

Listen to the Voice of Nebraska Democracy!

Those over-zealous Clark editors who have been calling Mr. Bryan a traitor will please publish the indorsement given Mr. Bryan by the democratic state convention of Nebraska and explain to their readers why a delegate to a national convention should be criticised for carrying out the sentiments of his constituents.

Mr. Metcalfe's Speech at the Nebraska Democratic Convention

Following is the address delivered by Richard L. Metcalfe at the democratic state convention for Nebraska at Grand Island, in defense of the Bryan resolution:

It is true, as one gentleman has said, Mr. Bryan needs no indorsement at the hands of this convention. The things he did at Baltimore place him beyond the pale of the sort of criticism urged against him here. Bryan is not on trial. This convention and the democratic party of Nebraska are on trial; and you are to say in this very tent, and within this very hour, whether you want your party to be progressive or reactionary, whether you want it to stand for popular government or for government by the few.

One of the speakers has complained that Mr. Bryan shook hands with the leader of Tammany and that on one occasion he said "Great is Tammany." Mr. Bryan in politics must work with the tools at hand. You democrats have permitted such organizations as Tammany to grow and thrive within your party councils and so long as you have failed to purge your party of them you are estopped from complaining that a party leader has associated with the men and the organizations you have permitted and provided for your party use.

"Who will be satisfied with the passage of this resolution?" asks one of the speakers. I'll tell you who will be satisfied. Men and women everywhere who know a man when they see him and admire the highest sort of courage and the best form of patriotic effort shown under the most discouraging circumstances—they will be satisfied with the passage of this resolution.

Those who honestly object to this resolution and are not governed purely by malice are unable to understand the things going on about them today. When the representative of the north and the representative of the south clashed in the United States senate in ante-bellum days they called it a fist fight. They learned better later, just as they know now that that conflict was among the epoch making incidents all pointing the way to a great crisis in our country's affairs. We are face to face with such a crisis at this time. On the one hand we find growing unrest among the people. We find a breaking down of party ties, an increasing disrespect for party platforms. We find the socialist party offering what many of us believe to be an impossible theory. We find the republican party all but wrecked by a pliant submission to special interests; and we find leaders in the democratic party—a party whose declared principles are in harmony with the foundation of this government as the fathers laid it—we find these leaders seeking to lead that party away from its principles, seeking to wreck it on the same rock that has shattered the republican ship. At this very moment when a large portion of the republican party is going democratic these leaders are seeking to make the democratic party go republican.

BRYAN AT BALTIMORE

What did Mr. Bryan accomplish at Baltimore? If that convention had adjourned, as it opened, with the reactionary program in full swing there would have been no convention hall in the land big enough to hold the forces that would gather under the banner of the new progressive party. Make no mistake—Theodore Roosevelt is to be a foeman worthy of your steel. He has had a personal popularity unlike that of any other public man in all the world's history and with all of his inconsistencies it is admitted that he has done much to advance the cause of the progressive principle. You must meet him yet upon the field of battle. Had it not been for Bryan's fight and Bryan's victory your struggle with the new progressive party would have been utterly hopeless; for there are men, thoughtful and experienced democrats and republicans alike, who believe that in spite of Bryan's victory at Baltimore, in spite of any-

thing that might have happened at Chicago democratic and republican party alike is at heart reactionary and that nothing in the way of real reform may be expected at the hands of either of them. There are men who honestly believe that it would have been better for this country had Bryan lost the battle at Baltimore, for then whatever course he might have taken there would have been that political realignment that is bound to come if any genuine reform is brought about in our public affairs. In this connection I want to read to you an editorial that appeared in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, a really independent paper. However sternly it may strike my party or my position I feel within my heart that every word of this editorial is true. Here it is:

"Colonel Bryan says four-fifths of the democratic party is progressive. No doubt he is right; but the conservative fifth would have controlled proceedings at Baltimore except for the remarkable fight made personally by the Nebraskan. It was a great fight and a famous victory. It probably postpones for some time that completely new and rational party alignment which began at Chicago. The democratic party, however, is still the party of Ryan, Murphy, Parker, Taggart. They lost by a hair at Baltimore. Next time they may win.

"The party name has no permanent meaning. That it stands for progress in this national campaign is hardly more than a happy accident. Four years hence the determining accident—or incident—may be less happy; while in New York, for example, national democratic victory simply renews and strengthens Tammany's lease of power.

"If a reactionary or pliant candidate had been named at Baltimore he might have won this year; but his nomination would have accelerated that disruption of the present organizations which is bound to come. Governor Wilson gets the nomination under especially favorable circumstances. Of all names before the convention, his was least acceptable to the tory contingent, and it opposed him to the last. Not only his own inclinations, but the circumstances of his nomination, pledge him to an out-and-out progressive administration. We have no doubt he will do his best to give such an administration if elected. But we are still anxious to see party alignment on a basis of fixed principles and party names that have meaning."

INTERRUPTED BY OMAHA MAN

You are doing what you can here tonight to prove the correctness of the claim that the priceless principles in your party's creed are for mere dress parade. You are doing what you can to prove the truth of this editorial.

(Here some member from the Omaha delegation shouted that Roosevelt and Bryan should travel together.)

"Thank you for reminding me of that" retorted Mr. Metcalfe. "That reminds me that there appeared in this morning's World-Herald an editorial saying that Governor Wilson's managers had decided to pit Mr. Bryan against Mr. Roosevelt. The World-Herald congratulated them upon this fine decision and then concluded with this paragraph:"

"Meanwhile Woodrow Wilson having by one splendid stroke of policy taken care of both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Bryan, will be free to go on with his campaign, sedately and with dignity, as he had planned. He's a wise man, that Woodrow Wilson, and everybody ought to vote for him. Nearly everybody will."

In other words your party organs and your party leaders are quite willing to use Bryan against Roosevelt whose popularity with the people you can not match and whose indictments against special interest government you can not meet; you are quite willing that this man should go out and fight your battles for you against a man you dare not face upon the field; Bryan, you admit, is the only man who can cope with

Roosevelt yet you would deride him and insult him at Baltimore and you would cover him with insults here. What a happy combination, from your viewpoint as well expressed in this World-Herald editorial, of using Bryan to fight your battles with Roosevelt, and thus disposing of both of these troublesome gentlemen with one skillful move. Do you think you can play this sort of a game long without exposing it to the men who admire Bryan because of the faithful battles he has made for popular government? Do you imagine, even at this moment that they do not see through the thin veil that the party leaders—who would elevate and honor the Belmonts and the Ryans while they hate such men as Bryan—throw over their ingenious plans? You have nothing but words of censure for Bryan but you have no censure for your democratic organizations in New York where Murphy rules. Taggart tried to resign from the national committee in Indiana and you ceased your attacks on Bryan long enough to persuade Taggart to recall his resignation. There are known representatives of special interests holding powerful places throughout your party and you are so busy denouncing Bryan that you have no time to protest against this practice of using the livery of heaven for the service of satan.

You say that if we pass this resolution it will be a reflection upon Champ Clark and that it will "fill Champ Clark's cup to the full." Champ Clark is a great and a good man. I am sorry for any man when he meets the great disappointment that must have been his when he failed to realize upon his life's ambition. But we are not interested in any individual. So far as this great issue is concerned Champ Clark is a closed incident. He had his opportunity when he was invited by Bryan to take his stand with the progressives on the temporary chairmanship. It is not so much what he did as what he failed to do.

MANAGERS MADE BAD GUESS

As a practical proposition Mr. Clark's managers guessed that Murphy was a bigger man than Bryan. As a practical proposition Governor Wilson's managers guessed that Bryan was a bigger man than Murphy—and the Wilson managers guessed right the very first time.

Mr. Clark lost the nomination upon a false move or, if you please, upon a failure to make the right move and he has no one to blame but the gentlemen who managed his campaign, some of whom are just as intimate with the special interests in every day life as they were upon the floor of that convention hall.

But Mr. Clark is, after all, of no concern in this fight. It matters not who happened to be hurt by what Bryan did at Baltimore. It matters not even what the instructions to Bryan were at the primaries. He was chosen a delegate because it was known that he would fight the system wherever and however he found it. Had it been known in advance what the lineup at Baltimore would be Mr. Clark could not have secured an indorsement in this state.

You men are to say now whether Bryan did right. So far as Bryan is concerned, personally, your action is of no moment. We all know where he stands. The question is where do you stand? Where does the democratic party stand? By this action at Baltimore he gave you the one possible hope you would have had for victory—and had he been defeated not one of you would have given a penny for the democratic party's chance.

Whatever you may say of him here is of no importance to him personally. He has made his mistakes but the people understand him. He has fixed his place in history and you are baying at the moon when you try to injure him by vicious assaults and your thinly veiled innuendo.

Gentlemen here have spoken about harmony. Again I say to you that they have no understanding of the crisis confronting our country. Men may easily harmonize upon a personal difference. Petty quarrels may be speedily disposed of. But the real question under discussion tonight can not be compromised. There can be no harmony upon it unless all stand upon one side or upon the other, for one great line runs through it all and that line separates those who believe in popular government, from those who believe in government by the special interests.

What is the matter with the democratic