

ownership of the railroads, held up before eyes made accustomed to such visions during the past four years, will probably attract more voters, in the present state of the public nerves, than it will affright. . . . But honest Touchstone would be compelled to proceed: "In respect that it is the speech of a sober and constructive statesman, it is a very vile speech." The new Bryan has the chief fault of the old. . . . He is in a great state of excitement about plutocracy, but just how he is to put a hook in its snout, one reads his speech in vain to find out.

+

New York Times (pluto. Dem.), Aug. 31.—It cannot be denied that the evils Mr. Bryan declares to be overshadowing do exist. Discrimination has been practiced, and it is harmful. But the public remains to be convinced that it was through railroad discrimination alone that the trusts have been built up, and it is very far from being convinced that public ownership is the only effective remedy. . . . Mr. Bryan's new doctrine of public ownership for the railroads is distinctly and measurably more dangerous and upsetting than his abandoned issue of 16 to 1. It is revolution that he proposes, and incalculable disaster would attend the success of his effort. . . . Mr. Bryan professes to believe that it would restore the regime of individualism. It would leave a multitude of the most capable and efficient individuals in this nation without work to do and without any incentive to make further application of their energies. . . . Mr. Bryan's express appeal to members of both parties, it seems to us, leaves Democrats all over the country free to manifest their disapproval of his principles, and to reject public ownership as un-Democratic and him as no longer a Democrat. The Democratic party, with its history, its traditions, and its achievements, cannot surrender to this radical and revolutionist.

## RELATED THINGS CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

### TO WILLIAM J. BRYAN.

For The Public.

Bryan, not simply for thy eloquence  
Whose lightest word a list'ning nation weighs,  
Nor for thy saving stores of common sense,  
Nor for thy statesman's mind, I give thee praise;  
Nor for thy temper steadfast and serene,  
Nor for thy tireless energy and strength,  
Thy dauntless courage, in defeat twice seen,  
In searching vict'ry to be crowned at length—  
But for thy heart, which never yet has beat  
Save to the music of the rights of man,  
Which freedom, progress, love of justice heat,  
Thy place compelling in the battle's van.  
Oh, how exploiters and their puppets sink  
When thou art leader! How timeservers shrink!

W.

\* \* \*

### FLOTSAM FROM THE NEW YORK RECEPTION.

First of the Nebraskan home folk to put in an appearance in the corridors of the Victoria hotel today was Mayor Dahlman of Omaha, who was reminiscent of what had taken place after the termination of the reception to William J. Bryan at Madison Square garden.

According to Mayor Dahlman, a party of three Mayors was made up. They were Tom Johnson of Cleveland, Mayor Dunne of Chicago, and Mayor

Dahlman. Dahlman had never met Mr. Dunne. While the three were disposing of a lobster Mayor Dahlman outlined his views of how cities should be run. Addressing Mayor Dunne, he said:

"Now, old man, I don't know about things in your little outfit, but on the whole I think there is too much red tape on this mayor's business. Now, I don't write a volume of reasons when I kill or veto a bill or an ordinance. I just write 'Nothing doing' across the face of it."

"Right you are, Jim," said Mayor Johnson; "You have the right idea; the people want mayors who deliver the goods."

"Yes, you are both right," answered Mayor Dunne; "the people of Chicago are tired of red tape and they want the goods delivered, not promises."

"Chicago!" stammered Mayor Dahlman. "Dunne, are you the Mayor of Chicago? Well, I didn't mean to offer you advice, but I guess what I said will go anywhere."

A silent toast was then drunk to the Mayor of every city in the country.

—Chicago Inter Ocean of Sept. 1.

\* \* \*

### DEMOCRACY AND PLUTOCRACY.

From Mr. Bryan's Speech at Madison Square Garden, New York City, Aug. 30, 1906.

The Democratic party is not the enemy of property or of property rights; it is, on the contrary, the best defender of both, because it defends human rights, and human rights are the only foundation upon which property and property rights can rest securely. The Democratic party does not menace a single dollar legitimately accumulated; on the contrary, it insists upon the protection of rich and poor alike in the enjoyment of that which they have honestly earned. The Democratic party does not discourage thrift, but, on the contrary, stimulates each individual to the highest endeavor by assuring him that he will not be deprived of the fruits of his toil. If we can but repeal the laws which enable men to reap where they have not sown—laws which enable them to garner into their overflowing barns the harvests that belong to others—no one will be able to accumulate enough to make his fortune dangerous to the country.

And who can suffer injury by just taxation, impartial laws, and the application of the Jefferson doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none? Only those whose accumulations are stained with dishonesty, and whose immoral methods have given them a distorted view of business, society, and government. Accumulating by conscious fraud more money than they can profitably use upon themselves, wisely distribute, or safely leave to their children, these denounce as public enemies all who question their methods or throw a light upon their crimes.

Plutocracy is abhorrent to a republic; it is more despotic than monarchy, more heartless than aristocracy, more selfish than bureaucracy. It preys upon the nation in time of peace and conspires against it in the hour of its calamity. Conscienceless, compassionless, and devoid of wisdom, it enervates its votaries while it impoverishes its victims. It is already sapping the strength of the nation, vulgar-

izing social life, and making a mockery of morals. The time is ripe for its overthrow. Let us attack it boldly, making our appeal to the awakened conscience of the nation in the name of the counting-room which it has defiled, in the name of business honor which it has sullied, in the name of the people whom it has oppressed, in the name of the homes which it has despoiled, and in the name of religion upon which it has placed the stigma of hypocrisy.

\* \* \*

## IS IT WORTH WHILE FOR A DEMOCRATIC DEMOCRAT TO RUN FOR CONGRESS?

A Letter to the Honorable Robert Baker.

Dear Mr. Baker:

Your generous letter of April 16th reached me in due course, and I am not finding it quite an easy matter to fashion a reply.

In the name of honest Democracy you call upon me to enter its more active service, by taking steps to secure nomination as a Congressional candidate in this district; and you put me to the supreme test by your kind assumption that I would be willing to fail, if need be, to advance the cause. I really believe I could qualify, under even that test, for about all my life I have trained with those who always fell short of obtaining political power.

But the issue arising here is: Would nomination and defeat in this district advance the cause? I must believe it would not! The showing would be so inconsiderable as to be cited by the unopposed Republican press of the district, as final evidence that the Democratic party is as a sinking ship, from which the voter, wise for the future, would swim ashore.

You are relying on the unmistakable signs of approaching changes in party alignment of the voting rank and file; and I have no doubt your expectations will be realized, in many sections,—especially in your own State and district; but in this district there are two strongholds of uninquiring conservatism which nothing short of famine, under Republican rule, can awaken, namely, the farmers and the Scandinavian operatives in the great factories. It is the old issue between metropolis and province. The Ohio situation was recently changed; but by the voters of her goodly list of medium sized manufacturing cities, and not by the rural vote, as I understand.

You know what New York State does as a counterbalance to the democratic vote of New York City. We all know the reactionary power of the provincial vote in France, as against the progressive spirit of Paris. But if all the constituencies should send Democratic representatives to Congress, at the approaching election, would the cause of true democracy be advanced? I fear it would not! It would still be the modern political curse which a real Democrat—Gov. Altgeld—called: "Government by political party." In a thousand pages I could not hope to show you any phase of party-machine betrayal of the people which you have not perceived and denounced most earnestly.

We all know that the legislative, the judicial and the executive departments of our government are in

the hands of those who have been chosen to administer them in favor of special privilege and studiously against equality of right. The majority of the Congressmen and Senators, even of the South, as well as the Southern federal judges, are skulking agents of railroad and sugar interests. The Democratic party machine is but little less devoted to plutocratic treason than that of the Republican party.

With the government seized by such enemies of popular rights, what can the people expect in their own behalf? Nothing!

These apostates can deceive us by granting our demands in one department and nullifying that grant in another. Is it not childish for us to appeal to them? If it were in my power, to-night, to place on our statute books, state and national, laws embodying the waiting, practical, saving reforms, I would not lift my hand to attain such an end. It would be but the entrusting of the things sacred to equality of right, to the chosen agents of obstruction. These agents would compass the pitiful failure of any such reform measure (as was done in Italy, in the case of the enacted law establishing proportional representation) and secure the acceptance of the verdict: that the measure was not practical, "not safe and sane;" and a reform thus betrayed is killed for at least one generation, and all the earnest toil and sacrifice brought to nothing.

I cannot expect any orderly permanent progress in the restoration of popular government while all legislation, interpretation and administration are in the hands of those who have systematically destroyed it, and who are, as systematically, blocking its restoration. We must place the friends of equality in the seats of power; and this can never be done through political party. That boat is going in the opposite direction.

Being now advised that I harbor these heresies, you will understand my conviction that the effective field of patriotism and statesmanship lies in non-partisan participation in those simple plans for reforming representation, namely, questioning of candidates (especially in favor of initiative and referendum), and (above all) the fundamental reform in representative government—proportional representation.

How can special privilege be abated while we have representative government based on district representation and administered by political party? This situation is the "devil's dream" in the field of statesmanship; and no visions of popular justice and happiness are realizable while we weakly permit such an evil system to endure.

I need hardly assure you that I have named the above movements only as means to an end; and that that end is the final application, in government, of the living, saving principles of the so-called single tax—the cause which commands your fealty and mine, and to which a Christian civilization must turn if it is not to perish from the earth.

I am aware of your courageous and spirited services in Congress, and respect and admire you for your record made there; but after all, was it not too much like writing an honorable name on the ooze of a polluted stream, to be instantly washed into ineffectiveness by the unclean and troubled waters?