

# The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1904.

Number 345.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

Mr. Roosevelt is reported as being delighted with the results of the election, and the Chicago Tribune interprets it as a vote "by the people that Theodore Roosevelt deserved well of the republic." Mr. Roosevelt may be pardoned for his self-gratulation, but the Tribune is wrong in its interpretation. The people did not vote that Roosevelt deserved well; they voted that a plutocratic Democracy deserved ill.

The landslide for Roosevelt is not for him affirmatively. It is for him only negatively. It spells democratic discipline of the Democratic party. This is abundantly evident from the fact that the overwhelming pluralities for Roosevelt come as the climax of an apathetic campaign. Had the people intended to express admiration of Roosevelt by their votes they would have made their admiration apparent in enthusiastic campaigning. But the absence of banners, and buttons, and parades, and window pictures, and such other tokens as a character like Roosevelt would call out from enthusiastic admirers, testifies that there was no enthusiasm for him. The enthusiasm was against Parker, not for anybody, and was manifested in the way in which that kind of enthusiasm always is manifested—in an overwhelming but resentful and silent ballot on election day.

This landslide is very much like that of 1894, when the people rebuked President Cleveland at the Congressional elections, and for much the same reason. Cleveland

had identified himself with the plutocracy, and in 1894 the Democratic majority of 41 in the lower House of Congress gave way to a Republican majority of 74. Parker comes forward the branded candidate of Cleveland, Hill, Belmont, McCarren and other plutocratic elements of his party, and he has gone down to the most disastrous defeat his party has experienced for thirty years.

It may be supposed that the astute politicians who were buncoed into nominating Parker are keenly enjoying the wonderful victory they were promised. "We are for Parker because we are weary of defeat!" exclaimed Senator Daniels at the St. Louis convention—if not in those exact words at any rate to that purport and in phraseology not much different. Senator Daniels is presumably as weary as ever. He ought to be disgusted as well as weary. Some of the defeats he had gone through were well fought battles for democratic principle. But this last defeat!

It may have been a "united" party that Parker led down to this disaster, but it was not a unified party. Plutocracy and democracy cannot unify, even if leaders unite. Although Mr. Cleveland could support Parker, he couldn't carry his plutocratic followers into a party in which Bryan was a prominent figure. Although Mr. Bryan could support Parker, he couldn't hold his democratic friends in line for a candidate who seemed to them only a substitute for Cleveland. Bryan and Cleveland stand for opposite things in the public mind, and their followers can no more be merged in one political party than oil and water can be mixed in one vessel.

This is the opportunity the plutocratic Democrats have spent

their money for. The defeats of 1896 and 1900 they attributed to Bryanism, deliberately ignoring the crushing disaster of 1892 which was due to Clevelandism and out of which Bryanism, badly as it was beaten in the count, raised the party again into life. They schemed for control and they got it. Their own candidate was nominated against Bryan's protest. That candidate of a "united" party threw the gold standard shibboleth into the faces of Bryan Democrats, as the plutocratic clique in New York ordered him to. He minimized the democracy of the platform in his speech and letter of acceptance, just as they desired and required. Bryan put no obstacles in his way, but served in the campaign as and where he was requested to, and only so. He spoke in Indiana where he had followers to win; he staid away from New York where he had political enemies who might be affronted. He did all he could to elect Parker, and he did it in sincerity, with self respect and with vigor. Yet the Democratic party, under the plutocratic control of the Belmonts, and Hills, and McCarrens, and the leadership of the "safe and sane" Judge Parker, suffers a vastly greater defeat than it did under the democratic control of the Bryans. If there is any such thing in politics as estoppel, the plutocrats of the Democratic party are estopped from again claiming title to it on any of the grounds they have so vociferously pleaded. It was turned over to them to "reorganize," and they have "reorganized" it to an irreducible minimum.

The time is now ripe for Mr. Bryan's movement for reorganizing the party in Democratic directions (pp. 257, 264, 283). He has already been heard from. He will doubtless be heard from more definitely at an early day.

Meanwhile it is the part of wisdom for eager democrats of all parties to practice with reasonable moderation the saving grace of patience and to cultivate the virtue of political common sense. Whether the Democratic party is to come out of this confusion rejuvenated and reinvigorated, or a new party with a new name is to spring up out of the circumstances, no one can foresee and no one need pretend to. Events will determine this; no man, no committee, no conference, can do it, and no toy politics can lend any very useful aid. If a new party comes it will not be an expansion of any paper party; it will more probably be an outburst of the democratic elements of the Republican party. If the old Democratic party has still a democratic future, it will not be long before something of that future is foreshadowed. Meanwhile let us all—democratic-Democrats, democratic-Republicans and democratic-Populists—remember that a cause is more important than a party, and principles than partisanship; and be prepared to adjust ourselves to the fighting method which events may thrust upon us.

The election of Douglas as Governor of Massachusetts shows what can be done by a democrat who leaves "weasel" words to the Presidential candidate, and puts his principles before the people in plain language. He made a free trade campaign; made it with good sense, but without timidity; made it in the interest of the people and not in fear of this protected interest or that one; and a State that Parker lost by almost 100,000 as Democratic candidate for President, he has won as Democratic candidate for Governor by nearly 40,000.

Although the election is over we reproduce in our Miscellany, from the Commoner, Mr. Bryan's address to the Populists. We do this because we regard this brief editorial as having historical value. With one part of it we do not agree. According to Mr. Bryan, Democrats who regarded their

party as having been captured by the plutocrats ought not to have voted against Judge Parker with a view thereby to hastening its reorganization. On this point Mr. Bryan says that "no one can afford to put the interest of his party or of his faction of the party above the interests of his country." That is quite true when the interests of one's party or faction are not in his judgment identical with the interests of his country. But in this case the interests of the democratic faction of the Democratic party were regarded by an immense number of Democrats as identical with the interests of the country. For the plutocrats, already owning the Republican party, had secured control of the Democratic party and named Judge Parker as their own chosen candidate for it. It thereupon became a question for the genuine democrats of the party to decide, each for himself, whether plutocratic control of the country itself could, in the long run, best be thrown off by supporting Parker or by defeating him. We cannot, therefore, accept Mr. Bryan's dictum that voting against Parker in order to hasten the reorganization of the Democratic party was doing evil in the hope that good might come out of it. It might just as well be said that voting for Parker by those who regarded him as representing the plutocracy of his party, but in order to achieve some possible good in spite of that fact, was doing evil in the hope that good might come out of it. It is turning into a question of eternal moral principle something that is simply a question of temporary political policy. This same thing is what the Populists also have done. They have said, with reference to Mr. Bryan himself, that he was supporting a positive evil for a possible good. Unjust, illogical and petulant to an absurd degree have many of them been in charging him with inconsistency. Mr. Bryan answers them, in the article we quote, and does so with characteristic dignity, good feeling and thoroughness. He shows them that as matter of general political policy, and

this is incontestably true from any common sense standpoint, his own proper path in the late campaign was the one he took. He goes further. He shows them that it was the only righteous path for him. While we object to the dictum that those Democrats who voted to discredit the plutocratic control of the Democratic party were doing evil that good might come, we fully appreciate the fact that Mr. Bryan himself, believing as he most sincerely did regarding what he describes as paramount issues in the recent campaign, could in good conscience have done only as he has done.

Too much cannot be said in favor of the Chicago public school innovation, credited to Superintendent Cooley and the principals, which contemplates organizing in the schools working models of the political systems of the country. Following is a description of the innovation as understood by the Chicago Tribune and reported in its issue of the 6th:

Miniature city councils upon which the public searchlight may be turned at any time; miniature legislatures minus the shadow of the octopus; and near-real Congresses in which the national policy will be molded without regard to party prejudices are to be organized in the Chicago public schools. In addition, "good government" and "improvement" clubs will be formed. All of these departures from traditional methods are advocated by Superintendent Cooley as a most efficient means of teaching practical civics to the high school students. City, county, State and national conventions will be held—unless the pupils decide to try the direct primary experiment—and nominations made for all the offices in all branches of government. The platforms of the school parties then will be outlined. One organization may put in a plank declaring against the use of cigarettes by minors and fixing a penalty for their sale to children. A prohibition clause may be inserted. They will, however, be constructed in the "regular" way and the campaigns carried on in a dignified, well ordered manner. The voting will be by the Australian system, and in this way the pupils will be thoroughly instructed in regard to the laws governing voting. The city councils will not only discuss questions of vital interest to the government of the school, but also those of foremost interest to the municipality. They will take up such problems as traction and municipal ownership. Corps of schoolyard "white