

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

Vol. 6. No. 52.

Lincoln, Nebraska, January 11, 1907.

Whole Number 312.

CONTENTS

STATE AND NATION
THE IOWA DISPUTE
SHIP SUBSIDY
SAGACITY
INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM
REFORM IN AUSTRIA
JAMES BRYCE
THE "RAG BABY" BOOM
WASHINGTON LETTER
COMMENT ON CURRENT TOPICS
HOME DEPARTMENT
WHETHER COMMON OR NOT
NEWS OF THE WEEK

THE IOWA DISPUTE SETTLED

The readers of The Commoner will be pleased to know of the settlement of the dispute in Iowa over the appointment of a successor to Mr. Walsh, late member of the democratic national committee. The state committee at first recommended Mr. Marsh, a man whose energy and activity in the last campaign gave him the support of the state organization. So much opposition developed, however, that he withdrew in the interest of harmony. The opposition to Mr. Marsh centered on Hon. Cato Sells, who has for many years stood in the front rank of the Iowa democracy.

After the withdrawal of Mr. Marsh the state committee recommended Ex-Congressman Martin J. Wade (a part favoring Mr. Sells), and it became a contest between two leaders, each commanding a large and loyal support. A few days ago Mr. Sells found that business interests would require him to remove to Texas in the near future, and he at once called on Mr. Wade and discussed with him the policies of the party. Being satisfied that the latter was sound on all questions and in sympathy with the aggressive and progressive element of the party Mr. Sells withdrew and asked his friends to endorse Mr. Wade.

Mr. Bryan is sufficiently acquainted with Mr. Wade to feel confident that he can be relied upon to stand for a positive and clear cut platform in the next campaign. While not in entire sympathy with the party's platform on the money question in 1896 he gave cordial support to the ticket in both 1896 and 1900 and has taken advanced ground on the trust question, the labor question, the tariff question and the question of imperialism and favors an income tax, the election of senators by the people and strict regulation of railroads.

Mr. Sells' departure is a great loss to Iowa, for no one has been more influential in the party's councils or more effective on the stump. The good wishes of the Iowa democrats will follow Mr. Sells to his new home. He will enter Texas politics with wide experience to his credit and will be the champion there, as in Iowa, of democracy pure and undefiled.

DEMOCRATIC IDEAS

The British house of commons in granting a constitution to the people of the Transvaal and the Orange River colonies gives another evidence that the liberal party is progressing toward democratic ideas. Mr. Churchill, in presenting the constitution, said that the free state had been the model small republic of the world and that the people had shown themselves eminently law-abiding and that it is only fair that they should have the same treatment as the Transvaal.



THE BURNING SHAME OF THE AGE

"STATE AND NATION"

The Portland Oregonian, discussing the "State and Nation," observes:

"To the petty oligarchies which ruled the original thirteen colonies the principle of state's rights was exceedingly dear because their power depended upon it. The political structure of the country then resembled that vague and fragile union which we see among the parts of a jelly-fish. To be sure the parts hang together after a fashion, but their dependence upon one another is of the slightest. They have the semblance of a common nervous system, but the rays of the fish are virtually independent, and if one is cut off from the rest it survives. Thus it was with the American colonies for some time after the constitution was adopted. Mr. W. M. Ivins, in an able article in the New York Press, points out that the true nervous system of the country has developed since that period. By this he means our railroads, telegraphs, telephones, mail facilities and the infinitely complex movements of interstate commerce. Because we now have a true nervous organization we have ceased nationally to resemble the starfish and may be accurately compared to those higher animals whose parts are so intimately united that none can be severed from the rest without perishing.

"The growth of the national idea in America, Mr. Ivins points out, has been unceasing since the union was organized. The force which has fostered it has been the common economic welfare of the people; the force which has continually opposed it has been the interest of special privilege. Throughout our history, exactly as today, special privilege has looked to the doctrine of state's rights for its protection. We have, says Mr. Ivins, 'forty-six sovereignties, to each of which the seekers of privilege may appeal, and every one of which sovereignties may permit the existence of conditions which make against the

national welfare.' Naturally, the endowed classes and holders of special privilege are deeply concerned in preserving those rights of the states which are to them such a boon."

The Oregonian is in error. The monopolists who are bleeding the country are the very ones who are constantly defying the state and belittling their rights. Of course they object to national legislation, and in making their objection they naturally present arguments in favor of the state, but these arguments ought not to fool anybody. Whenever the state attempts to do anything these same monopolists rush to the cover offered by the federal courts. The railroads have done more to build up the power of the federal courts than any other one influence, and there is scarcely a state legislature which the railroads have not defied. If the trust magnates and the railroad presidents had their way about it, state lines would be entirely obliterated and corporations would be chartered by the federal government. That they do not have their way about it is due to the fact that the people recognize the necessity for local self-government. It is true that the states have been brought nearer together and their relations made more intimate since the adoption of the federal constitution but the need for the state is stronger today than it was a century ago. The wide extent of our country, the increase in our population, the greater complexity of our business relations and industries, all these increase the importance of the state. The federal government could not look after the multiplied interests of the people. The founders of the constitution built more wisely than they knew when they reserved to the states the powers not delegated to the federal government. Congress has all the power that it needs. In the realm of interstate commerce it is supreme. The state can charter corporations, and so long