

**DEMOCRATIC PRESS DESERTS BRYAN.**

The amazing result of yesterday's election reveals very conclusively the monumental fact that the democratic party did not support its candidates. Mr. Bryan is defeated in 1900 by the Mr. Bryan of 1896. There was no democratic re-union. On the contrary, there was open and palpable democratic disorganization, panic and rout.

There are other conspicuous facts which may as well be recognized. In the presence of the almost unexampled disaster which has fallen upon the democratic organization at a time when success ought to have been sure it is plain that, of all the men who might have been nominated at Kansas City, Mr. Bryan was the weakest before the people.

It is plain that any one of a hundred sound money democrats standing upon a gold standard platform and advocating other unmistakable democratic ideas would have received more votes than Mr. Bryan received.

It is plain that whatever policies populist republicans and socialists may propose as remedies for the evils of republicanism democrats cannot be led to their support.

It is plain that no man involved in any way with the stupendous financial and economic blunder of 1896 can be elected president of the United States.

It is plain that nothing is to be gained, nothing is to be hoped for from a continuation of the immoral and degrading alliance now and for four years past subsisting between the democratic organization and that of the populists.

It is certain that the people of the United States will not take their politics from a mongrel combination whose first purpose appears to be the driving away in alarm of men of business, men of affairs, men of substance and men of intelligence.

It is certain also that no alliance of free silver republicans, populists and democrats can, in the face of innumerable democratic precedents in favor of expansion and free trade, set metes and bounds in the development of American power and prestige in the politics and commerce of the world.

In spite of the crimes of the republican party, in spite of the declarations of the Kansas City convention, in spite of the engaging personality of Mr. Bryan, in spite of all preachments oral and written in behalf of the democratic candidates, there has been but one real issue this year, and that issue has been the political vagaries of Mr. Bryan himself. Democracy and populism would not mix. No convention, no newspaper, no amount of oratory, no combination of favorable circumstances, could bring about a true fusion between elements fundamentally antagonistic. Mr. Bryan is defeated by democratic votes, because democrats could not be made to believe

that his candidacy represented anything better than it represented four years ago. All else has been ignored. All other issues have been postponed. Populism alone has gone down, never to rise again, let us hope, with the assistance of any one who calls himself a democrat.

This should have been a democratic year. Except for the forbidding record of 1896 all of the conditions were favorable. The republicans were shamelessly committed to a dozen vicious policies which the people hold in horror and contempt. They had fastened upon the country an outrageous tariff. They had created and fostered monopolies and trusts. They had surrendered ignominiously to the sugar and tobacco trusts in their Porto Rico legislation. They had taken the first steps toward a colonial policy wholly in the interest of monopoly and not at all in the interest of true American expansion. They had embarked upon a dangerous programme of foreign alliance and adventure. They had declared in favor of a great army and a great navy. They had doubled the expenses of government and immensely increased the burdens of taxation. They were pledged to steamship subsidy legislation involving many millions of dollars. They were in open and avowed league with the organized avarice of the republic. They had trampled upon the constitution and flouted the decisions of the supreme court. They were led by a candidate who had given evidence on more than one occasion that his political fortunes, his official conduct, even his personal opinions, were all held subject to the censorious bossism of the syndicates.

To defeat this aggregation of greed and infamy only one thing was needed. There was need of a democratic party inspired by undoubted democratic sentiment and led by democrats of unquestioned soundness in the faith. In its place appeared an organization led chiefly by populists and upholding doctrines which few democrats recognized and which great multitudes of them repudiated.

Under such auspices the mischief done in 1896 could not be repaired in 1900, even though the conditions were in some degree changed. It is now seen clearly that the authors of the earlier disaster were doomed from the beginning. The leaders of 1896 were the leaders of 1900. The awful blight of populism was upon them. The silver ghost madly raised at Kansas City, would not down. The small fanatics and ignoramuses, the bankrupts in purse and character, the failures in business, the dreamers and radicals, the cheap peddlers of every quack political nostrum, the idle, the vicious, even the hoodlum—all redolent of populism—came to the front and occupied the places which a mighty party had once

seen filled by democrats of commanding ability and of unquestioned leadership. The impressive result is before us. The wreck, such as it is, is total, but it is a populist wreck and not a democratic wreck. It is a wreck in which few great democrats are involved and in which no great democratic principle has been carried down. Organization, candidates, loyal workers, millions of everfaithful voters—all have been overwhelmed, but the noble ideas which they lightly abandoned, the examples of illustrious democrats dead and gone, the doctrines born with the republic and destined to survive it, neglected for the moment, remain undimmed and imperishable.

Shall this second demonstration of the folly of present democratic leadership suffice? Are there lower depths yet to be sounded? Is there in the republic today a saving remnant of true democracy around which the scattered legions of democratic voters may rally? Is there a time-serving politician anywhere who, in the face of today's figures, needs further evidence that honesty is the best policy? Are the thousands of defeated democratic candidates in all parts of the country ready to acknowledge that the surrender of principle is the poorest recommendation that an office seeker may urge in his own behalf? Shall the old democratic party rise again?

These are questions which the conservative citizenship of the republic must consider speedily and with the gravity that they deserve. They are questions also to which practical men in politics, men who may not be overburdened with scruples or principles, but who desire success, must and will give heed. They are questions which thoughtful republicans, conscious of the perils which their own party has brought upon the country, will hope to see answered and answered right.

If the democratic party had been in evidence yesterday it would have been used by the people as a righteous instrument for the punishment of the republican party. Evidence of this fact is within the knowledge of every intelligent man. It would have won a victory as glorious and as far-reaching in its consequences as that of 1800, when Thomas Jefferson came into power. A splendid opportunity for a great patriotic public service has been lost, and for what? For a paltry alliance with the always treacherous populist, for a foolish consistency in wrong-doing and for an hallucination, amounting practically to a mania, that in some manner, never yet explained and never to be explained, appeals to the ignorance, the fanaticism, the timidity and the prejudices of the people are more likely to succeed than arguments addressed to their intelligence, honesty and judgment!

The price paid for the dismal experience has been prodigious, involving as