

knowing they have done effective work in the cause of truth.

s. c.



### A Lesson for the Democratic Party.

There is a lesson for the Democratic party in the election returns. It can not continue to be half progressive and half reactionary. It must become wholly one or the other—or die. There is furthermore the lesson that the safer course is to become wholly progressive. The Democratic losses principally occurred where the party nominated reactionary candidates. Roger Sullivan's defeat was clearly due to the thousands of progressive Democrats who voted for a genuine democrat, Raymond Robins. Had the party nominee been a democrat, say John Z. White or Carl Vrooman, these voters would not have gone outside of its ranks for a candidate, and Illinois would not have sent Sherman back to the Senate. There was a similar occurrence in Ohio, where reactionary Timothy Hogan was the candidate; in Iowa, where reactionary Maurice Connolly had been nominated in preference to the progressive Meredith; in Washington, where the party refused to nominate progressive George F. Cotterill; in Wisconsin in the case of the reactionary gubernatorial candidate, John C. Karel; in New York, Connecticut and elsewhere. The election in 1912, in Colorado, of the reactionary Ammons as governor gave the State an administration so servile in its adherence to monopolistic interests that the voters refused this year to favor a different Democratic gubernatorial candidate, although, as also happened in Wisconsin, they did elect the senatorial candidate, as well as a democratic Democrat, James H. Teller, as Supreme Court Judge. The voters in many states have saved the party from further discrediting itself by defeating the reactionary candidates so stupidly nominated.



These reactionaries clearly hoped to secure election by claiming their election to be necessary to uphold President Wilson. Lacking merit themselves, they figured on appropriating for their own benefit the credit that belongs to the President. These plans failed, as they should have failed. The defeat of these candidates—some of whom had the President's endorsement—was a much better way to uphold his administration than to entrust them with power to bring shame and discredit upon it.



It was inevitable perhaps that with so many unworthy candidates to defeat a few worthy

candidates, such as Stanley Bowdle in Ohio, ~~had~~ have suffered. But these cases were surprisingly few. In California, where the Democratic party had a democratic nominee in James D. Phelan, it elected him easily in spite of the strong temptation, that many democrats must have felt, to support so excellent a democrat as the Progressive nominee, Francis J. Heney. The Democratic party has received notice to become thoroughly democratic. Will it heed?

s. d.



### Political Straws.

Elections may bring sorry comfort to the politician, but they enable the statesman to catch the drift of public opinion. Yet even as a political barometer they are not always interpreted aright. Too often, indeed, men look only for evidence of what they want to believe. Some points of the recent election however stand out with sufficient prominence to arrest attention. One of these is the fact that President Wilson is more popular than his party. The Democrats of the whole country are still in the minority and owe their continuance in power to the divided ranks of their opponents. There is tendency toward a healing of the Republican rift which means that as the Progressive party disappears the Democratic party will find it harder and harder to win an election. The party is singularly fortunate in having a standard bearer whose popularity has increased with service; but it should not be forgotten that the most powerful influences of the financial world will oppose a further extension of his program. Nor will these influences be confined to the opposition parties.



The slump in the Progressive party vote, and the corresponding increase in the Republican vote, indicate an early reunion of the two wings of the protectionist party. This does not mean, however, that all of the Progressives will return to the Republican fold. A goodly number of them are democrats who, becoming disgusted with the Democratic party, thought to be rid of Bourbonism by joining a new party. Had Speaker Clark or Mr. Underwood, instead of Mr. Wilson, been President these Progressive democrats would have been confirmed in their choice. But Mr. Wilson from the day he took charge of the party has been breathing into it the breath of life, until it begins to show signs of revival. As the third party melts away these radical members will be drawn again to the Democratic party. And with

them will come many from the Republican party, who have heretofore been repelled by Democracy's Bourbonism.



If no higher motive than expediency be considered the Democratic party must grow more and more radical. Voters imbued with the spirit of protection naturally will incline toward the Republican party, which is bound up in that philosophy. Hence, the logic of circumstance will compel the party now in power to continue an aggressive program. Should it turn back, should it resume its time honored shuffling and dodging, backing and filling the large element of democratic Democrats will be as eager to smash the machine as the Democrats of Illinois were to repudiate an unworthy candidate. It is one of the healthy signs of the times that voters are judging parties by present principles rather than by past achievements. And it is still more encouraging that they are going down to fundamental principles. Now is the time for the Democratic party to lay aside its ante-bellum Bourbonism, and begin to manufacture campaign material for 1916 by enacting laws that will destroy privilege, and secure to the mass of the people their share of the fruits of science and progress. This is a rare opportunity for the party.

S. C.



### The Progressive Party's Lesson.

The returns show that many progressive voters have lost confidence in the Progressive party. Probably no one has done more to help them to this conclusion than Theodore Roosevelt. The party leader's militarist and protectionist views, together with economic blindness in other directions, could have no other result. Then, also, must be considered his opposition to the efforts of such men as Amos Pinchot, who endeavored to release the party from the reactionary Perkins influence. It would be unfair to attribute the party's one conspicuous triumph this year, the re-election of Governor Johnson in California, to the fact that Johnson was the only candidate of his party for whom Roosevelt made no speeches. But it is not unfair to draw the conclusion therefrom that Roosevelt's help is not needed to bring success, even though it does not actually weaken the candidate. If the Progressive party would regain lost ground it must abandon its reactionary tariff program, repudiate Roosevelt militarism and substitute advocacy of fundamental remedies for its superficial program of boards and commissions to supervise evils that ought to be abolished. S. D.

### Democrats Who Succeeded.

The elections have played havoc with reactionary Democrats and—it is furthermore pleasing to note—the democratic candidates have, as a rule, won. Warren Worth Bailey is triumphantly re-elected in the nineteenth Pennsylvania district, a Republican stronghold. Re-elected also are David J. Lewis of Maryland, Edward Keating of Colorado, Frank Buchanan of Illinois, Robert Crosser of Ohio, William Gordon of Ohio and others. On other than the Democratic ticket are elected such democrats as William Kent, Independent, of California; John I. Nolan, Progressive, of California, and Meyer London, Socialist, of New York, and no doubt a number of others. The voters have shown unusual ability in discriminating between Democrats and democrats. The influence of the democratic element in the next Congress should be strong enough to inject more democracy into legislation.

S. D.



### What Pennsylvania's Anti-Gangsters Should Consider.

In Pennsylvania Penrose, extreme protectionist, was opposed by Pinchot and Palmer, moderate protectionists. If protectionism is a sound doctrine at all, then Penrose was right. If protection is an economic benefit, we can not have too much of it. All three candidates appealed to protectionist voters, telling them that they opposed abolition of the tariff. Such unanimity necessarily confirmed the foolish fears of these voters that tariff abolition would be harmful. So they logically reasoned that the tariff would be safest with Penrose, even though he was personally objectionable. When the protective tariff is at stake, protectionist voters have no time to listen to arguments for purity in politics. The way to attack the Penroses is to attack protectionism and to offer no apologies for doing so. To be moderate in attacking it is to confess that it should not be attacked at all.

S. D.



### Cannot Always Be Fooled.

Missouri's plutocrats have failed in their attempt to hobble the Initiative and Referendum. A subservient legislature submitted what was called an anti-Singletax amendment. Its real object was to prevent use of the Initiative for any purpose distasteful to plutocracy. The drastic provisions regarding Singletax were but intended to make possible an appeal to an unreasonable prejudice. But the voters have nevertheless overwhelmingly rejected it. Judge W. H. Wallace, George W. Fal-