, that

the opponents of the democratic party in those campaigns would feel better today if they had not jumped "to the preposterous extreme of contradicting every premise on which those policies were supposed to hang down to the Ten Commandments."

Time was when political parties were presumed to display strength and political leaders were regarded as statesmen when they withheld their endorsements of proposed reforms advocated by the opposition; and there have been instances where men vigorously fought the very reforms which they had previously as vigorously advocated, and all because the opposition had adopted their own plans. But such things are of the past.

If democrats are not sufficiently sincere and patriotic to support their own plans for reform, even when those plans are adopted by sincere republicans, then they are incapable of giving strength and vitality to the political organization to which they belong.

If the democratic party were made up of men who would desert their principles and their policies simply because an honest republican had undertaken to put those principles and policies into effect, it might, in truth, be said that the democratic party is dying.

But at this time when the masses of the people are hopefully turning to democratic policies, and when those republicans who are honestly striving for reform find their efforts thwarted by the powerful hold which monopoly has upon their own organization, there is every reason for the democrat to have faith in his party's vitality, and hope for the ultimate adoption by his countrymen of the principles for which his party has fought.

## THE GREATEST GOOD TO THE GREATEST NUMBER

J. T. Harness of Colorado, Tex., writes: "Enclosed find eighteen subscribers and money order for same. In a few days will try to get up a list of signers to the primary pledge. Could and would have done so before, but to me it didn't look right until I had sent in some subscribers. Faith without works is dead. Prefer to show my faith by my works, small and humble as they are. If my good wishes would give you subscribers by the millions you would surely have them. Those sending in lists to the primary pledge should kill two birds with one stone by sending in subscribers' names as well. Yours for the greatest good for the greatest number."

Taking advantage of the special offer Commoner readers have sent in subscriptions to The Commoner in number as follows: George I. Gargett, Alma, Mich., 22; Benjamin Stagg, Crowley, La., 14; Dr. O. H. Russell, Lomax, Ill., 10; I. N. Hodge, Bremen, Ohio, 7; John Roush, Lewis, Ia., 6; J. W. Hardaway, Umatilla, Fla., 9; R. O. Thomas, Montague, Tex., 6; James Pace, Nowata, I. T., 6; S. C. Vedder, French Gulch, Calif., 6; John Anderson, Rogersville, Tenn., 10; William Simmons, Hinton, W. Va., 10; Perry Craig, Pleasant Hill, Mo., 6; W. T. Conner, Guthrie Center, Ia., 10; Levi Moyer, Edinburg, Ind., 10; A. S. Beardsley, Dillon, Mont., 6; W. N. Clay, Barboursville, W. Va., 6; J. C. Moyer, Kent, Ohio, 8; B. L. Thomas, Dyersburg, Tenn., 7; G. L. Hettick, Quenemo, Kans., 10; H. M. Cochran, Union Star, Mo., 6; J. G. Briggs, Versailles, Mo., 6; L. W. Jones, Foster, Mo., 6; J. R. Brim, Mesa, Wash., 6; J. I. McComb, Wabash, Ind., 6; Charles

E. Demoret, Shandon, Ohio, 6; George B. Jones, Andrews, N. M., 6; E. M. Crawford, Petersburg, Tenn., 7; W. T. Tull, Magnolia, Miss., 12; B. J. Carney, Yellville, Ark., 8; W. H. Butler, Cayuga, Ind., 6; S. P. Elliott, Conifer, Colo., 7; G. H. Fairbanks, Cleveland, Ohio, 6; J. W. Canaday, Neeses, S. C., 6; Dr. E. B. Koger, Tate Springs, Tenn., 6; J. H. Ball, North Nassau, N. Y., 8; P. B. Hart, Lamont, Okla., 10.

The following named subscribers have each sent five yearly subscriptions: J. H. Mobley, Piru, Calif.; S. L. Rycraft, Alsea, Ore.; Cyrus Clary, Baldwin, Kans.; P. B. Hart, Lamont, Okla.; H. A. Cornell, Phosphoria, Fla.; D. H. Sweet, Thompsonville, Ill.; J. F. Sophy, Garretson, S. D.; B. Depue, Wellington, W. Va.; I. N. McClintock, Horton, Kans.; D. S. Burson, Richmond, Ind.; W. J. Reid, Sheridan, Ark.; Patrick J. Sullivan, Naugatuck, Conn.; George W. Cline, Albany, Ore.; John Shimp, Springfield, Mo.; R. F. Bostick, Gainesville, Tex.; J. H. Cantwell, Prohibition, La.; C. D. Brewer, Marshfield, Ohio; H. C. Risk, La Belle, Mo.; G. H. Van Horne, Beatrice, Nebr.; J. S. Ennis, Korn, Okla.; O. L. Moore, Jefferson City, Mo.; S. F. Poindexter, Lynchburg, Va.; B. W. Mathis, Crystal Springs, Miss.; R. A. Page, Milan, Mo.; William Charet, Hazleton, Ind.; I. M. Judy, Adrian, Mo.; J. H. Shoe, Degraff, Ohio; William E. Rose, Council Grove, Kans.; J. M. McClay, Shenandoah, Ia.; C. C. Hughes, New Boston, Mich.; D. C. St. John, Clarendon, N. Y.; Thomas Hannett, Shepherd, Mich.; J. H. Manley, Buckhannon, W. Va.; J. B. Ingram, Keller, Wash.; George B. Harden, Maxwell, Calif.; G. W. Aticks, New Cumberland, Pa.; J. W. Nichols, Mor-

gan, Ark.; Thomas Connell, McJongah, W. Va.; James W. Woolf, Post Oak, Mo.; G. H. Littlewood, Lisle, N. Y.; F. F. Keller, Scottsdale, Pa.; D. B. Spencer, Farmington, Ill.; Silas A. Cline, Danville, Ind.; C. R. Feist, Easton, Minn.; George C. Voshe'l, Aurora, Ind.; George T. More, Greenville, O.; Mark Gordon, Lincoln, Ill.; W. F. Gearring, Rock Elm, Wisc.; Joseph E. Henry, West Brooklyn, Ill.; J. T. Myers, Everton, Mo.; Peter L. Bosley, Yeater, W. Va.; John F. Neill, Higginville, Mo.; A. C. Clary, Bryan, Ohio.

### REFERENDUM NEWS

The Referendum News has been established by the People's Sovereignty League of America, with headquarters at Washington. The News is to be published monthly and will be devoted to the referendum movement. George H. Shibley, conspicuous among the energetic and painstaking reformers of the day, is editor. The first number, recently issued, will be interesting to people generally, while it can not but be helpful to the important reform for the advancement of which the Sovereignty League is striving.

### FOREVER?

The St. Louis Globe Democrat (republican) says "The flag which is up in the Philippines will stay up forever." Then what becomes of the claim so frequently made that according to the republican policy the people of the Philippines are ultimately to have independence?