

Judging a Judge by His Friends

From the Literary digest: "Another Bryan idea, many editors note with interest, won at least a temporary victory when the house, by a vote of 148 to 82, passed the Cullop amendment to the Evans judiciary bill. This amendment provides that 'before the president shall appoint any district, circuit, or supreme judge he shall make public all indorsements made in behalf of any candidate.' Mr. Bryan, we are reminded by the Springfield Republican (ind.), began his agitation for this reform in connection with the elevation of Justice Hughes to the supreme court, and it was given fresh emphasis by the outcry recently raised over the proposed appointment of Judge Hook. In spite of the fact that republican 'insurgents' voted with the democrats to pass this bill, the press seem to regard it dubiously from many points of view. It will never pass the senate, say some, or, if it does, they predict it will receive the president's veto. It is unconstitutional as well as absurd, say others, who seem prepared to laugh it out of court. On the other hand, the Sioux City Tribune (ind.) believes that the passage of this bill through the lower house 'will be considered by many thinking men as the most important thing that has yet come from this session of congress.' This Iowa paper goes on to say:

"The more the states work out and put into action such practical reforms as the two-cent passenger-rate law, the initiative and referendum and recall, and the more these measures are held up and baffled at every turn by the federal courts, the more the people grow into the belief that the appointments of federal judges are procured by influences that oppose these reforms; that even the selection of supreme judges are influenced by these same interests, and the people are wanting to ask the president, 'Why don't you give out the names of the men who solicit these judicial appointments?'"

"Mr. Bryan asked the president this question, and he refused to answer it. By his silence the president said to Mr. Bryan and to the people, 'It is none of your business who the backers are of the men appointed to the federal bench.'"

"THE STORY OF BRYAN"

George Creel, in the Denver News: Sometime, somewhere, some writer will take his pen in hand, and set down the story of Bryan. It is not a task to be attempted by any small-bore person, for in the tale to be told there must be passages resonant with the whirring clang of triumphal chariots and the shoutings of a nation, others keenly psychological, and still others bubblingly alive with humor or gray with pathos.

It is, in truth, a mighty task, for, if well done, the author will have written the "Great American Novel" for which the world is waiting, because the story of Bryan and Bryanism is typically American, and possible in no other country or among any other people. He must begin with the Bryan who practiced law in a small way and dabbled in politics quite a bit. There comes, as a sort of prologue to his public career, a term in congress, marked by a flash of greatness here and there, but chiefly noticeable for a certain flamboyant oratory.

Then, as scene shifters working in the dark, the stage must show the Chicago convention of 1896. With powerful strokes the death grapple of warring factions must be painted, in which the great political captains used states as chess experts use pawns. And out of the smoke and fury Bryan must burst upon the convention—head of the successfully contesting Nebraska delegation—a big, boyish grin on his rosy face, and ill-cut trousers flapping noisily about his legs. And there is the strategy of captains to be considered—the victory of the silver forces, the elimination of Bland, the humiliation of the granite-faced Cleveland, and the sudden substitution of Bryan as saint and savior of his "cross of gold and crown of thorns" speech.

And then the writer must call upon the ancient gods for inspiration, for his task grows increasingly difficult. Not only does the path of Bryan lead him along dizzy heights, all the valleys below white with the upturned faces of worshipping thousands, but the story commences to gather in psychological interest.

Lines that means things come into the face of the Nebraskan, his huge mouth quits its grin and settles into firmer lines, and in his eyes there dawns a new light. Much the same

"This bill, passed in the lower house, if it becomes a law, will say to the president, 'The federal court is the public's court, and as to how men get places in that court is everybody's business.'"

"Not the house, but the senate, should move in this matter, says the Columbus dispatch (ind.), since, 'as a matter of constitutional fact, the house has nothing whatever to do with appointments.' After commenting on the house's 'indiscretion' the Dispatch continues:

"Nevertheless it would seem not amiss to have always a frank interchange between the executive and the senate. There ought to be nothing in the executive's motives which he would care to hide, and equally there should be nothing in the senate's actions of which that body need to be ashamed. Each is charged with a public duty, and they ought to work together for the public good. The house's action can be considered as nothing more than an expression of that sentiment, unless, indeed, it was meant as a vote of lack of confidence in the executive."

"The progressive republican Philadelphia North American remarks that the Cullop amendment suggests 'a nice way to get up a corporation directory,' and in the Charleston News and Courier (dem.), we read:

"It is perfectly reasonable to suppose that, if the Cullop provision is passed by congress, the president will veto it, and if it is passed over his veto he will ignore it. There is no reason why he should not, for it is essentially an impeachment of his honesty of purpose, or of his capacity. The proper thing, it seems, if the people are dissatisfied with the mode of appointment of the supreme court, is to amend the constitution and make the justiceship elective. Other devices are merely beating about the bush. They stir up animosity and feeling, but can not accomplish anything of real value."

"'Fantastic!' exclaims the New York Tribune (rep.), in contemplation of this latest demonstration of 'its wild-goose-chasing proclivities' by the democratic majority in the house of representatives."

Evidently publicity with respect to judicial appointments is a sore spot with the representatives of privilege.

change must have come to Joan of Arc as she walked the orchard at Donremy, and saw the familiar landscape form into marvelous vistas at the ends of which were kings and crowns and adoring multitudes.

In that campaign a new Bryan was born. Opportunity clothed him in impressiveness, his soul swelled with hunger aspirations, and strange new words burst from his lips, expressions of strange, new thoughts. As he journeyed from coast to coast, and caught the cry of the oppressed, there came to him exact and definite comprehension of the terrible inequalities and injustices in this sunny world of ours, and realization of the fact that election meant more than the mere question of which party was to have the distribution of offices. In that wonderful campaign of 1896 the non-essentials of him were sloughed, and he came close to greatness.

He lost—not by reason of votes, but through the corrupting and befuddling thousands poured into every state by the financiers back of McKinley.

Out of defeat and its sordid cause come years less splendid—the months of political bargaining and planning that culminate in the nomination of 1900. Another defeat, but this time no emergence of disheartened figure trying to scrape off the ashes, but the rise of a phoenix.

The real Bryan came out of the disaster of 1900—the Bryan who saw causes and remedies with clear, unshrinking eye, and who vowed himself to the work of betterment without thought of self or future. He faltered in 1904, listening to the advice of friends rather than his own conscience, but with the overwhelming defeat of the ill-starred misbegotten Parker, Bryan swept forward, growing in courage, statesmanship and vision.

He thought 1908 the psychological time, but in his pursuit of truth, his incursions into the ideal, he had forgotten that the great mass of the people move slowly and are infinitely cautious. In most of his ideas he was years ahead of his time, and the people, while they loved and admired him, could not quite make up their minds to follow.

Today there is a different story to tell. We have caught up with the Bryan of 1908, and while he is still ahead of us—still pioneering

and path blazing—we are come to see that he is not a visionary to be feared, but a prophet to be followed. The dead hand of the past no longer weights down—the superstitions of tradition have lost their ancient power to affright—and on every hand there is evidence of the open mind, and general eagerness to accept the new when it is true.

And here is the pathos of it! By far and away the greatest man in the democratic party—idol of the south and west and respected even by those of the north and east that once held him in abhorrence—William J. Bryan is barred from the nomination by his three defeats. He himself feels it—even those who most love him feel it. With the exception of silver, everything that he stood for has been adopted, and whatever advancements the nation has made are due to his courage and vision, and yet he enters this campaign of 1912 weighted down with the memory of past failures. Had he not run in 1908, who knows?

In this bitter hour of "what might have been," he shows his essential bigness. Putting himself to one side, he attacks the Underwoods and the Baileys who were once his supporters, and gives himself enthusiastically to Wilson without thought of the Joline letter, for he sees growing honesty and increasing purpose in this college professor who is unlearning from experience what he learned in books.

WHY OPPOSED TO BRYAN?

To the Editor of the New York World: Why is it that many of the patrons of the World are so opposed to William Jennings Bryan? Do they want a democratic leader tinctured with the current republican graft principles—a kind of democracy diluted like the watered stocks so common on the market? If graft, or "boodle," is what they are after, and it is what they are bound to have, then I say, "Lay on, Macduff, and damned be he who first cries 'Hold, enough!'" until the people have had a surfeit of spurious democracy.

I once heard a blatant politician proclaim that he was "a democrat with republican principles." That expression comes pretty near describing the characteristics of some of the present-day democrats (?) in or out of congress. Their propensity to hover dangerously near the political maelstrom of the old federal-whig-republican oligarchy reminds one of the exhortation of the old dandy at a camp-meeting, where he called on the Lord to "shake de sinners rite ober de jaws of hell, but be keerful, O Lord, not to let them drap in!" JUNIUS.

Stonington, Conn., Feb. 15.

SENATOR LA FOLLETTE IN THE RACE

Senator La Follette has issued the following statement to the progressive republicans: "I take this means of answering many inquiries and misrepresentations. The statement that my health is broken is false. A brief rest will put me back as of old on the firing line. I shall continue in the contest as a candidate for well defined principles and for a definite program of legislation which, once enacted into law, will break the hold of privilege on the industrial life of the people and free them from the burden imposed by thousands of millions of fictitious capitalization. In twenty years of fighting for the progressive cause, I have not halted or turned aside to find the easy way. I have steadfastly refused to make combinations which would in any way involve the issues in uncertainty. I want the support of such delegates only as are willing to win or to lose, if need be, on this basis."

THE STOCK EXCHANGE POLL

New York, Feb. 27.—The New York Globe has now received a total of 375 votes in its Stock Exchange presidential poll, twenty-four having been registered since yesterday. The vote now stands:

Taft	219
Harmon	91
Roosevelt	41
Wilson	10
Underwood	8
Clark	6

Lining up the Taft and Harmon adherents on one side, representing the conservative vote, against the combined vote for the other candidates, the result shows:

Conservative	310
Radical	65

If the total vote of 1,057 were to be cast and the same ratio maintained, the result would be: conservative, 865; radical, 182. This shows no change from yesterday's computation.