

view this contest with more complacency than I did the same kind of a contest in our party.

Now, I am a believer in harmony; I am very fond of it. I am a friend of harmony, for I have learned the value of it by its absence in my party during recent campaigns. But harmony is not the most valuable thing a party can have and it is a more difficult thing to secure than some think. When I find that a group of people boast that they think alike, I conclude that they do not think at all, for when people think differences of opinion appear. A party can be perfectly harmonious if there is only one person in the party, but even then the vote must be taken at once, for he may change his mind. If there are as many as two persons in the party, you can not expect harmony because one will be radical and the other conservative. There are eighty millions of radicals in this country, if you take the opinion of the most conservative man in the nation; and there are eighty millions of conservatives if you take the opinion of the most radical man. Radicalism and conservatism are relative terms. That which is radical today may be conservative tomorrow. It is necessary to have both radicals and conservatives; but for the conservatives the radicals would go too fast, and without the radicals the conservatives would not go at all. The radical suggests, the conservative investigates. The radical makes a suggestion and his suggestion is not heeded, and a little later he makes his suggestion a second time, and if that suggestion is not heeded, later on he makes the suggestion again, and so on, and each time the conservative says no, and finally the radical drags the conservative on.

When I was in Japan I saw two lions, two Korean lions, that stood in front of the doors of the temple; they are not fierce looking lions, but rather comical looking. One represents the positive and one the negative—they represent the eternal conflict between the radical and the conservative. I brought them home with me and have them on either side of my porch steps, and when I go up the porch steps I walk as nearly as I can in the center between the two.

Progress is between the two extremes. We are now having a contest in the republican party between the radical and the conservative, and no doubt the radical will finally win. There is only one place in the world for the standpatter—that is in the grave; that is the only place he is at home, for everything that has life lives, and if it has intelligence as well as life it moves forward. There is no such thing as standing still. If the republican party dared to stand still for ten years it would not hold power in a single state unless it be New Jersey. In fact—there is some prospect here of progress, but, to be frank with you, I think this is one of the least hopeful states we have. But we have to go forward, and the party that does not go forward is going to be left in the struggle, and in the contest now waging between reform and the standpat republican, there is no doubt about which is going to win. If your standpatters are going to control the policies of that party, it is bound to die. The only hope of any party is in a progressive movement.

Lincoln spoke on the battlefield of Gettysburg of the unfinished work of those who died there. Every generation finds the work of the last unfinished; every generation leaves to the next an unfinished work—everywhere the work of government is in the line of bringing the government nearer to the people. I believe in everything that tends to bring the government nearer to the people and to give the people larger control over their government. I am in favor of the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people, because it brings them nearer to the people. And if any of you doubt that the feeling is growing in favor of broader democracy, let me tell you the history of this country on that subject.

It was over one hundred years after the constitution of these United States was adopted before a protest against the present method of electing senators reached the point where there was an expression on the subject in the congress—a little more than a hundred years—and yet in 1892 the Fifty-second congress adopted a resolution proposing the necessary amendment to the constitution for that purpose. That was fifteen years ago. After one hundred years of waiting, during which time first one and then another, and then a few more, were advocating this reform, the sentiment became strong enough to secure the passage of a resolution through congress, and in the last fifteen years that resolution has passed five times through the popular branch of the federal congress.

Twice the congress was democratic and three times the congress was republican. But if any republican boasts because his party passed

it three times and ours only twice, let me tell him that ours passed it twice before the republicans passed it at all, and we would have passed it oftener, but we have only had but two congresses, and two republican congresses adjourned without acting upon the resolution that two democratic congresses had already passed.

At last the sentiment grew so strong that a republican congress acted favorably, eight years after a democratic congress had set the example. But I am willing that they should follow even eight years behind the democrats. Nearly two-thirds of the states have acted, and I think nearly as many republican as democratic states have acted favorably. Eighteen states are now electing their senators as nearly by direct vote as they can under the constitution, and of these eighteen states ten are democratic and eight republican.

So you see that democratic sentiment is broader than any party. I am glad that the democratic sentiment in this country is too large for any party to monopolize.

If a man trusts the people he is willing to let the people have their own way. If he does not trust the people he is always trying to build up a system between the people and their officials, and the less confidence he has in the people the more system he wants.

I never think of this system without thinking of the story I heard when I was a boy, a story connected with St. Louis. A peddler went to a six-story building, and when he began to open his pack on the first floor, he was sent to the second floor, and when he commenced to open his pack on the second floor, he was sent to the third floor and so on to the sixth floor, and when he went to open his pack there the floorwalker took him by the coat collar and the slack of his breeches and sent him down one flight of the stairs, and when he landed there he was thrown down another flight of stairs, and so on until finally, when he got out into the street, he turned around and looked up at the building and said: "My, what a system they have in that place!"

Now a man who does not trust the people is always wanting some system built up, but the man who does trust the people is willing for the people to have what they want in government.

Now we are going to get election of our senators by direct vote; it is bound to come; I have no doubt of it whatever. I am confident that it is right, and that which is right will always triumph in the end. It takes time for right to triumph, but it triumphs at last, and we are going on applying fundamental principles until we get this government where the people will control it absolutely.

One of the most important reforms in this direction is known as the initiative and the referendum.

I am glad that I can speak on this subject in this presence without alarming the people. I spoke of it in Brooklyn the other night and I was surprised to find next morning that some papers featured it as if it was the only thing I had said during the evening. I made a speech there of two hours, and this was only an illustration of the principle I tried to present to the people in the line of representative government. Then some of the New York papers talked about it as if it was a perfectly new idea—as if I was trying to smuggle in something from abroad without paying duty on it. I am going to wait until they get over their scare and then I am going to tell them that it was in the democratic national platform six years ago—they ought to know what was done after all this length of time.

Of course, I know it takes an idea a good while to get from the west down east—I don't know but we ought to have a fast train for the express purpose of carrying ideas from the west to the east for the benefit of the editors of the New York newspapers. But wouldn't you suppose that the platform adopted at Kansas City six years ago last summer would, by this time, have gotten down here and be reasonably well known in the east? And I am bringing in a new idea! Why, my friends, it was in the democratic platform in Nebraska four years before it got into the national democratic platform.

Ten years ago last summer the democratic state convention of Nebraska adopted a platform favoring the initiative and referendum. Before you people knew my name, before any of you even suspected my being connected with the democratic nomination for president, we were endorsing this doctrine in Nebraska, and I was chairman of the committee on resolutions when it was done.

But even out there we had editors who were sort of an abridged edition of the New York

editors, and the editor of the republican paper in my home town said that when I read that plank about the initiative and referendum the democrats looked at each other in surprise and that one democrat said to another: "What is that?" And the other democrat replied: "Why, that is a new kind of democratic drink." And according to that republican paper, it went through unanimously then. Ten years ago last summer a republican editor was making fun of the initiative and referendum and speaking as if it was a new kind of democratic drink.

But, my friends, if it were really a new kind of drink I believe it would be more popular in some quarters than it is. That idea is growing and will grow. State after state has adopted that idea. You came within four votes, I am informed, of passing a resolution in its favor through one branch of your legislature. Up in Maine, which I have always regarded as more or less an eastern state, they are to vote on it at the next election. And so it is growing all over the country. I do not see how any argument can be urged against it.

If a man believes in the right of the people to govern themselves, how can he object to the initiative and referendum?

Now there are some people who have a false idea of government; there are some people who think that a representative is elected to think for the people. But that is not our theory. Our theory is that people think for themselves and that the representative is elected to act for the people and carry out what the people think.

I might give you an illustration of the fact that we recognize that. Why do we have platforms if we elect men to think for us? Why hamper them with what we think? Why not leave them free to think as they please? When platforms are written the writers of them recognize the right of the voter to have a representative in harmony with the views of the voter. And so, I believe that the time has come when we should bring our government closer to the people and give the people a more complete control of their government.

Now let me digress for a moment to say that there is an idea of leadership in this country that is misleading. It is not the duty of the leader to think for the people; the leader thinks with the people, not for the people. Someone—I think it was ex-Governor Oglesby, of Illinois—said that a leader is one who is going in the same direction with the people, but a little bit ahead, and it is the best definition of a leader that I know of. He must be going in the same direction and he must be a little bit ahead of the people or he will not be leading them, and the only way to select a leader is to select the one who says what the people want said, and who says it better than the people themselves can say it.

The molder of public opinion is like the molder of bullets. The molder of bullets does not make the lead; he simply puts the lead in form for use. So the molder of public opinion does not create the opinion; he simply gives it form that makes that opinion more effective. The man who attempts to create an opinion that the people oppose, ceases to be a leader. We have had in this country many instances of men who have supposed themselves to be leaders, and yet when they have looked around they have found themselves walking all alone.

We have seen this in both parties, and I do not know anything more pathetic in public life than to have a leader with no people following him, and the people will not follow him unless he goes in the direction they want him to go. The leader is not nearly so important as the people themselves. I believe in organization but, my friends, the organization is not as important as the voter. I remember a campaign in Nebraska when a party arose, and without any previous organization, in one campaign secured enough voters to make it almost a tie with the other two parties. Power comes from the people; it comes up to the leader from those for whom he speaks, and he only speaks for those who want him to speak for them and they want him to say what they want said.

One of the New York newspapers, discussing the initiative and referendum, said that they have only used the initiative and referendum in Switzerland a few times in twenty-five years.

Well that is an argument in favor of it, not against it, for one of the advantages is that even after you get these things you do not have to use them; but if you do not have them you frequently need to use them. Why don't you need to use them? Because, if the people have the initiative, they have a system whereby they can compel the submission of anything they want to