

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 30, 1904.

Number 330.

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.

Bryan's call to the Democratic party to move forward sounds a trumpet note. An unambiguous warning to plutocratic Democrats that the party is not always to be their plaything, it is a grateful assurance to democratic Democrats that there is still a God in the Israel of Democracy.

That Bryan's temporary removal from the nominal leadership of his party was best, not for its plutocratic but for its democratic element, is made evident by this call. So long as he was the nominal party leader, Bryan felt bound to stand only for the principles of the authorized platform; but now that another is intrusted with the responsible leadership, and Bryan bears only the responsibility that each citizen must bear—responsibility for his opinions, his utterances and his conduct—he considers himself free to undertake a work he has hitherto avoided, "the work," as he himself declares it, "of organizing the radical and progressive element in the Democratic party."

He has availed himself of this freedom in the manner best adapted to the circumstances. By its harmony with the present trend of democratic sentiment in all parties, his call is calculated to revive rational hopes for the early future; while its calm, determined tone engenders confidence in the genuineness and power of its author's popular leadership, and its Jeffersonian spirit excites enthusiasm. Along the lines which this call prescribes, the Democratic party can

be restored to its inheritance of democracy. It can be made a party in which no plutocrat can live, but out of which no democrat will wish to go and into which all democrats will be glad to come.

In minor respects Mr. Bryan's call may be fairly criticised. Its characterization of the income tax as just, for instance, would hardly bear examination. Yet the concession must be made that it approximates justice more nearly than the tariff tax, with which Mr. Bryan contrasts it.

We doubt, also, the correctness of Mr. Bryan's intimations on the Negro question. It does not seem to us that this question can either be settled, or be put in the way of settling itself, by any change of Federal administration or any device for withholding Southern postmasterships from Negroes. While President Roosevelt may have thrust a stir-about-stick into the question, and for partisan purposes, yet the question boils deeper down. We shall never be rid of the Negro question in our politics so long as a "white man's government" class insists upon restoring Negro slavery. We do not mean, of course, that any class insists upon restoring slavery in its old form. That form is dead. But the thing survives. Our allusion is to such devices as the "black codes" which followed emancipation, to the systems of Negro peonage which have come in vogue through distortions of the criminal law, to the barbarous chain-gang practices of Georgia just revealed by the democratic decision of a Federal judge, to the evasive disfranchisement laws which make this peonage and barbarism possible, to the rabid race hatred and contempt which deny equality of legal rights to Negroes and regard them as out of their "proper

place" when they are out of menial servitude. The Negro question is in the last analysis nothing but a phase of the labor question set in ebony.

We must not be understood, however, by this reference to the race question, as intending to criticize Bryan for going around it in order to rally the progressive element of his party for a grapple over economic questions. Economic questions not only occupy public thought more completely than the race question, but they are more fundamental. That was not true when chattel slavery existed; it is true now. Bryan is right in holding that if economic questions are settled justly, the race question will settle itself justly; and he is not open to fair criticism as a political leader, for ignoring that question at this time. To attack economic conditions and race injustices in the same political fight, when the cleavage of public opinion does not run along the same lines as to both questions, might be interesting political heroics, but it would be poor political generalship. There is something splendid, no doubt, in always "keeping to the middle of the road" regardless of obstacles; but it is worth while to remember, since the habits of animals are not without useful lessons to man, that the only animal which always "keeps to the middle of the road" regardless of obstacles, is the mad dog. In popular movements, some wrongs are necessarily ignored in every conflict; the only question that can arise is, Which wrong shall it be? and the answer to that question depends upon the circumstances. It is true that the race question, like every other question of moral right and wrong, is to be tested at all times and under all circumstances by the same standards—in the forum

of morals. In that forum nothing is relative. But on the political battlefield issues are always of relative importance, and the best leadership is not that which "keeps to the middle of the road" regardless of obstacles.

If Mr. Bryan's call to the Democrats were under consideration as an economic document, we should then regard it as defective. As such a document it would be open to the objection, from our point of view, that it says things which it ought not to have said and leaves unsaid things which it ought to have said. We should hold it defective in ignoring the question of the equal right of all men to the use of the earth, at home and in the midst of civilization and not merely in the wilds. We should hold it defective in advocating or even tolerating systems of taxation which draw upon individual earnings while relinquishing to the privileged large shares of those social earnings which are measured by the pecuniary advantages of location. We should even question the economic soundness in detail of his plan for lifting from the backs of the American people their old-man-of-the-sea, railroad monopoly. Nor are those the only items of possible criticism on economic grounds. But Bryan's call to the Democracy is not an economic manifesto. It is not intended to embody the complete plans and specifications for a moral ideal in the way of government. He issues it not as a political economist and moralist enumerating all the objects which democratic Democrats should seek as they grow in democratic grace, but as a popular leader suggesting issues through which the forces of progressive democracy can fuse into one force, with fundamental democracy for its aim and the Democratic party for its instrument. In this aspect, the only one in which it can fairly be viewed, Bryan's call to Democracy is both timely and true.

While he does not regard the

money question as finally settled, he does regard it as in abeyance and therefore to be passed by in favor of more insistent issues. First among these is the railroad question. Against the continuance of private control he projects irresistible arguments. It facilitates extortion; it affords opportunities for discriminating against localities—favoring one town at the expense of another, building up large cities and destroying small ones; it debauches politics; it corrupts the bar; it owns senates. Mr. Bryan's remedy is government ownership and operation. But he would have the States, and not the Federal government, acquire and operate their respective systems, leaving the regulation of rates, etc., in inter-State commerce to an inter-State commerce commission. In our opinion an open rail-highway, owned and maintained by the Federal government, and used competitively by carriers, like any other highway but under appropriate though simple regulations, would be a better remedy for railroad monopoly than the one Mr. Bryan suggests. But that is matter of detail, and therefore of minor concern at present. He does not appear wedded to his particular plan, but suggests it for the reason, principally, that it is better calculated to concentrate opposition to the existing system and its evils. What he stands for essentially, in this connection, is the proposition that "the Democratic party as a party should turn its face toward the solution of this great question, and by the advocacy of the government ownership of the railroads bring to the people relief from the economic evils that have followed private ownership, and relief from the political corruption which seems indissolubly connected with the private ownership of railroads."

This advance against railroad monopoly is the central thought of Bryan's call to the Democracy, but he suggests related questions for collateral action. In municipi-

pal politics he would have the party demand municipal ownership of municipal franchises. In national administration he would have it demand the addition of a telegraph system to the Federal postal service. Added to these, is a demand for an income tax as a necessary condition of "any effectual tariff reform." The election of senators, judges and postmasters by the people, the establishment of direct legislation (the initiative and referendum) are also urged; and the party is admonished as to the labor question, that it—

must be the champion of the man who toils—not his defender when he does wrong, not his apologist when he is led into error, but his exponent, in the effort to secure the protection of his rights and the conservation of his interests. The Democratic party is not the enemy of wealth; on the contrary, it is the friend of honestly acquired wealth, for by preventing the acquirement of wealth by illegal and unjust methods it would give to the possessor of wealth the honor and the distinction to which his thrift, energy, industry and economy ought to entitle him.

In every detail Mr. Bryan's call to the Democracy answers to the need of democratic Democrats for a keynote to which their democracy may be attuned for effective political action. But it should be considered not alone with reference to its details, but also with reference to its robust democratic spirit. No one who reflects upon this call can believe that Bryan has either lost his cause or forsaken it. He looms up larger than ever as a great Commoner, the political tribune of American democracy, "the lion of the tribe of Jefferson." And his call is a significant climax to his splendid record at the St. Louis convention. Consider the spirit in which it is conceived. The Democratic party—

must declare war upon every private monopoly, and it must prosecute that war relentlessly until the principle of private monopoly has been eradicated and industrial independence again secured. The door of opportunity must not be closed against the young men of this country. The right of the citizen to build up an independent business and to enjoy the fruits of his toil must be guar-

anted to him. It is the basis of our industrial development and it is the guaranty of our political liberty. . . . The Democratic party, if it is to be a power for good in this country, must be the defender of human rights. It must devote itself to the protection of human rights. It must declare, establish and defend the true relation between man and property, a relation recognized by both Jefferson and Lincoln—a relation which puts man first and his possessions afterward, a relation which makes man the master of that which he has created, a relation which puts the spiritual and moral life of the nation above its material wealth and resources. . . . The right must go on, and must go on until victory is secured.

This exalted concept of Democratic duty is fitly coupled with an answer to the question, "Can we win?" The answer should be an inspiration to all despondent friends and captious critics "who think that a temporary victory of the conservative element ends progress in the Democratic party." To those who do so think Mr. Bryan suggests this reply:

O ye of little faith! Go forth into the fields and see how the myriad grains, bursting forth from their prison in the earth, push upward toward the light. Watch them as under the influence of sunshine and shower they grow to maturity and furnish food for the race. Go into the orchard and see the seed of the grafted twig grow into a great tree whose leaves furnish shade and whose fruit gives nourishment to man. Measure if you can the mighty forces behind the grain and the tree, and know ye that the forces behind the truth are as irresistible and as constantly at work. God would have been unkind, indeed, had He made such ample provision for the needs of man's body and less adequate provision for the triumph of those moral forces which mean more to the race than food or clothing or shelter. He is a political atheist who doubts the triumph of the right. He lacks faith in the purposes and the plans of God who for a moment falters in the great struggle between truth and error—between man and mammon.

In such a faith and with such a goal to strive for, under a leader who has the discernment to grasp political opportunities as they unfold and the skill to take advantage of them for his cause, is there not good work for democratic Democrats to do?

The question propounded by the New York Nation of April 28

in behalf of the Democratic party has lost none of its interest, now that three months have gone by and things not reckoned with by the Nation have happened. "What the party is beginning to ask," said the Nation, "is what Mr. Bryan intends after he is beaten in the drafting of the platform?" One of the things which have happened and with which the Nation did not reckon, is the fact that Mr. Bryan wasn't so very completely beaten in drafting the platform.

It is a cheerful thing to be told that imperialism is the dominant issue in this Presidential campaign, extremely cheerful when the information comes from men who voted for imperialism four years ago. Let's be fair to Roosevelt. It was not he, it was McKinley, who set the pace for American imperialism. Roosevelt has merely inherited McKinley's policy. He may like it, but he didn't invent it. To what extent imperialism is an issue in this campaign will appear more clearly when Parker's letter of acceptance sees the light. The Democratic platform on the subject is excellent, but who knows that Parker will not amend the platform again? Whether he does or not, a proper modesty should induce men who voted for McKinley in 1900, when imperialism was a vital issue, to "sing small" about imperialism in 1904, when it has almost become academic. Having then nailed the black flag of imperialism above the stars and stripes, their protests against imperialism now have a flavor.

"A sphinx or a sport, which?"
"You marks your ballot and you takes your choice."

In McClure's for August Lincoln Steffens makes another valuable contribution to his exposure of the business man's "graft" in politics, his specific subject being the political conditions in Illinois. This subject enables him to suggest a significant parallel between the political career and finan-

cial enemies of Deneen, the Republican prosecuting attorney of Chicago, now Republican candidate for governor of the Republican State of Illinois, and those of Folk, the Democratic prosecuting attorney of St. Louis and now Democratic candidate for governor of the Democratic State of Missouri. It is a parallel which impresses the lesson Mr. Steffens has in mind—that business "grafters" are strictly non-partisan. What makes Mr. Steffens's work especially valuable is the unmistakable fact that he is digging down below the surface. A "grafter" is to him simply a "grafter," even if he does sit in high social and business places and call his "graft" business and his methods "safe and sane." The likeness he finds between Folk and Deneen, while not perfect, is really close enough to justify the parallel he draws.

Prof. Frederick Starr's protest against a demand that the Igorrotes at the St. Louis exposition be covered with some kind of civilized clothing, is well taken. The clothing these people wear is what they are accustomed to. It is meager to the extreme of scantiness. But it is not immodest, and only innate immodesty or provincial ignorance could be shocked by it. Prof. Starr's criticism of this mock modesty is severe enough, but it is altogether just; and it is in keeping with the strong character of the man. He is a college professor who isn't satisfied with the superficial. As a sociological expert he has delved deep enough to find that man is more than an animal, and is pretty much the same in essentials wherever you come to know him. Simply through his anthropological investigations and studies, distinctly inductive or "scientific," Prof. Starr has reached democratic conclusions that are usually associated only with idealism. This is doubtless due to his human method. Others may study "inferiors," but Starr studies men, doing so in the only way in which any type or race of men