

would afford aid and comfort, not to the new party that had accepted their principles, but to the party that was opposing their principles. For there is that about human nature which tends strongly to develop in organized men a love for their organization which supplants their love for its cause.

✦

The Outlook for the Future.

What then remains for fundamental democrats to do?

✦

If the Republican party, entrenched in power, is now given over to plutocracy as 60 years ago the Democratic party, entrenched in power, was given over to slaveocracy; if the Democratic party can draw to itself neither the powerful plutocratic elements that would make it strongly plutocratic, nor the democratic masses who would make it truly democratic; and if the existing side parties afford no encouragement,—if all this is true, what is the outlook for the future?

No one can answer that question with certainty. But judging the future by the past, assuming that history will repeat itself in the sense that like conditions produce like results, a reasonable answer is possible.

From the historical viewpoint, the outlook for the future is disruption of the Republican party and the formation of a new party. Not a manufactured new party, but a new party spontaneously generated by some burning question of immediate national concern, involving the essential principle of aristocracy versus democracy.

Whatever that concrete question might be, it would tend to shatter the party in power and precipitate an opposition party commanding the support of one of the factions or another into which the Republican party is as certain to divide as history can foretell events.

✦

The revolting party might spring from the dominant faction of the party in power, as did the National Republicans in 1828; or from its dominated faction, as did the Democratic-Republicans in 1796; or from its dominated faction in coalition with fragments of the old opposition, as did the Republican party in 1856. But whatever the mere form of readjustment, political history points with remarkable definiteness to an outcome of that general character.

It points, too, to an outcome in particular respects not unlike the one indicated above. The coming and the going of four "eras of good feel-

ing" in our history, each closely resembling the others in detail as well as character, is suggestive at least of the manner in which the fifth may go.

✦

Meanwhile none of us can do better than wait with patience, promoting our own educational work in our several ways as best we can, and making no very definite changes of political association, until the dawn of coming events shall have thrown further light upon the political pathway.

Only one thing is as yet perfectly clear.

It is the importance of an unobstructed field for the spontaneous revolt from plutocracy when it shall occur. The less and the weaker the mere party loyalty which that revolt encounters—whether loyalty to old parties or to new ones,—the better for the cause of progress toward fundamental democracy.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

DANIEL KIEFER AND "THE PUBLIC."

Cincinnati, O., November 9—The Public owes its continuance through this year to those of its subscribers who responded (see vol. x, pages 937, 944, 1037, 1081, 1088; and vol. xi, pages 21, 165, 260, 356, 404, 764) to the call I made last Winter for a "sustention fund." In addition to these favorable responses there were letters from a very large number regretting their inability to help for the current year, but hoping that they would be able to contribute when the second year's call should be made. To those and the others who made no acknowledgment of the circular letter of last Winter for a three years' fund, I beg to quote from a circular letter now in the mails to those who are already contributors:

For myself, I have had rich compensation for my part in the work, in the association it brought me with rare minds the world over, to whom the cause so nobly served by The Public is sacred, and who have assumed their share of the cost not as a burden but as a blessing.

Notwithstanding this has been a panic year, the outlook for The Public has materially improved. Whether or not my hopes be realized, that a three year sustention period might put the paper beyond need of further subsidy, there are those who argue that The Public must nevertheless be continued. If it does not get upon a paying basis these friends urge that it be sustained continuously by the kind of support you have shared in this year, and thus be kept going in its needed and deserved position of independence.

Not only have you helped to make headway in an effort to permanently solve the problem of sustaining The Public, but you have enabled me to distribute the load which was carried for several years by its editors and a few friends. You have also proved that you too are capable of that highest test of devotion which finds happiness in sacrifice for a cause.

It was to be expected that many pledges would not be paid. Among so many subscribers a proportion of loss from the accidents of fortune was inevitable, and the expressions of unhappiness at their inability, which have come from subscribers to the fund, have been indeed painful to us to whom they were addressed. This fund for the second year thus largely reduced, will no doubt be further reduced by the withdrawal of others, who, though they have paid for the first year, are feeling severely the pinch of the times. While I urge upon all such to be frank, and to have no hesitation in withdrawing if their own circumstances are such as to necessitate withdrawal, I hope that there may be others who can and will increase their subscriptions, and that all who do withdraw from necessity will interest new supporters or send me names of possible supporters with whom I may correspond on the subject.

Payments for the second year may be made as before, in installments or at deferred periods during the year. They are not to begin until the New Year, 1909; but it is necessary that I know during the next few weeks just what may be expected, so that plans for the coming year may be made by November 30 at latest.

At the close of this year I shall prepare a detailed statement of my stewardship and of the condition of The Public. This statement, while not for general publication, will be delivered to any person in interest upon application.

An expression of opinion from every friend—whether with an offer of pecuniary support or not—will be much appreciated. All correspondence on this subject should be addressed to me at 530 Walnut street, Cincinnati.

DANIEL KIEFER.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

THE DAY AFTER ELECTION.

Milwaukee, Wis., Nov. 4.—Suppose Mr. Bryan had not sought the Democratic nomination, can any intelligent person doubt that some plutocrat calling himself a Democrat, would have been nominated by the "machine"?

He would have been supplied liberally with money, and plutocratic papers all over the country would have supported him and probably have elected him. This would have provided another historical mark for the Republicans to point to as a Democratic failure. Mr. Bryan's entering the race has saved us from that.

It has done more, for Mr. Bryan has forced the Republicans, in order to keep him out of the White House, to promise tariff revision and to guarantee prosperity. They would have liked to deliver prosperity during the past year, no doubt; but they couldn't. Can they do it in the year to come? Can they even revise the tariff? In the fight between the favored interests I doubt if they will be able to reduce it as much as 5 per cent. But they caught thousands of votes with their promises, and if they don't make good they will meet the tidal wave coming back two years hence.

If they do make good we can all cheer up. For

if we all get prosperity, what difference whether the Democrats, the Socialists or the Republicans bring it?

JOHN DOYLE.

* * *

THE WAY OUT.

Moline, Ill., Nov. 8.—Well, the third battle has been fought, and lost—"but the war goes on!" Yes, the war of democracy against privilege will go on, even to final triumph. But not the war of the Democratic party vs. the Republican. The sooner that ends the better. Party—any party—is the peculiar machine of privilege. The sole practicable pathway for successful democracy is that of direct legislation. The masses can almost always be frightened from the seeming hazard of a radical change of political policy, as involved in change of party dominance; but they cannot be frightened nor fooled from voting for single measures. They dare not elect a Democratic government for fear that it will give them not only the particular laws they wish for, but others that they either fear, or are ignorant of. Of course I voted for Bryan. But I didn't care a rap for the fact that he was a Democrat. What I cared for was the chance that Bryan would afford for democratic progress—progress toward democratic government. And that means emancipation from party government, whether identified as "Democrat" or "Republican." Party is the perfect tool of privilege, against which direct legislation is the public's sole defense. Indeed, how can we expect the public to discriminate wisely between parties—complete political regimes—if it cannot act intelligently in single acts of legislation? We ask too much of the public when we require the former; we cannot ask less than the latter. How grandly Bryan looms above his successful opponents! How his name will illumine the histories yet to be written, when society shall have advanced to his plane!

E. H. PUTNAM.

* * *

EACH FOR ALL.

I said it in the meadow path,
I say it on the mountain stairs—
The best things any mortal hath
Are those which every mortal shares.

The grass is softer to my tread,
For rest it yields unnumbered feet;
Sweeter to me the wild-rose red
Because it makes the whole world sweet.

Rich through my brothers' poverty?
Such wealth were hideous! I am blest
Only in what they share with me,
In what I share with all the rest!

And up the radiant peopled way
That opens into worlds unknown,
It will be life's delight to say,
"Heaven is not heaven for me alone."

—Lucy Larcom.

* * *

Suppose that men kill thee, cut thee in pieces,
curse thee. What then can these things do to prevent thy mind from remaining pure, wise, sober, just?—Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.