

Will Democrats Invite Defeat?

Surely no well-informed democrat can be deluded into the belief that it would be party policy to nominate a reactionary. While the division in the republican ranks seems to insure success, unless the Baltimore convention makes some egregious mistake, still the party's chance of success rests entirely upon the nomination of a progressive democrat, upon a progressive platform. In no possible contingency would it be politic to nominate a man suspected of reactionary tendencies.

The republican national convention may do one of three things, and no one at this time can say which. It may renominate President Taft, but if it does so, it will be through the influence of the southern delegates, for Mr. Taft is not likely to have a majority of the delegates from the northern states. In case Mr. Taft is nominated, the progressive republicans—that is, the rank and file—would be likely to support any democrat known to be progressive; but as between Mr. Taft and a reactionary democrat, they would naturally prefer Mr. Taft, and thus, with the slump that would follow among progressive democrats, would insure Mr. Taft's election.

But the Chicago convention may nominate Mr. Roosevelt for a third term, in which case the nomination of a reactionary democrat would be equally fatal, because Mr. Roosevelt would draw enough progressive democrats to offset his loss among the stand-pat republicans, so that his election would be assured. The nomination of a progressive democrat, on the other hand, would insure the defeat of Mr. Roosevelt, because a progressive democrat would hold the progressive vote, and the republicans who oppose Mr. Roosevelt would have nowhere else to go and would vote the democratic ticket from necessity.

But a third contingency is possible. The fight between Taft and Roosevelt has become so bitter, that they may be put aside and a dark horse nominated. If La Follette should happen to be the lucky man, it would take a very strong progressive democrat to hold all of the democratic votes. A reactionary democrat would be defeated before the battle was begun. If the dark horse proved to be a man satisfactory to both the Roosevelt and the Taft element, democratic chances would be very much lessened, and no one could hope for success, unless he was in a position to take advantage of the progressive sentiment of the country—a reactionary would have no possible show of election. This is the situation, as anyone must clearly see who will give a moment's time to the serious consideration of politics.

Why, then, are the democrats willing to invite defeat by encouraging the candidacy of a reactionary? It is easy enough to understand the tactics of Wall street, because Wall street has no politics. It does not matter to Wall street whether the president is a democrat or republican, provided he goes to Wall street for advice. What Wall street wants is to nominate both tickets, and then elect the republican ticket; for it is beyond Wall street's power to elect the democratic ticket, even if it wanted to. It can not throw its entire influence to the democratic ticket, for however satisfactory the candidate himself may be to Wall street, Wall street is afraid of the democratic party, and it knows that a democratic president could not carry out Wall street's policies, even if he used all the patronage in his effort to do so. The most that Wall street could do is to nominate a democrat who would be easily defeated; and having nominated a man whom the rank and file of the party would not support, it would then abandon him to his fate, and leave the party where it left it in 1904.

Can it be possible that the democrats, who have fought so loyally for twenty years against the predatory interests, can be duped at this time; and are they willing to throw away the best chance they have had of victory, merely to please the element that has brought defeat to the party for sixteen years? Will the democrats risk the election of Mr. Roosevelt for a third term, with all that that means in the overthrow of the traditions of the nation? Will they, by nominating a reactionary, enable Mr. Taft to regain the confidence of the people—confidence which he has lost as few presidents have lost it?

The road would seem to be a plain one—

leading to victory, with all that victory would mean to our party. Both principle and policy point the way. The party needs only to "have faith in the wisdom of doing right," it needs only to stand firm and retain the confidence that its splendid fight has won.

If the republicans had authorized the democrats to map out a course for the republican party with the view of securing the overwhelming defeat of that party, a democratic committee could not have advised all of the mistakes that the republican leaders have made, and the democrats would have been ashamed to ask the president and the ex-president to enter into the unseemly fight in which they are now engaged. Surely the circumstances favor the democrats, unless the democrats themselves deliberately destroy the hope of democratic victory; and they can destroy it in but one way, viz., by surrender to the interests, by retreat from the high position that they have occupied, by compromise with those who are exploiting the masses.

WALL STREET'S MISTAKE

Editorial in Cincinnati Enquirer: Reactionary bulletins claiming Texas and Maryland for a reactionary candidate no longer pass, even with the most gullible, and the indications are exceedingly strong that Tennessee, Michigan and Kentucky have all disappointed the hopes of the managers of the ex-attorney general of the United States.

In every state of the union, save in Ohio, this candidacy is at an end, and that May 21 will end it in Ohio no one who is in touch with the progressive sentiment of the voters can doubt for a moment.

Those who promoted it were guided by false hopes, inspired by selfish considerations to a large extent, and were wonderfully obtuse to the prevailing political conditions, which vetoed such a movement, barred such a candidate, and decreed defeat to both from the very inception of the plan.

For more than four years it has been apparent that the republican party was abandoning its old leaders, getting away from embarrassing alliances, and in every campaign since it has been approaching closer and closer to the principles and policies outlined by the democratic party in 1896 and in the subsequent campaigns.

The voters of the two parties have become very much closer in thought, and leader after leader of the stand-pat republican element has been quietly relegated to private life, or publicly executed by compelling him to walk the plank to political doom.

The republican party has been reformed, and transformed, and its members are no longer thinking upon the same lines that they did even ten years ago.

A republican who is not a progressive has no standing or influence in his party, and that being so with our political opponents, what consummate folly it was in a few men of Wall street to think they could capture and control the great party of progress, the democratic party, by nominating a candidate who, if successful, would turn back the hands of the national timepiece 20 years, as far as national issues were concerned.

Well, they tried their best, and have failed in every state, for Ohio, on May 21, will record her vote in favor of progress and will elect progressive delegates to the Baltimore convention.

It is most fortunate that these baseless claims of the reactionary managers have been so completely exploded in the outside states before the democrats of Ohio are called upon to choose their representatives to the convention.

Every democrat in the state can now see there has never been any foundation for the claims of these so-called national and state managers.

It has been a series of bombastic utterances, their campaign; a tissue of misrepresentation as to democratic sentiment in all the other states, through which they hoped to delude the democrats of Ohio.

OHIO INDICTMENT OF HARMON

Progressive candidates for delegates to the national democratic convention present the following indictment against Governor Harmon:

First—We favor the nomination of a democratic candidate of the "Bryan school" and re-

Heve that in the candidacies of Champ Clark, Woodrow Wilson, Thomas R. Marshall, Joseph W. Folk, Governor Burke, Ollie James and Governor Foss, the democratic party has sufficient material from which to select the most capable and acceptable leadership; and that under such leadership an aggressive democracy will move forward to certain victory.

Second—We are opposed to the nomination of any reactionary presidential candidate. We do not believe the democratic party can afford now to look back, having once more put its hand to the plow. We are opposed to Parkerizing and paralyzing the democratic party this year.

Third—We do not believe in the candidacy of any man who, in the trying days of '96, while a "watchman on the tower" preferred to aid and abet in the election of the high priest of protection, rather than to contribute by voice or vote to the success of progressive democracy.

Fourth—We do not believe in the candidacy of any man who wanted in 1873 to "kill the democratic party."

Fifth—We do not believe in the candidacy of any man who as governor would leave his post of duty and for upward of four weeks resume his old role of "special pleader" for a giant corporation (The C. & O. R. R.) in a suit to deprive a widow of her due.

Sixth—We do not favor the nomination of a "double dealer" who is all things to all people under all conditions—a "wet" amongst the "wets," and a "dry" amongst the "drys" and nothing any place.

Seventh—We do not favor the nomination of a candidate who, twice elected on a people's platform, will openly repudiate that platform and, in a game of "mock heroics," urge a constitutional convention to repudiate the personal pledges of practically four-fifths its members—much as he himself would be capable of repudiating—and advise them not to give the people even the opportunity to say whether they want the initiative and referendum embodied in the constitution.

Eighth—We are in favor of a "state ride" that will lead a progressive and militant democracy to keep its banner of progress waving and to save itself from the impossible candidacy of an impossible candidate.

A DOUBTFUL COMPLIMENT

The following compliment will not impress favorably those who object to having a president who is on intimate terms with the heads of big business, but Governor Harmon's friends seem to rely on such indorsements. The Baltimore Sun says:

"Judge J. A. C. Bond, of Westminster, was in Baltimore recently and talked a good deal about Governor Harmon, of Ohio. He was at the railroad station to meet Mr. Harmon when he arrived in Baltimore and is strongly in favor of his nomination by the Baltimore convention. Judge Bond was a close friend of the late John K. Cowen, with whom he was associated in the law department of the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, and after Mr. Cowen's death Judge Bond, then president of the state bar association, got Governor Harmon to read a paper on Mr. Cowen before the bar association. He selected Mr. Harmon because he and Mr. Cowen were friends and boys together in Ohio. Indeed, Judge Bond said that he knew it to be a fact that President Cleveland offered the portfolio of attorney general of the United States to Mr. Cowen, but he declined and urged the appointment of Judge Harmon. The office of attorney general, Judge Bond added, was also offered to Mr. Cowen by President McKinley."

It seems that Mr. Cowen suited two presidents.

GAYNOR A "PEOPLE'S MAN"

To the Editor of The New York World: My choice for president is W. J. Gaynor. He has proved by his work throughout his whole career as lawyer, economic preacher, judge and mayor that he possesses the most salient qualifications for chief magistrate of the United States.

With knowledge of the laws of the country, executive ability of the highest order, moral courage to administer his office to the best good of most of the people, he is fearless, honest and not a political demagogue.

His little eccentricities are to be overlooked as harmless and characteristic of a man of his type. If ever there was a people's man, literally speaking, Gaynor stands out today as one.

Brooklyn, May 6.

A. K. S.