

covery that Emma Goldman is not the vulgar criminal she is charged by reckless and malicious newspapers with being, but is a worthy woman of intellectual ability and humane purposes? Is there any exaggeration in saying that America is nearer Russia than one would infer from looking at a map?

+ +

Free Speech in Ohio.

A contest between the Manufacturers' Association and the Socialists in Dayton, Ohio, has ended in the discomfiture of the former. Designing to stop Socialist speaking, the Manufacturers' Association inspired the police to suppress out-door Socialist meetings arbitrarily. This was done on a Sunday night on the supposition that public street-meetings on Sunday were unlawful. But that turned out to be a mistake after the meetings were broken up by the police and the speakers arrested. Then the imprisoned speakers were accused of disorderly conduct; but the police magistrate held that there had been no disorderly conduct and discharged the accused. Socialist street speakers are doing good work in resisting these aggressions of the police authorities who have entered upon a crusade against free speech. Orderly public meetings should be encouraged, or at least not suppressed, no matter what doctrines they advocate. This is the true way of maintaining order.

+ +

Taxation of Life Insurance Companies.

When the mania for taxing everything in sight, and everything not in sight that can be discovered, reaches to the life insurance business, it comes very close to the extreme of absurdity as well as injustice. Even a babe ought almost to understand that a tax upon the life insurance business adds to the cost of doing that business, and therefore to the cost of insurance. If low taxes or no taxes on life insurance do not always reduce premiums, the reason is that insurance companies conspire to keep premiums up. But taxation of life insurance absolutely necessitates high premiums. It is like a permanent increase in the death rate. People who advocate life insurance taxation are therefore advocating taxation of the industrious, the prudent and the thrifty. Life insurance should be encouraged by exemption from taxation. It should not be made more expensive to the insured than actual cost, either by insurance combines or by taxation of the insurance business.

+ + +

No man can be fit for liberty who will not allow it to the other man.—The Silent Partner.

THE FUTURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

In all probability the future of the Democratic party will be determined at Denver in July. Not merely its immediate future; of course that goes without the saying. But its future in the sense of its fate.

Should there be reaction toward plutocracy at Denver, the Denver convention of 1908 would probably be to the Democratic party of the plutocratic period—in general effect, whatever the variation in detail—somewhat as the Charleston convention of 1860 was to the Democratic party of the chattel slavery period.

The circumstances are such that the defeat of Bryan by means of the old pro-slavery two-thirds rule, would very likely be the outward sign of that inward reaction. But if Bryan is nominated, and there seems no longer to be the remotest reason for doubting that he will be, then the fate of the party will depend upon the confidence it continues to hold, and the further confidence its course in the campaign inspires, in its tendency away from the flesh pots of Egypt and toward the goal of democratic principle.

Whether it wins or loses at the election will make little difference. The vital thing will be the reputation it earns among democratic Democrats and democratic Republicans, in the Presidential campaign now before it.

+

The most thoughtful literary contribution on this subject has not yet commanded the attention it deserves. We refer to the leading article in the *Atlantic Monthly* for May, by Thomas Mott Osborne.

Mr. Osborne lives in a mental atmosphere saturated with high-toned business traditions; for he inherited the management of the Osborne agricultural implement works at Auburn. But the possible untoward influence of business associations in a commercial era in which "high tone" has become in business circles hardly more than a name, was neutralized in his temperamental tendencies by the best of anti-slavery traditions.

He has, moreover, had personal experience in the "good government" phases of reform—the "goo-goo" experience as it is called by the politically irreverent. But if it be cynically said that "the 'goo-goo' is a good citizen who has never been tempted," and that "after temptation the 'goo-goo' becomes either a moral crusader or a respectable crook," even his most virulent enemy would have to place Mr. Osborne in the crusader

class of "goo-goo" products. Family tradition and civic experience alike, tend to make him an idealist in politics. To these experiences, however, must be added official experiences as a former mayor of Auburn, and as a present member of one of the public utilities commissions of the State of New York; they emphasize the influence of his superior business traditions and tend to make him prudent and practical.

All these together, supplemented with the subtle influences of an aristocratic social and intellectual environment from youth up, incline Mr. Osborne personally to the daintier side in political alignments. A fundamental democrat to the core, both in mind and heart, he nevertheless seems to recoil as instinctively from democratic groups that are not "Harvardized," so to speak, as from plutocratic groups that are. A weaker or less scrupulous young man of his temperament, associations and training, would most likely have remained within the respectable surroundings of the Republican party into which he was born, instead of going over as he has done to the Democratic party. For it must be conceded that in the latter there is a desert of rudeness to repel, and only a few oases of conventional refinement to attract, any one of fastidious likes and dislikes.

These personal references and estimations seem necessary to a fair appreciation of Mr. Osborne's paper in its entirety. Though in the main a paper which deserves to rank high as an example of political interpretation, its perspective seems to us distorted by the density of its author's business and cultural atmosphere the moment Mr. Bryan's figure comes into his field of vision.

+

Mr. Osborne does gross injustice to Bryan and grosser injustice to himself by echoing the criticism, long ago consigned to the scrap pile of partisan misrepresentations, that Bryan's advocacy of the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain made him partly responsible for imperialism in the Philippines.

Every one should realize at this historical distance from that event, that it was not the treaty of peace with Spain that made imperialism in the Philippines. It was the rage for imperialism that afterwards set in among the American people. More responsible by far than Bryan for imperialism in the Philippines, were those anti-imperialists whom this false accusation against Bryan made lukewarm in the Presidential campaign of 1900; for that campaign, had it ended in Bryan's election instead of his defeat, would

have put an immediate end to imperialism and restored the Philippine republic.

What Bryan advocated was not imperialism, but a treaty of peace—the only treaty of peace offered. That treaty left it to this country to determine the political fate of the Philippines, and incidentally our own. But it did not compel our people to imperialize. It only gave them the option, and until it was ratified they had not even the option. The whole matter until then was one of military power and not of constitutional authority. The treaty of peace took the question of imperialism away from the autocratic power of the war office, where it then was and where it would have remained indefinitely had this treaty of peace been rejected, and referred it to the American people. The war office had already begun an imperial regime. There was no way of stopping it except by an appeal to the American people on the basis of their democratic traditions. But this could not be made while the war with Spain legally continued; and the war with Spain would have legally continued, no one knows how long, if Bryan's influence had not turned the scale in favor of the ratification of that particular treaty of peace.

Most clearly the treaty ought to have cared for the Philippines as it did for Cuba, and Bryan would have had it so. Its failure to do this was not Bryan's fault. If he used his influence at all, it had to be for that particular treaty of peace or none.

The partisanship of the time that tried to influence votes by so misrepresenting this episode as to make Bryan appear equally responsible with McKinley for the Philippine usurpation, we can understand. But we never could understand anti-imperialists who fell into that particular trap; nor can we understand Mr. Osborne now, except upon the temperamental explanation we have already suggested. For he, at so late a day as this and in another connection, makes a fling at Bryan by suggesting with reference to the campaign of 1900 that it was absurd to try "to awaken enthusiasm over a fight against imperialism with a candidate who was himself partly responsible for the ratification of the Philippine treaty."

+

Mr. Osborne is much more considerate in his reference to the financial campaign of 1896. As to this he recognizes, even if dimly, that regardless of the economics of the financial issue, plutocratic conditions justified the revolt that Bryan led, in so far as it was "a revolt against existing conditions," and "in so far as it was a protest

against the betrayal of the party by their leaders in the matter of tariff reform."

But an unreasoning antipathy to Bryan appears again when Mr. Osborne considers the future of the party. His allusion here to Bryan as an idolized leader, the object of "undiscriminating adulation," regarding whom the people must be warned that they "should not tie up to any one man, no matter how good or how great he may be—or how well he talks." To account for these allusions upon any other ground than unreasoning antipathy would unjustly discredit Mr. Osborne's faculties as a political observer. In the abstract, to be sure, he is right in condemning indiscriminating adulation of leaders. But there is far less indiscriminating adulation of Bryan than there has been of any other popular leader in our country's history. There is incalculably less of it than of indiscriminating antipathy.

If Bryan is idolized, it is not for his personality but for his proved fidelity. His is not the case of a Webster or a Clay, who could go from one side to the other of great issues and take their following with them. For his personal fortunes, the people who "idolize" Bryan care little, except as they may humanly care for everybody's. But for the proof Bryan has given that he has convictions, that they are profound, that their tendency is fundamentally democratic, that they transcend and dominate his personal ambitions, and that plutocratic overtures, no matter how tempting in substance or subtle in approach, do not faze him—for these reasons it is, and for these alone, that Bryan is so widely and intensely idolized.

Mr. Osborne is right again, in the abstract, when he deplors the tying up to any one leader, and advises that in a multitude of counselors there is wisdom. But where is this multitude of counselors whom the democrats of the Democratic party may tie up to as they tie up to Bryan? Mr. Osborne neither names nor hints at one. Although he prints Cleveland's name, it is as an historical figure and not as a contemporary leader. And does he suppose that if Cleveland were in the fullness of his powers, his leadership would evoke any enthusiasm outside the circle of his personal admirers, except from the identical plutocratic sources that strengthen the conditions against which the democratic masses of all parties are in revolt? Mr. Osborne's neglect to name leaders who measure up to Bryan in the necessary respects, can hardly be because he would not but because he cannot.

Doubtless he knows of men who would make such leaders. So do we. Doubtless he knows of men who are such leaders within special circles

and localities, some narrow and some wide, but none national. So do we. We know of men who would measure up to our own specific views in all respects better than Bryan does in all respects. But there is no man, national in his influence and in the confidence he commands, who even approaches Bryan as a representative of the present stage of democratic development on national issues.

This is not an inference, nor a loose guess, nor a wish in the guise of a thought. It is a statement of a fact—a statement in another form of what everybody knows to be true, that Bryan is the only national leader in the Democratic party whom the masses of the people of the party of the whole country, in contradistinction to its machines and bosses and plutocratic newspapers, do in fact believe in and follow.

✦

When out of the range, however, of the disturbing influence of Bryan upon his perceptions and judgment, Mr. Osborne discusses the great facts from which the future of the Democratic party must be inferred, in a manner which, as we have already said, entitles his paper in the May Atlantic to rank high as an example of political interpretation. To be appreciated, the paper in its entirety should be read. It is an impressive paper, not only in the sweep of its thought and the charm of its diction, but also in the purity and sanity of its democracy. In the hope that whoever reads this comment may read every word of the paper itself, we venture a brief summary.

Wisely enough, though hesitatingly, Mr. Osborne seeks an understanding of the Democratic party of to-day by looking for an explanation of democracy, and of democracy by inquiring into its origin. In the course of this inquiry, he brings out in excellent proportion and with suggestive emphasis, the development of organized society through the four stages preceding the real advent of democracy.

Beginning with the dominance of brute strength, he finds that this developed into imperialism, the rule of master over slave, of which Rome is the historic type. But the rule of master over slave could not withstand the influence of the philosophy and religion which trickled through society though thus organized. With a great crash, imperialism went down and feudalism slowly arose. The enslaving impulse had not died however, but under feudalism it took the form of lord and vassal. As feudalism declined, paternalism, "based upon the relation of a parent claiming divine right and his children seeking guidance, came to poli-

tical development," only to give way in turn to aristocracy, "the domination of a ruling caste, a nobility of material success, sometimes of birth," as descent from freebooter or sycophant; "sometimes of wealth," as landlords; "sometimes of intellect," as "statecraft, commerce, letters or beer;" and "sometimes a mixture of all these." It was in the decline of aristocracy that democracy as a concrete experiment in government on a large scale arose. It arose because aristocracy, however plausible, is untrue to the natural laws of human association. Mr. Osborne graphically argues:

The rule of a privileged few, whether their claim be founded on birth, wealth, scholarship, or what not, is in practice a selfish and arrogant domination. It is the same old story. "How much better the world would be governed if the ignorant many were only willing to be guided by the wise few!" cry those who consider themselves the wise and aspire to be the few. It is a plausible argument. But the many always refuse, and always will refuse, to listen, when the few commit the grievous error of exchanging their intellectual influence for political domination. Moreover, the many have always shown that politically they are wiser in the long run than the aristocrats. For the judgment of the many remains in the mass unselfish, while the privileged few upon whom the gift of power has been bestowed have proved that with the gift of power go the fatal gifts of pride, luxury, ambition, greed,—these in place of that righteousness which alone would defend the placing of man in power over his fellow-man. "No man," said Lincoln with deep insight, "is good enough to rule another man, without that other's consent."

The democratic experiment to which Mr. Osborne refers, arose under favorable circumstances, as he views them. Not only was it in a broad sense no experiment, since "every other system of government had failed to satisfy mankind," but it got its foothold on a new continent, "where England, the island country which had been enabled to pursue most naturally its own development, had planted colonies where freedom was breathed in with the very air." Then came the natural and inevitable division into political parties—the progressive and the conservative,—Hamilton giving personality to the latter and Jefferson to the former. These divisions are characterized as natural, healthy and inevitable, because it is instinctive with some natures to press forward progressively toward new good, and of others to hold fast conservatively to the good they have. Both are necessary to a republic because—

without the curb of the conservative the progressive party would rush forward too fast, and taking no time for proper consideration of the way, find itself arriving with scattered forces at wrong destinations; without the stimulus of the progressive, the conservative party would lag behind, becoming more and more stupid and reactionary, until it would ulti-

mately find itself going backwards, rather than forwards.

With the passage of time the progressive following of Jefferson fell, as Mr. Osborne finds, into the Democratic-Republican party, which glided naturally in Jackson's day into the Democratic party, the change presenting two phases of one party rather than two periods with different parties. When the slavery question arose, it confused the natural alignments of this party; also of its opponent, which from Federalist had become Whig. Slavery is treated by Mr. Osborne as a survival from imperialism, a special interest which had seized upon the Democratic party "to advance its own natural welfare and intrench itself in power without consideration of party welfare."

While slavery lasted no progress was possible. Its removal however was not the proper task of the Whigs, says Mr. Osborne, "for they formed the conservative party of that day." It was therefore inevitable, unless the Democratic party became democratic by turning against slavery, that a new party would be formed by progressives. As the Democratic party did fail in this democratic duty, the Republican party sprang into the arena.

But after the slavery fight was over, then— exactly as the Democratic party before the war, its organization seized upon by the slave power, had changed from a party of progress to one of reaction, so the Republican organization, captured by certain powerful commercial interests, now became in its turn a party of reaction.

As the remainder of Mr. Osborne's able and suggestive paper deals with the political situation resulting from reaction in the Republican party, a situation in which we are still entangled, his further observations are very likely to appear sound or unsound according to the bias of readers, and may be so in fact according to the bias of their writer. To some of them we should not agree, as we have already explained; others seem to us eminently sound. But the really important thing is the significance of the history of democracy, as Mr. Osborne indicates it, with reference to the future of the Democratic party.

Will the party throw off its part of the incubus of the new special interests that have wholly captured the Republican party, or will it again fail of its democratic duty and thereby create the conditions out of which a new party will spring full-armed and ready for the fray. In our judgment the true prophecy may be spelled out in the proceedings at Denver six weeks hence.



With Mr. Osborne's view in his own conclusions

upon the subject, that there must come "some progressive party," we are in hearty accord. And with him we ask whether that will be the Democratic party made again democratic, or a new party springing spontaneously, as the Republican party did half a century ago, out of the other parties. Again, we agree with him that "progress can be made with much less waste of energy and expenditure of labor under an old organization than under a new;" and still again, when he implies that if the old one fails to rise to the occasion the new one will surely come.

We do not agree with him, however, that "the leaders of the party should forget their quarrels and unite," for those who are quarreling now, quarrel over the very issue at stake—democracy or plutocracy,—and there can be no real union between these two irreconcilable elements. If those leaders unite, the Democratic party will not rise to the occasion. Neither do we agree with Mr. Osborne in his slightly veiled and not very conciliatory intimation that Mr. Bryan should "put aside" his "personal ambitions" in order that the party may win. Were Mr. Bryan to lay aside what his enemies are pleased to call his "personal ambitions," he would be compromising with the enemies of democracy within the Democratic party, and would not only lose the confidence of the democratic masses but would deserve to.

Yet we do agree with Mr. Osborne, and most cordially, when in this connection he rises above the influences that have here and there diverted the true current of his thought, as we consider it, and says of this sacrifice of "personal ambitions":

Or if we grant that while such action would be magnificent it would not be politics, as it is played nowadays, let us come back to the people. For everything in a democracy does come back sooner or later to the people. If Democrats remain indifferent and discouraged how can they hope to succeed? But if they will arouse themselves to the struggle; realize their responsibilities; forget former defeats and divisions and think only of the future—of the chance to make their party once more what it was formed to be, has been, and can be made, the great party of progress, the party of democracy; if they will do this, not only can they again place their president in the White House, to occupy the chair of Jefferson, Jackson, and Cleveland, but they can start a new wave of genuine and orderly progress which will uplift the people of this democratic republic to a higher place than has ever yet been reached.

+

"Let us come back to the people!" That is the true word. But as we do come back to the people, what is the response we get? Is it not this as to policies?—Democracy for all in place of special privileges for some. And is it not this as to can-

didates?—The only leader in the Democratic party to-day who holds the confidence of the democracy of the whole country, is William J. Bryan.

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 Tuesday, June 2, 1908.

Presidential Politics.

In reply to Mr. Taft's telegram in answer to Mr. Bryan's proposal regarding publicity of campaign contributions (p. 199), Mr. Bryan telegraphed Mr. Taft on the 26th as follows:

I am very much gratified to receive your telegram and trust the publication of your letter will add the weight necessary to turn the scales in favor of the measure. Elections are public affairs, and publicity will help to purify politics.

Mr. Bryan also wired Senator Culberson and Representative Williams on the same day, saying:

Please secure copies of my telegrams to Secretary Taft and his reply concerning campaign contributions. His letter to Senator Burrows may enable you to secure action on the bill.

But Congress took no action.

+

Although Mr. Taft is said to have a majority of the delegates to the Republican national convention, it is now reported that the seats of 229 of them are contested, and that 147 of these contests involve a hard fight between the Taft and the anti-Taft managers. They include eleven State contests, involving 44 delegates; ninety district contests, involving 180 delegates; two Territorial contests, involving 4 delegates, and a fight over a single delegate in Pennsylvania, making a total of 229 delegates involved in the fighting. The hearing of the contests will begin before the national committee on the 5th.

+

Mr. Taft has evoked criticism, of which his Republican adversaries are making much, because in his Memorial Day address at Grant's Tomb, in New York, he included in his story of Grant as the military hero of the Civil War this incidental reference to the unpromising beginnings of Grant's military career:

But in 1854 he resigned from the army because he had to. He had yielded to the weakness of a taste