

AN OHIO DEMOCRAT REPLIES TO JOHN R. McLEAN

The Celina (Ohio) Daily Standard in its issue of Friday, June 24, prints the following letter:

Editor Standard: I beg leave through the columns of the Standard, to utter a word of warning to the democracy of Ohio. I am prompted to this by an editorial that appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer yesterday, which assumed that the refusal of the democratic convention to endorse a candidate for United States senator was intended as a rebuke to Mr. Bryan.

I was the one who, a few weeks ago, drafted the resolution adopted by our county central committee, endorsing Governor Harmon's administration, and urging upon the democracy of the state and nation the wisdom of nominating him for president in 1912, so that I can not be charged with any disloyalty to Governor Harmon. My warning to those interested in Harmon's re-election as governor, and nomination and election to the presidency, and incidentally to Governor Harmon is that the democracy of Ohio be not given the impression that the Enquirer's insult to Bryan and his friends meets the approval of Harmon and his friends. The Enquirer long since declared its withdrawal from the democratic party (all of which seemed unnecessary, in view of its past policy) so that the Enquirer is not a safe monitor for the democracy, but Bryan's friends in Ohio have not withdrawn from the party; they are democrats who, like Mr. Bryan himself, are earnestly and unselfishly fighting to re-establish in this country "government of the people, by the people and for the people." The convention at Dayton, in deference to Governor Harmon's expressed wish, voted down the resolution to endorse a senatorial candidate, but not with any intention of rebuking Bryan, for if the majority of those who voted down the resolution were consulted it would probably be found that in their private opinion the people ought to know before voting for a candidate for the legislature who he would support for United States senator if elected. The people are becoming weary of the policy of electing representatives on the promise of good behavior. They are beginning to see the wisdom of knowing in advance whether, if elected, they will stand by the trusts, and others who fatten on graft, or will give their untrammelled support to a candidate who will fight the people's battle ably and fearlessly. Mr. Bryan insists on endorsing candidates for senator because, by knowing in advance who their candidate for senator shall be, the people can require a pledge of their representative to support him.

But recurring to the Enquirer's assumption that Bryan was rebuked. For what was he rebuked, and why should he be rebuked? He insisted on nothing more than has been considered wise in other states by democratic conventions. This is but one of the methods urged by democrats in carrying into effect the plan of electing United States senators by direct vote of the people. Bryan was a pioneer in the advocacy of the election of United States senators by popular vote. Does not the overwhelming majority of both parties strenuously demand this? Then why rebuke him for insisting that that the people's demands bear fruit? He was a pioneer in demanding railroad regulation, a curbing of the trusts, etc., and purification of the ballot. Is it for this he is to be rebuked? In fact he advocated these reform measures long before Roosevelt, who was grown popular by, at least pretending to want them enforced, had ever been heard to utter a word about them. Is it for this that the Enquirer would have the democracy rebuke him? I must not encroach further on your valuable space further than to say in conclusion, that neither democrats nor republicans can point to a single reform measure that Roosevelt has been lauded for carrying into effect, that was not first advocated by Bryan, and is still advocated by Bryan. Is Bryan to be rebuked because he was a pioneer in advocating the measures that the people have discovered is good for them, and has always consistently and fearlessly adhered to his honest opinions on these matters?

No, Bryan was not rebuked by the Dayton convention. Not only the democracy of Ohio and of the nation, but a large part of the republican party, and in fact of all parties who love an honest, fearless man, resent such inference. I believe that Governor Harmon would resent it, and thousands of his friends, who see in Bryan the embodiment of fearless honesty and unquestioned patriotism will resent it.

Let the democracy of Ohio be united and harmonious and Harmon can be re-elected gover-

nor, and advanced to the presidency, all of which the great majority of the people undoubtedly devoutly hope for, and all of which may be accomplished without detracting from the opinion that Mr. Bryan is among the greatest statesmen this nation has produced in the last hundred years.

P. E. KENNEY.

TRIBUTE TO NEWTON D. BAKER

Newton D. Baker of Cleveland, Ohio, led the fight in the Ohio democratic state convention for the nomination of a candidate for United States senator. The Dayton (Ohio) Journal pays to Mr. Baker a high tribute. From the Journal's editorial the following extracts are taken:

On the question of senatorial endorsement for which he fought and lost little need be said at this time. That the party broke faith with the people must be set down to its shame; but to that party's credit be it said that all hope is not fled from it, no matter how much it may be now obscured. Men like Newton D. Baker do not live for self rather than principle; they do not know when to give up, and they never will give up.

Principles like those which Mr. Baker stands for never die.

They may be dragged down into the muck by those elements that live and delve in the muck for their political life, but they are eternal.

Think a moment, if you please, at what was happening on the floor of the convention yesterday. With oily unction, J. Sprigg McMahon who, by the way, happens to live in this city, was nailing to the cross the only principle, the only Faith, the only Truth which the democracy of Ohio has stood for. Lawyer-like, he marshaled his points and made a fabric which he flaunted in the faces of the democrats on that convention floor, and called upon them to accept it as their standard.

It was of no matter that he was breaking for his party that party's pledge to the people; it was of no moment that he was embarrassing the governor who later was to be shamed by a riot under his nose as he sat on the stage; it was of no consequence to him—that democracy was to be forced into submission to bossism.

He felt strong, no doubt, in the strength of his followers; principles were nothing; party was all.

It took a man like Mr. Baker to brave the wrath of the bosses as Mr. Baker did. But then, what does an honest man care for envy as long as it comes from the source that opposition to Mr. Baker's principles came from?

Young men must not be schooled to believe that such a perversion of politics is public service. They should be taught what life's bitter experience later must teach them, that sincerity and truth are better their portion in defeat than insincerity and untruth risen to victory.

They must be taught to be patient, as Mr. Baker is patient. In his chivalrous yielding to his opponent Mr. Baker himself remarked that for many years he had been opposing the same tactics and frequently the same sponsors for these inverted principles; yet, he said, he had not grown discouraged; he had not lost hope; he does not believe that what is defeated today can always remain defeated.

The history of all political parties bears out these truths.

The experience of life vindicates the same principles that the experience of politics vindicates. Many a once-sorrowing heart now glad, many a once-bowed head now raised, attests that it is often better to taste of the gall of defeat than to wear a crown.

Mr. Baker could not smile in the faces of those who wished him ill—could not maintain the splendid courage for his principles that he did unless he was upheld by something stronger than sordid aims and purposes.

What supported him then and what will support him throughout his fight for the right is faith.

We hope sincerely that the younger men who saw howled down and later made the victim of such a splendid defeat will realize the lesson that his courage revealed. We hope that by Mr. Baker's course more democrats, more younger democrats, will be nerved to do likewise. Mr. Baker has been heard from before, and he will be heard from again—long after his present foes will have been swept down life's stream into oblivion.

We pity, too, the splendid legal minds that see Mr. Baker's case at an inverted angle. It may be that these men are sincere in their way;

we at least hope some of them are sincere, for some, we know, are not sincere—never were.

It is too bad to see citizens in political life who promise by their equipment such splendid service to their party and to their state, leading trustful followers into the slough, while the true faith-keepers perish on the straight road.

There is no use moralizing on politics, some will tell you. Calloused souls have they who can view the advance of a great state under such sponsorship without a tremor.

The barefoot boy in the corn-furrow chafes at his lot. The pampered youth of fortune is envious of the barefoot boy. Neither knows the happiness of the other; because both are only human and can not work out their own destinies. Later on, perhaps, the humbler gains in faith more than the other gains in pelf. And his battle of life is won.

So now with those who stand at this moment of democracy' shame in defeat—with those who, perhaps, may feel bitterly that it "didn't pay" to fight a good fight and to keep the faith—they should read the handwriting on the wall.

Another Daniel, in another age, will come to the judgment as surely as right is right and wrong is not right.

Perhaps there may be a temptation now to depart from the losing contest, though it is the right contest.

To the credit of one man be it said—he dared to stand against them all. To the credit of Cuyahoga county's democracy be it said, they truly were unterrified. Those other counties which had sent men to this convention—men who were not afraid to break the gag that bound them speechless, have kindled a small blaze of hope that yet may quicken into flame. But not yet—not this year. Perhaps later on.

The same bosses that forced justice to bend the knee invited attention of the nation at large to view their presidential candidate. Better far the request were not made. The nation is not interested in its democratic presidential aspirants, not yet. The nation, however, was watching Ohio democracy yesterday to see if it would keep the faith.

It failed. The nation will draw its own estimates of its presidential timber on the plans and specifications of the sincerity of Ohio democracy.—Dayton (Ohio) Journal.

LOOK THIS OVER

George H. Locey of Southern Pines, North Carolina, writes for the New York World, the following interesting statement:

"Statistics prove annual increase in our national wealth does not exceed four per cent per annum. Total national wealth, 1910, \$128,000,000,000; increase in national wealth for that year, \$5,120,000,000; government expenditures for that year, \$1,033,859,693. Nearly one-fourth of the entire increase in our national wealth! What are you going to do about it? It is time to stop and ponder long and well."

LAUGH, LITTLE FELLOW

Laugh, little fellow, laugh and sing
And just be glad for everything!
Be glad for morning and for night,
For sun and stars that laugh with light,
For trees that chuckle in the breeze,
For singing birds and humming bees—
Be one with them and laugh along
And weave your gladness in your song.

Let nothing but the twinkle-tears
Come to your eyes these happy years,
When you are free of task and toil
And all the frets that come to spoil
The hours of folks whose feet have paced
The road along which all must haste—
Laugh, little fellow, for it drives
The shadows out of other lives.

Go romping care free as you will
Across the meadow, up the hill,
And shout your message far away
For all the world to join your play.
This is the time for laughter; now,
When time has not set on your brow
The finger prints that come with care
And leave abiding wrinkles there.

Laugh, little fellow, laugh and sing
And coax the joy from everything;
Take gladness at its fullest worth
And make each hour an hour of mirth,
So that when on the downward slope
Of life the radiant sky of hope
Will bend above you all the way
And make you happy, as today.

—Chicago Evening Post.