

friends there were those who thought it would have been in better taste to have returned the pass without comment, or at any rate without publishing his comment. But time has proved that Mr. Baker was right. As his chief object was to expose the system of free pass bribery, he argued that silence would have been futile. This is evident now. It was the publicity he gave to the subject that produced the downfall of the system.

Nor did he stop with that exposure. At the first caucus of Democratic Congressmen he attended, November 7, 1903, he introduced the following resolution:

Whereas it becomes increasingly apparent that the trusts owe their existence in large part to the fact of their having been the beneficiaries of outrageous and illegal freight rate discriminations, and it is also evident that the Republican party is controlled and directed by railroad and trust magnates; and whereas it is both right and expedient for the Democratic party to attack these monopolies, making it clear that no permanent relief from these oppressive conditions can be had until the illicit and criminal relations between the trusts and the railroads are terminated; and whereas the time has come to present to the people convincing evidence that no one charged with the formulation or putting into effect Democratic principles is in any way a party to or countenances these violations of law and morals; therefore be it resolved: That regardless of the practice of the Republicans, it is the sense of this caucus that its members do not accept passes or other favors from the railroads.

As Bryan's Commoner of November 20, 1903, editorially said, that resolution "should have been promptly adopted by the Democratic caucus." But it was not promptly adopted, nor adopted at all. A few votes supported the resolution; but the majority sent it to a committee which Mr. Baker was never able to get together.

His next effort was to secure action by the House of Representatives. On the 26th of January, 1904, he introduced a resolution for an investigation by the judiciary committee into the question of the criminality of the Baltimore and Ohio in issuing passes to Congressmen. But a House-full of Congressmen with pockets full of passes speedily buried the resolution out of sight.

Congressman Baker could not get the ear of the Democratic caucus on this subject, nor a hearing from the House of Representatives, but he did get a hearing from the people; and although the newspapers jeered him, the people took him soberly. And now that the giving and taking of passes has been made a crime, the name of "Anti-Pass Baker," as the corporation newspapers jeeringly called him three years ago, is worthy of perpetua-

tion as the honorable title of the real father of all anti-pass legislation, both State and national.

+

Mr. Baker was renominated in 1904, but the landslide against the Presidential candidate carried him down with his ticket. He received 1,800 more votes for Congress than Judge Parker received in the same district for President, but these were not enough. After the mayoral campaign in Greater New York last year, in which he was one of the most effective speakers for Mr. Hearst, the municipal ownership candidate, Mr. Baker was offered and accepted the position of secretary of the Department of Docks and Ferries, under Mayor McClellan. He is a poor man and this office paid him \$4,000 a year; but upon learning three days after his acceptance, that he would be expected to refrain from publicly discussing public questions, he resigned the office.

Mr. Baker's most valuable place of service is in Congress, and it is to be hoped that his district will send him back at the next election. He is a tireless worker, an effective speaker, a ready and fair debater, and a man of intelligent convictions, of sterling loyalty to his convictions, and of enviable courage. Such men are needed in Congress. A group in Congress of half a dozen such democratic Democrats as Robert Baker would go far toward making the Democratic party democratic, if indeed it did not also revive the latent democracy of the Republican party.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### BRYAN'S NEW YORK RECEPTION.

New York, Aug. 31.—Yesterday was Bryan day here, and last night capped the climax of such a reception as no private citizen not in nomination for office ever received in New York before. Madison Square Garden, which covers four acres of ground—an entire block bounded by Fourth Avenue, Madison Avenue, Twenty-sixth Street and Twenty-seventh Street—and rises four tiers high, was packed when the speaking began, from street level to roof. After Bryan had spoken ten minutes, those who had come from motives of curiosity and found the heat of the August night unbearable, left their seats in the upper galleries to seek the fresh air of the streets; but their places were taken as fast as they vacated them, and at the very end the great auditorium was nine-tenths as full as at the beginning.

+

Mayor Johnson of Cleveland presided, his introduction as chairman being made by Gov. Folk of Missouri. The other speakers were Henry W. Walker of the Commercial Travelers' Anti-Trust League and Augustus Thomas, the playwright. Mayor Johnson

received a warm greeting from all parts of the house. His speech was very brief, and this was its dominant political note: "In some form or other in all civilized countries democracy is struggling against privilege. Millions of our people have but just begun to learn that this irrepressible conflict is being waged in the United States. They are just beginning to learn that American democracy must abolish special privilege, or special privilege will abolish American democracy."

After welcoming Mr. Bryan as "an ideal Democrat who is worthy to lead and competent to lead," Mayor Johnson named him to the audience and his hour-and-a-half speech began.

+

The underlying principle of Mr. Bryan's speech was stated by him in connection with his declaration that the Democratic party cannot be the enemy of property, because "it stands for human rights, which are the basis for the sanctity of property." With this sentiment for his underlying principle he named the trust question and the questions that grow out of it as the great issue in American politics, because the question of trusts is the question of monopoly. It was in no gentle manner that he dealt with this question as he briefly indicated its many manifestations; and President Roosevelt is not likely to follow Mr. Bryan's economic leadership as far as Bryan carried it last night.

But whatever Mr. Roosevelt and his party may decide to do, Mr. Bryan left the Democratic party no room to question their duty. "The Democratic party must not merely try to regulate monopoly," he said; "but it must try to make it impossible for monopoly to live." Nor was he at all indefinite here. In his view, the Democratic party, in dealing with monopoly "must lay the ax at the root of the tree."

+

Reaching out to the concrete forms of monopoly that are now in the political arena, Mr. Bryan laid his principal emphasis upon the tariff issue. "Many monopolies," he explained, "owe their existence to the tariff," which has established "protection for the sake of protection" and thereby been made "a fruitful source of corruption." The exigencies of time and the difficulties of lengthy speech to an audience of such enormous size, necessitating but a brief consideration of this phase of his subject, Mr. Bryan announced his intention of discussing the tariff question in all its bearings on future occasions.

Up to that point the speech was not especially distasteful. In so far as it might have displeased the plutocratic contingent they were willing to accept it as pickwickian. But in dealing with another form of protection, which not only makes monopolies but is itself a monopoly, and which also is a fruitful source of corruption, Mr. Bryan made these gentlemen "sit up and take notice." This was railroad monopoly, regarding which the Dugald Dalgettys of politics and the press are now saying that Bryan is more dangerously radical than ever before.

+

At the outset with reference to this question, Mr. Bryan evoked the first applause, at once hearty and

general, by indicating the dangerous power, with its enormous incentives for corruption at elections, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, if regulation of railroad freights is to be reposed in that commission and railroad profits are to be left to "private enterprise." "The rate regulation law," he declared, "provides for a high stake in presidential elections;" and then he added: "My fear is that if the history through which we have gone in regard to municipal enterprises repeats itself, we may find that larger corruption funds will be raised from railroads to control the Interstate Commerce Commission than were ever raised from the manufacturers to secure protective tariff legislation." With this introduction he launched out into his proposal of government ownership and operation, publicly made by him and widely advertised two years ago, and now confirmed by his European observations. This was received with tremendous enthusiasm by the audience and it has since happily relieved Mr. Bryan of certain recent and unwelcome political friendships.

+

He did not describe the policy of government ownership as one that he would insist upon having his party adopt at this time. He mentioned it, he said, because as he regards the railroad question as it now presents itself as part of the trust question, he could not in frankness withhold his personal opinion regarding it. "I have reached the conclusion," he said, "that there will be no permanent relief from railroad monopoly until the railroads are the property of government and operated by government—Federal ownership of the trunk lines only and State ownership of all the rest of the railroads." His objection to complete Federal ownership was the danger it involves of centralization, a danger that "cannot be brushed aside," for "the greatest danger of a republic is the consolidation of all power at the capital remote from the people." And as to the practicability of allowing local lines to be owned by the several States he explained: "I did not believe the argument weighty before I went abroad, and my observations in other lands have convinced me that State ownership of local lines is entirely feasible. In Germany almost all the railroads are owned, not by the Empire but by the several States; not even the trunk lines are owned by the Imperial government; and yet they have no difficulty about interstate traffic. If one travels from Constantinople to Vienna, he passes through Turkey and Bulgaria and Serbia and Hungary and part of Austria, and every state owns its own railroads, and they speak different languages on the different divisions, and yet you travel without change of cars."

+

In the course of his speech Mr. Bryan advocated the abolition of wars between nations, and of the bitter conflicts between labor and capital, by arbitration; the arbitrators to define and adjust disputed rights, and obedience to the award to be left to the peaceful but powerful influence of public opinion. He called attention to the loss not alone of democratic prestige but of commercial benefits by our colonization schemes; he opposed the collection of public debts from weak nations by strong ones by force of

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

---

Week ending Wednesday, September 5.

---

arms; he denounced government by injunction, and advocated the eight hour day and the election of senators by the people; and he expressed his gratification at the fact that the movement toward democracy is universal. On the money question he spoke with satisfaction of its present elimination from politics by the vast production of gold which has pleased the gold standard men by making the gold standard acceptable, and the bimetallists by furnishing an adequate supply of money. In connection with the trust question he denied that the trusts are here to stay, asserting that they are not an economic institution harmonizing with economic progress; and he took in support of this assertion, the strong ground that the moment any economic organization "secures a monopoly it ceases to be in the line of economic progress."

+

Mr. Bryan went to New Haven and Bridgeport today. He goes to Newark and Jersey City to-morrow. Some friction occurred with reference to Newark. Ex-Senator Smith, who is nominally a Democrat but really a political partner of Senator Dryden and the great monopoly interests that own northern New Jersey geographically and the whole Senate politically, and who was one of the band wagon converts to Bryan, had announced weeks ago that he had engaged Bryan to speak in Newark. This was false, and was proven to be by a cable message from Bryan to Mayor Johnson; but the pretense was kept up and Smith went on with his preparations. The opposition of anti-machine Democrats to Bryan's appearance in New Jersey under Smith's especial auspices was widespread and emphatic. Under the circumstances Mr. Bryan had positively refused to go; but at a late hour last night he yielded to the advice of James Martine, the leading Bryan Democrat of northern New Jersey, who until then had co-operated with John Moody in opposing Bryan's appearance under Smith's patronage. With this exception and the exception of the disappointment of the predatory interests which had hoped to win Bryan over to their brand of "safety" and "sanity," nothing occurred to mar his unique and enthusiastic reception. Friends of Bryan came from all parts of the country east of the Rocky Mountains. The cities represented by genuinely Democratic mayors, besides Cleveland by Mayor Johnson, included Omaha by Mayor Dahlman and Chicago by Mayor Dunne.

L. F. P.

+ + +

Shall we yield to any other nation in the estimate to be placed upon the value of human life? I confess that my aversion to killing increases with the years. Surely the Creator did not so plan the universe as to make the progress of the race dependent upon wholesale blood letting. I prefer to believe that war, instead of being an agency for good, is rather an evidence of man's surrender to his passions, and that one of the tests of civilization is man's willingness to submit his controversies to the arbitrament of reason rather than of force.

—W. J. Bryan at Madison Square Garden, Aug. 30.

### Russia Gay Above Her Volcano.

The gayety of France in her revolutionary days, and the exaggerated theater attendance during the dark days of our own Civil War, have their counterparts in contemporaneous Russia. A dispatch reports that "the music halls and cafes of the capital are thronged nightly by gay crowds solely on pleasure bent;" and adds, as if history had been forgotten, "to foreigners it seems almost as if a certain moral sense were lacking in the Russians."

+

Nineteen soldiers found guilty of participating in the Sveaborg mutiny (pp. 441, 462) were shot on the 31st.

+

The hated General Trepoff, ostensibly on the ground of ill-health, has been removed from the position of governor of the palace of Peterhoff.

+ +

### China Grows Stronger.

The Emperor has promulgated an edict in regard to the constitutional government toward which China is drifting (p. 511). The edict thus describes the "forward movement" in China:

Since the beginning of our dynasty there have been wise emperors who have made laws suited to the times. Now that China has intercourse with all nations our laws and political system have become antiquated and our country is always in trouble. Therefore it is necessary for us to gather more knowledge and draw up a new code of laws, otherwise we shall be unworthy of the trust of our forefathers and the people.

+

A still more concrete evidence of China's awakening is to be found in the renewed and more strenuous measures now under consideration for the suppression of the opium traffic. Advices have been received in Washington to the effect that China contemplates entering into an agreement with India to diminish annually the import of opium into China, so that the traffic will cease in ten years. An imperial edict is expected condemning the use of opium and forbidding the employment in the government service of opium eaters. The edict is also to order an annual reduction in poppy cultivation, with the industry to be prohibited at the end of ten years.