

THE THREAT OF A PANIC

Mr. Taft says that his election is due primarily to the support of the business interests of the country. During the latter part of his campaign, Mr. Taft appealed to the business interests to elect him in order to avert a panic. If Mr. Taft had promised anything of advantage to the business interests, he might feel more complimented at the success of his appeal. But what is the situation?

What legislation does Mr. Taft propose in the interest of business? He does not promise to protect the small manufacturer from the trust; he does not promise to protect the merchant from the greed of the monopolies; he does not promise to separate dishonest business from honest business or to relieve legitimate accumulations from the odium which is invited by illegitimate accumulations. His only argument is that somehow the republican victory will give confidence, and that a democratic victory would disturb confidence, and who endorses this proposition? Mr. Morgan, who used last fall's panic to drive a rival corporation to sell to the steel trust. He had the endorsement of Mr. Carnegie who has profited to the extent of hundreds of millions out of republican privilege, and he had the endorsement of Mr. Rockefeller, the most conspicuous criminal of the age, who is sure that Mr. Taft will not venture upon any "rash experiments." While the west was supporting Mr. Taft on the ground that he was a reformer, those who were entrenched behind privilege supported him on the ground that he would not disturb them.

Have we reached the point where the beneficiaries of favoritism can coerce the nation by threatening a panic if they are disturbed? As some one has expressed it, they keep panics in cold storage and threaten to bring one out if the people attempt any remedial legislation. Have we reached a point where the employers can multiply their votes by the number of employees and thus disfranchise those who work for them? At the close of the campaign employers in many instances threatened their employees with loss of employment, and these threats were communicated from those higher up.

If people demand purity in politics, they are answered not with arguments, but with the threat of a panic; if the people demand the election of senators by the direct vote of the people, they are met not by argument, but by the threat of a panic; if depositors feel insecure and ask for protection for their money, they are met not with arguments, but with the threat of a panic. If the victims of the trusts show any discontent, they are whipped into submission by the threat of a panic; if the laboring men ask for legislation which will protect them in their rights, they are told to be content with bread and butter and they are warned that these will be taken away from them if they ask for remedial legislation. If the consumer grows restless under the extortion practiced through a higher tariff, they are warned that any attempt by the consumers to reduce the tariff will result in a panic.

Thus every demand for correction of abuses, whether at home or in the Philippines, and no matter on what subject, is answered by the threat of the plutocrat: "Be still or we will starve you."

JOURNALISM

There are two newspapers in New York that, more than all the others, are recognized as the accredited and authorized mouthpieces of "the system." These are the Sun and the Times. For this reason their comments on Mr. Bryan, now that for the third time he has been defeated, are of special interest and significance. This is the Sun:

"And now let the Lazarus of a spent and degraded democracy renew for four more years the exhibition of his remunerative sores, with never a dog so mean that he will stop to lick them."

The Times is a bit more coarse and common in its brutality. It can not quite measure up to the epigrammatic malignancy of the Sun, and is forced to resort to ordinary epithetical abuse to vent its spleen. It reports that for Mr. Bryan, in his "crushing defeat," it has "not one spark of pity." In the course of a long, ill-tempered and ill-mannered editorial it refers to Bryan as "the arrogant and unscrupulous Nebraskan," excoriates him for his "callous selfishness" and concludes that he is only "an empty,

cunning, calculating, indefatigable, yet withal most persuasive, political adventurer."

How they do hate Bryan!

It is not, ordinarily, a part of the American nature to beat and pelt with venomous words a man who has been struck down. There is, thank God, a chivalry in the American heart, a sense of decency, that lets us be spared that spectacle! But it is not so when Bryan is concerned, and when it is the mouthpieces of the privileged oligarchy that are discussing him. When Bryan is indeed dead, and has been many years in his honored grave, plutocracy and its lickspittles will still go on pouring out a vomit of hate and bile whenever his name is mentioned.—Omaha World-Herald.



A REMARKABLE EDITORIAL

In its issue of Tuesday, November 3, the morning of election, the New York Herald printed a remarkable editorial. It was remarkable because the Herald, while all along ardently supporting Mr. Taft, warned the people—at the very opening of the polls—that a victory for the republican party might spell disaster for the American republic.

Following is an extract from this remarkable editorial:

"The citizen who deposits his ballot in accordance with the dictates of his judgment and conscience can afford to seek his business and pleasure with a tranquil mind, assured that the people control, and will continue to control, the destinies of the state and nation, regardless of the aberrations of any man who fancies that he is appointed by heaven to rule them and regulate their lives. Every student of history, even though he be a republican, admits the desirability of an effective opposition as a check upon the otherwise unrestrained power and extravagance, and many agree with Colonel Henry Watterson that as it took war to overthrow the long domination of the democratic party, so a further lease of power to the republican party may so intrench it that only a revolution will ever dislodge it. Hence a national democratic victory would be welcomed by a considerable body of citizens and would cause no shock to business, since any idiosyncrasies of the executive would be opposed by a republican senate."

CANNON WILL BE SPEAKER

The general opinion, so far as the election of the next speaker is concerned, is voiced by republican papers in the declaration that the recent election resulted in the vindication of Speaker Cannon and that he will succeed himself in the speaker's chair. The following from the Milwaukee Sentinel (rep.) is a sample on this line:

"Joseph G. Cannon has received a handsome and exemplary indorsement and vote of unimpaired confidence from the voters of his district. Those who know him best like him most—and that is a pretty good sign for any man. It became evident toward the close of the campaign that the violent and unreasoning hue and cry of spasmodic prejudice against Mr. Cannon was badly overdone and provoking a reaction. The American people like fair play; they do not like to see a man hounded in the virulently vindictive spirit; and it was plain to cool common sense that the shriek of ill-informed sectarian and class prejudice against Mr. Cannon was absurdly overdone. It is as clear as the record can make it that, whatever may have been Mr. Cannon's mistakes, the ledger of his long career in public life shows a handsome balance of patriotic public service to his credit. Mr. Cannon's district rallied to him with more than the old time enthusiasm, and Mr. Gompers especially should note that in the labor union sections there was more than the usual disposition to vote "Uncle Joe" all right. Triumphant re-elected by his district, Joseph G. Cannon will be re-elected speaker of the house. Those who dislike the house rules he must enforce and be governed by, should direct their energies toward reforming the rules, instead of misdirecting them in abuse of the speaker."

The Des Moines Register and Leader (rep.) says: "Cannon will be re-elected speaker in the Sixty-first congress. His friends view yes-

terday's results as a vindication for Mr. Cannon. It may be accepted as practically assured that Mr. Cannon will succeed himself as speaker. Mr. Taft as president will not make a fight against him for the speakership, and it is doubtful if any fight made against him from the White House could prevent his re-election for speaker. With Mr. Cannon re-elected to the speakership, Representative Sereno Payne will continue as chairman of the ways and means committee; Dalzell will be ranking member, and this committee will be dominated by high tariff and standpat elements. It goes almost without saying that any tariff bill that passes the scrutiny of the committee will be calculated to disturb the present Dingley schedules as slightly as possible."



GOOD OLD NEBRASKA!

The brightest spot on the political map today, the verdant oasis in a dreary desert, is Nebraska—good old Nebraska!

Where other states have faltered or turned to the rear until the spectacle is one discouraging to the loyal democratic heart, Nebraska steps proudly to the front, and, with her hand upon the shoulder of her great son proclaims her love for him, her trust in him, her devotion to the ideals and principles to which his life has been given.

The tremendous democratic gains made in this state, and in every section of the state, can not but be gratifying to Mr. Bryan himself, and to democrats everywhere. Nebraska has chosen not only democratic electors and a democratic governor, but a democratic legislature, and three and possibly four democratic congressmen.

It is a glorious victory that has been won in Nebraska. Democracy has not only swept the state, but has carried, by large pluralities, the two largest cities and two largest counties, each normally republican by a pronounced margin. Mr. Bryan carried his own precinct, his own city, his own county, his own state, in each instance overthrowing heavy republican majorities. Democrats are themselves surprised at the completeness of their triumph. Their surprise is the greater since it came in a year almost everywhere else bitter with the taste of defeat.

Democracy won in Nebraska because it deserved to win! And it deserved to win because democrats worked; worked hard, faithfully, intelligently, unceasingly. Thanks largely to the Bryan Volunteers, and to Secretary Gruenther, the state was better organized this year than it ever has been before, and that work of organization told its story in ballots on election day. And thanks to a loyal and devoted democratic press, democratic policies have been presented to the people of this state with an earnestness, a sincerity and an ability that was bound to have its effect. To the democratic editors all over Nebraska this newspaper tenders its compliments and congratulations. They deserve, in increasing measure, the thanks of their party.

Democracy deserved to win the national campaign that is ended. And if its candidates and its policies had been supported in every state with the same effectiveness as in Nebraska, the World-Herald believes that democracy would have won. The World-Herald is proud of Nebraska, and of Nebraska democrats.—Omaha World-Herald.



THE FULL BARN BASKET

Mr. Taft says that the farmers played an important part in his victory. During his campaign in the west he appealed to the farmers to support the republican ticket out of gratitude for their prosperity. Do republican policies guarantee prosperity to the farmer? The farmers' prosperity is traceable to two sources: First, to good crops, and second, to good prices. Surely the republican party will not contend that it furnishes the fertility of the soil or supplies the industry which cultivates the soil. It will not contend that it regulates the sunshine or brings the rain in due season. If one will just think for a moment, he will know that the republican leaders do not control the sunshine or the rain, for if they did, there would be a trust in sunbeams and a meter on the clouds; the farmer would have to contract for warmth at so much per day and for the rains at so much per shower. For have not republican leaders allowed the coal trust to tax the consumer when he wants to get warm,