

This reminds us that we have both duties and rights, as citizens of this great country, called upon as we are from time to time to exercise the suffrage of a free people. Let us speak of the duties as the first in order, and as the first in importance in a democracy like ours.

Our first duty is to cast an intelligent vote. This means that we ought to be open in mind, free in spirit, and investigate to the best of our ability the men who, as candidates on the different tickets, ask for our votes, and to examine to the best of our ability the different policies and issues that are before the people for endorsement.

This attitude requires independence, self-reliance and courage, a fearlessness in the presence of the party boss, and a personality that can resist the tyranny of party dictation.

In a democracy the ballot should represent real conviction and be the expression of the intellectual and moral desires of the voter. Such a voter discards as base ethics the political war-cry of "my party, right or wrong," and puts in its place, "to vote for the best men and measures, is always the first duty of a patriot."

Even that party loyalty that says that "I can make the curves my party can make," may only mean that I can degenerate in moral tone as fast as my party can, and that I willingly become a partner in its crimes and political corruption.

It is the duty of the voter to cast an honest vote. This means that a man should vote in the interest of the public good. There are some vicious things which a man can do which only injure himself, but because our ballot is a social function a man cannot cast a vicious ballot without to that extent injuring his friends, his neighbors and his country. This principle condemns as a dangerous element in our political life both the briber and the bribed.

As the aim of an election in a democracy is to find out the opinion and conviction of the voter upon the issues at stake, so the effort to influence the voter by bribery, is an effort to destroy the fundamental purpose of the franchise. It may be assumed that a man who will sell his vote is not a man of real and strong political convictions, but in so far as he has convictions he is bought and bribed to depart from them, so bribery to this extent defeats the purpose and virtue of the ballot.

No party man, or political worker, will bribe a man to vote the way he intended to vote, so if he is bribed at

all, he must be bribed to depart from his real convictions such as they are, and it is this that constitutes the viciousness of bribery.

But if we are duty bound to cast an intelligent and honest ballot at every election, we also have the right to a free ballot, and an untrammelled suffrage.

In theory every American citizen in this republic is a sovereign, and this ought to be the case in practice as well as in theory.

We have no tribunal elected or self-appointed in this country who are supposed to sit in judgment on their fellowmen and decide how they shall vote.

This is left to the judgment and conscience of each citizen. Nevertheless, this principle is often forgotten, and in the strong desire for party victory, and because of the great principles and prizes at stake, the temptation is often powerful to force, browbeat, intimidate, crack the party whip, hold the club of social ostracism, and even the fear of loss of position and bread and butter, over voters and force them against their will and convictions to vote a given way.

This is all wrong in every instance, and is destructive of the very foundations of a republic.

Every American citizen should have the right to vote on all occasions as his judgment and conscience dictate.

Every American citizen should have the right to not only vote as he thinks, but he should have the right to make public his political preferences and convictions, without endangering his position, his bread and butter, or being subjected to social ostracism. A man should have the right to vote for the minor parties, and propagate by legitimate methods even radical political measures without being persecuted, or socially and politically boycotted.

This is a fundamental political principle in this country, and the most un-American elements we have in our political society are those who strike at this principle, and who by force and illegitimate pressure lead voters to depart from their real convictions and sentiments on election day.

There are many considerations appropriate to be discussed in a pre-election sermon, but it is my conviction that a free ballot, honestly and intelligently cast by the millions of American voters next Tuesday, will best insure the prosperity, greatness and moral soundness of this nation for many years to come.

#### DEMOCRACY VS. PLUTOCRACY— THE ELECTION'S LESSON.

The leading editorial in Mr. Bryan's *Commoner* for Nov. 11, 1904.

The Democratic party has met with an overwhelming defeat in the national election. As yet the returns are not sufficiently complete to permit analysis, and it is impossible to say whether the result is due to an actual increase in the number of Republican votes or to a falling off in the Democratic vote. This phase of the subject will be dealt with next week when the returns are all in. The questions for consideration at this time are, what lesson does the election teach, and, what of the future? The defeat of Judge Parker should not be considered a personal one. He did as well as he could under the circumstances; he was the victim of unfavorable conditions and of a mistaken party policy. He grew in popularity as the campaign progressed, and expressed himself more and more strongly upon the trust question, but could not overcome the heavy odds against him. The so-called conservative Democrats charged the defeats of 1896 and 1900 to the party's position on the money question and insisted that a victory could be won by dropping the coinage question entirely. The convention accepted this theory, and the platform made no reference to the money question, but Judge Parker felt that it was his duty to announce his personal adherence to the gold standard. His gold telegram, as it was called, while embarrassing to the Democrats of the West and South, was applauded by the eastern press. He had the cordial indorsement of Mr. Cleveland, who certified that the party had returned to "safety and sanity;" he had the support of the Democratic papers which bolted in 1896, and he also had the aid of nearly all of those who were prominent in the campaigns of 1896 and 1900, and yet his defeat is apparently greater than the party suffered in either of those years.

It is unquestionable also that Judge Parker's defeat was not local but general—the returns from the eastern states being as disappointing as the returns from the west. The reorganizers were in complete control of the party; they planned the campaign and carried it on according to their own views, and the verdict against their plan is a unanimous one. Surely silver cannot be blamed for this defeat, for the campaign was run on a gold basis; neither can the defeat be charged to emphatic condemnation of the trusts, for the trusts were not assailed as vigorously this year as they were four years ago. It is evident that the campaign did not

turn upon the question of imperialism, and it is not fair to consider the result as a personal victory for the president, although his administration was the subject of criticism. The result was due to the fact that the Democratic party attempted to be conservative in the presence of conditions which demand radical remedies. It sounded a partial retreat when it should have ordered a charge all along the line. In 1896 the line was drawn, for the first time during the present generation, between plutocracy and democracy, and the party's stand on the side of Democracy alienated a large number of plutocratic Democrats who, in the nature of things, cannot be expected to return, and it drew to itself a large number of earnest advocates of reform whose attachment to these reforms is much stronger than attachment to any party name. The Republican party occupied the conservative position. That is, it defends those who, having secured unfair advantages through class legislation, insist that they shall not be disturbed no matter how oppressive their exactions may become. The Democratic party cannot hope to compete successfully with the Republican party for this support. To win the support of the plutocratic element of the country the party would have to become more plutocratic than the Republican party and it could not do this without losing several times as many voters as that course would win. The Democratic party has nothing to gain by catering to organized and predatory wealth. It must not only do without such support but it can strengthen itself by inviting the open and emphatic opposition of these elements. The campaign just closed shows that it is as inexpedient from the standpoint of policy as it is wrong from the standpoint of principle to attempt any conciliation of the industrial and financial despots who are gradually getting control of all the avenues of wealth. The Democratic party, if it hopes to win success, must take the side of the plain, common people. The Commoner has for two years pointed out the futility of any attempt to compromise with wrong or to patch up a peace with the great corporations which are now exploiting the public, but the southern Democrats were so alarmed by the race issue that they listened, rather reluctantly, to the promises of success held out by those who had contributed to the defeat of the party in the two preceding campaigns. The experiment has been a costly one, and it is not likely to be repeated during the present generation. The eastern Democrats

were also deceived. They were led to believe that the magnates and monopolists who coerced the voters in 1896 and supplied an enormous campaign fund in both 1896 and 1900 would help the Democratic party if our party would only be less radical. The corporation press aided in this deception, and even the Republican papers professed an unselfish desire to help build up the Democratic party. The election has opened the eyes of the hundreds of thousands of honest and well-meaning democrats who a few months ago favored the reorganization of the party. These men now see that they must either go into the Republican party or join with the Democrats of the west and south in making the Democratic party a positive, aggressive and progressive reform organization. There is no middle ground.

Mr. Bryan did what he could to prevent the reorganization of the Democratic party; when he failed in this he did what he could to aid Parker and Davis in order to secure such reforms—and there were some vital ones—promised by their election. Now that the campaign is over he will both through The Commoner and by personal effort assist those who desire to put the Democratic army once more upon a fighting basis; he will assist in organizing for the campaign of 1908. It does not matter so much who the nominee may be. During the next three years circumstances may bring into the arena some man especially fitted to carry the standard. It will be time enough to discuss a candidate when we are near enough to the campaign to measure the relative availability of those worthy to be considered, but we ought to begin now to lay our plans for the next national campaign and to form the line of battle.

The party must continue to protest against a large army and against a large navy, and to stand for the independence of the Filipinos, for imperialism adds the menace of militarism to the corrupting influence of commercialism, and yet experience shows that however righteous the party's position on this subject, the issue does not arouse the people as they are aroused by a question which touches them immediately and individually. The injustice done to the Filipinos is not resented as it should be or as we resent a wrong to ourselves, and the costliness of imperialism is hidden by the statistics and by our indirect system of taxation. While the party must maintain its position on this subject, it cannot present this as the only issue.

The party must also maintain its posi-

tion on the tariff question. No answer has been made to the Democratic indictment against the high tariff, and yet, here too the burden of the tariff system is concealed by the method in which the tax is collected. It cannot be made the sole issue in a campaign.

The party must renew its demand for an income tax, to be secured through a constitutional amendment, in order that wealth may be made to pay its share of the expenses of the government. To-day we are collecting practically all of our federal revenue from taxes upon consumption, and these bear heaviest upon the poor and light upon the rich.

The party must maintain its position in favor of bimetallicism. It cannot surrender its demand for the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, but the question must remain in abeyance until conditions so change as to bring the public again face to face with falling prices and a rising dollar. This, therefore, cannot be made the controlling issue of the contest upon which we are entering.

The trust question presents the most acute phase of the contest between Democracy and plutocracy, so far as economic issues are concerned. The president virtually admits that the trusts contributed to his campaign fund, but he denies that they received any promises of aid or immunity. No well-informed person doubts that the large corporations have furnished the Republican campaign fund during the campaigns of 1896 and 1900 and 1904, and no one can answer the logic of Judge Parker's arraignment of trust contributions. The trusts are run on business principles. They do not subscribe millions of dollars to campaigns unless they are paying for favors already granted or purchasing favors for future delivery. The weakness of Judge Parker's position was that the charge was made at the close of the campaign when it was neutralized by a counter charge. The trusts cannot be fought successfully by any party that depends upon trust funds to win the election. The Democratic party must make its attack upon the trusts so vehement that no one will suspect of secret aid from them. It will be to its advantage if it will begin the next campaign with an announcement that no trust contributions will be accepted and then prove its sincerity by giving the public access to its contribution list. In public enterprises the names of contributors are generally made public in order to denote the character and purpose of the work.

President Roosevelt has four years in which to make good his declaration that

no obligations were incurred by the acceptance of trust funds. He will disappoint either the contributors or the voters. If he disappoints the contributors, the trust question may be put in the process of settlement. If he disappoints the people, they will have a chance to settle with his party four years hence. "Death to every private monopoly" must be the slogan of the party in this question; any other position is a surrender. The platforms of 1900 and 1904 declare that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable, and this declaration presents the issue upon the trust question.

The party must continue its defense of the interests of the wage-earners; it must protect them from the encroachments of capital. The fact that the laboring men have not always shown their appreciation of the party's position ought not to deter the party from doing its duty in regard to them. The labor question is not one that concerns employers and employes alone; it concerns the entire community, and the people at large have an interest in the just settlement of labor controversies; for that reason they must insist upon remedial legislation in regard to hours and arbitration, and they must so limit the authority of the courts in contempt cases as to overthrow what is known as government by injunction.

The party must continue its opposition to national banks of issue and must insist upon divorcing the treasury department from Wall street.

The party must continue its fight for the popular election of senators and for direct legislation wherever the principle can be applied. It must not only maintain its position on old issues, but it must advance to the consideration of new questions as they arise.

It takes time to direct attention to an evil and still more time to consolidate sentiment in favor of a remedy, and Mr. Bryan is not sanguine enough to believe that all the reforms that he favors will at once be indorsed by any party platform, but the Commoner will proceed to point out the reforms which he believes to be needed. Among these may be mentioned the postal telegraph system, state ownership of railroads, the election of federal judges for fixed terms, and the election of postmasters by the people of their respective communities. Instead of having the government controlled by corporations through officers chosen by the corporations, we must have a government of the people, by the people and for the people—a government administered

according to the Jeffersonian maxim of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." Hope and duty point the way. To doubt the success of our cause is to doubt the triumph of the right, for ours is and must be the cause of the masses. "With malice toward none and charity for all," let us begin the campaign of 1908; let us appeal to the moral sentiment of the country and arraign the policies of the republican party before the bar of public conscience.

When thieves fall out, these days, honest men may read all about it in the ten-cent monthlies.—Life.

## BOOKS

### THE MOTHER-ARTIST.

I saw recently the following doggerel lines. A certain truth in them, which is said to be applicable to Fifth and other avenues, perhaps justifies their publication:

#### THE NEWEST WOMAN.

She'll be married if she can,  
For the woman wants the man—  
That's the law;  
But 'twill make her very sad  
If incumbrances are had—  
That's the flaw.  
She'll be busy on the go,  
In society, you know,  
All the while;  
So she wants not even one,  
For she's only out for fun—  
That's the style.

Against the notion that children are a burden and a nuisance this little book by Jane Dearborn Mills (Boston: The Palmer Co.; 50 Bromfield St. Price \$1 net. Postage 6 cents) which she calls *The Mother Artist*, is a noble protest which puts to shame all trifling words on the subject, and makes us feel not only the holy obligations, but the rich joys of parenthood. No one better than she has appreciated the economic and social significance of the modern trend of thought on this subject, and her words deserve wide reading. It is a significant fact that such a book should be needed. We seem to be far away from the time when it could be sung as the glory of a woman that she shall be "the joyful mother of children."

To give some idea of the author's purpose we cannot do better than quote at some length from her prelude.

"There has grown up," she says, "in modern days, a pitying spirit toward the mother, carrying with it an idea of martyrdom, and that almost unendurable, if the number of children is greater than three. It is an exceedingly unhealthy notion for mothers, actual and possible, and for all the world besides. It is a discounting of the dignity of motherhood, for it looks upon its duties as if they were the unintelligent drudgery of the slave."

"This little book is a suggestion of the richness of growth possible in the

mother's life. No element of character is left unexercised in the doing of a mother's duties. Her love-nature is fully aroused; her intellect may be, and actively so, if she will follow where the children lead with their wise little questions, and answer them as truly as she can; and her character may grow more wholly rounded into beautiful relative proportions, each part to each, in this work and atmosphere than is possible to it in any other condition. The drudgery is only that which any artist finds connected with his work."

In a pleasant, chatty way Mrs. Mills takes us through the phases of the mother-artist's work, discussing the experiences and cares and problems of a mother's life. To all the difficulties and trials her answer is triumphant: "Your especial trials," she says, "are from the abundance of your blessings." And what these blessings are she has shown in the course of the chats with the mother throughout the book.

That the cause of the modern prejudice about children is due to our present social conditions the author has shown in other writings. Perhaps under better conditions even the society woman, who is "only out for fun," will come to have a different feeling.

J. H. DILLARD.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

—Combinations, Trusts and Monopolies. By Edward J. Nolan, LL. B. New York: Broadway Publishing Co. Price, \$1.50. To be reviewed.

#### PERIODICALS.

The Educational Review for November republishes the last presidential address before the English Society for Psychical Research. The significant fact is the publication of this address in this review. It is an additional indication of the headway which Psychical Research is making as a fit subject of study. Sooner or later scientific men will be compelled to consider this subject. The attitude of the foremost scien-

## NOTICE TO READERS.

If you have been reading *The Public* on trial, this notice may interest you. Your regular subscription for three or six months or a year, if sent in before January 1, 1905, will begin at once and continue until three or six months or a year, as the case may be, after January 1, 1905. Thus \$2 will give you the paper from receipt of your subscription until January 1, 1906; \$1 will give it to you from receipt of subscription until July 1, 1905; and 50 cents will give it to you from receipt of subscription until April 1, 1905. The same offer is open to all persons not already on the regular subscription list of *The Public*.