

"The Source of Bryanism"

In its effort to prove that Mr. Bryan is not a democrat, the New York World has an editorial entitled "The Source of Bryanism." From this editorial these extracts are taken:

"July 2, 1892, the first national convention of the people's party met at Omaha, Neb. * * * This convention made a powerful appeal to William J. Bryan, then a young representative in congress from the First district of Nebraska and ambitious to represent the state in the United States senate.

"Mr. Bryan helped arrange a form of fusion between Nebraska democrats and populists by which the bulk of the democratic vote was cast for Weaver, Cleveland polling fewer than 25,000 in a total of 200,000. Mr. Bryan himself is said to have voted for the populist electors.

"The platform adopted by this convention was appropriated by Mr. Bryan and has been advocated by him ever since. Indeed, with the exception of anti-imperialism, which had not then come into existence as an issue, Mr. Bryan had insistently advocated almost no important principles except those enunciated in this populist platform.

"Sometimes it is free silver; sometimes it is government ownership; sometimes it is the initiative and referendum; but each time Mr. Bryan returns to the fountainhead of his political inspiration, the populist national convention of 1892.

"This is what makes it a labor of Hercules for Mr. Bryan to try to represent true democratic principles. He is not a democrat, but a populist. Instead of applying democratic principles to changed conditions, he instinctively applies populist principles.

"For fifteen years now Mr. Bryan has been experimenting to ascertain how much populist doctrine he could cram down the throat of the democratic party. How much longer are democrats of the United States going to submit to the experiment?"

The World is a great newspaper and many of its readers have implicit confidence in it. It ought not, therefore, mislead them by making it appear that Mr. Bryan bolted the democratic national ticket in 1892. It is true that a large number of democratic votes were cast for General Weaver, but this was done in the hope of keeping Nebraska out of the republican column in that year. The plan was not "arranged" by Mr. Bryan. It was arranged by the democratic national committee and for the benefit of Mr. Cleveland. The plan was communicated to the democrats in a "confidential letter" written by the late Governor James E. Boyd under date of October 17, 1892. In that letter Governor Boyd asked democrats to vote for the Weaver electors, saying that he made the request at the instance of the democratic national committee, and he assured Nebraska democrats that this would be "a definite step toward victory and the ultimate triumph of Cleveland and Stevenson and the principles they represent." It was in that year that Mr. Bryan was the democratic nominee for re-election to congress. The populists had a candidate who made such a vigorous contest that Mr. Bryan was re-elected by but a small plurality over the republican candidate. These facts have been repeatedly published and the editor of the New York World can not be ignorant of them. For the source of what it is pleased to call "Bryanism" the New York World must go back considerably farther than the populist national convention of 1892.

According to the World Mr. Bryan appropriated the populist national platform of 1892 and the national convention of that party was "the source of Bryanism." But two years before the populist national convention of 1892 Mr. Bryan was a democratic nominee for congress and his platform advocated most of those reforms to which the World sneeringly refers as "Bryanism." Mr. Bryan's platform of 1890 was then regarded as a pretty good democratic platform.

That platform contained a plank denouncing the tariff policy of the republican party as "contrary to the spirit of our constitution, inimical to the best interests of our country and especially unjust and unfair to the people of the great northwest." That was years ago. Two years afterwards the democratic national platform denounced a tariff levied for the purpose of

protection as unconstitutional, and the candidate who ran upon that platform carried the country by a large electoral vote and by a large popular vote.

Mr. Bryan's platform of 1890 condemned the giving of subsidies and bounties of every kind, and added: "Our merchant marine can best be restored by a repeal of the laws which have caused its decline."

Mr. Bryan's 1890 platform also contained the following plank: "We favor an amendment of the federal constitution which will take the election of United States senators from the state legislatures and place it in the hands of the people, where it belongs." When that plank was written the house of representatives had never passed a resolution proposing the necessary amendment, but since that time the house has four times passed such a resolution—twice with a democratic majority and twice with a republican majority. But each time the senate has blocked the way to the submission of the amendment. More than two-thirds of the states of the union have adopted resolutions favoring this reform. The democratic national platforms, both in 1900 and 1904 endorsed this doctrine.

Mr. Bryan's platform of 1890 also favored "the Australian or some similar system of balloting which will insure to every citizen the right to cast his vote according to his own judgment, free from corruption and intimidation." Since that plank was written the Australian ballot has been adopted in a large number of states and has been of great service to the country.

Mr. Bryan's 1890 platform also contained the following plank: "We are opposed to the trust in all its forms, and favor vigorous measures for its prevention and suppression." This plank was written in the beginning of the anti-trust fight, the very year that the Sherman anti-trust law was enacted. He was instrumental in having inserted in the national platforms of 1896 and 1900 the declaration that "a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable."

The platform of 1890 also denounced the force bill as "an encroachment upon the rights of citizens and an attempt to perpetuate the republican party in power by overruling the election laws of the states;" and it also condemned the republican congressman from the Lincoln district for the support of that measure.

The platform of 1890 said: "The public domain should be preserved for the actual settlers, and we demand the enactment of a law prohibiting the holding of lands by non-resident aliens."

The platform of 1890 denounced Speaker Reed's rules as "having the intent and operation not only of overruling the rights of the minority but also of enabling an actual minority, it being a majority of the party in power, to enact legislation at the dictation of the secret caucus without deliberation or debate, thus enormously increasing the influence of a corrupt lobby. Since the adoption of the Reed rules the house has ceased to be a deliberative body, and measures are often put through without discussion and without debate, and the majority has thus been able to avoid being put on record on amendments where a record vote might be embarrassing.

Besides containing the planks above referred to, Mr. Bryan's platform of 1890 contained a pension plank and the following plank on the silver question: "We demand the free coinage of silver on equal terms with gold, and denounce the efforts of the republican party to serve the interests of Wall Street as against the rights of the people." Just before the adoption of this plank (and two years before the populist convention of 1892) about nine-tenths of the democrats of the house of representatives had voted to recommit the Sherman silver bill with instructions to report a free coinage bill.

In 1892 two years after the adoption of this congressional platform, the democratic national platform contained a plank in favor of the use of "both gold and silver as the standard money of the country," and in favor of the "coinage of both gold and silver, without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage." The principle of bimetalism was thus stated, but the plank of 1892 contained a postscript which was unfairly construed to nullify the declaration in favor of the double standard. Prior to 1890 the democratic party in the house and senate had voted almost unanimously in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of sixteen-to-one, without

waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation, and the plank in Mr. Bryan's platform was in entire harmony with the uniform policy of the party.

Although in his public speeches in 1890 and at other times prior to the populist convention of 1892 Mr. Bryan advocated the income tax, bimetalism, election of senators by popular vote and similar plans, the New York World did not then question his democracy; on the contrary the World hailed him as a pretty good sort of a democrat.

But whatever the World's opinion of Mr. Bryan may be it ought to at least be fair to its readers when it comes to the statement of simple fact.

Washington Letter

Washington, D. C., August 5.—There is one phase of the North Carolina rate controversy which should not escape public notice. Within a few hours after the arrest of President Finley of the Southern railroad for aiding and abetting in the violation of the laws of North Carolina, the whole matter was quickly compromised on practically the terms originally demanded by Governor Glenn. As long as only under-strappers in the Southern railroad were arrested the railroad was willing to fight the law and stand on their so-called rights, and incidentally upon the rights of every one else, till the crack of doom. The dignity of the federal judiciary must be maintained at all costs. North Carolina's so-called propaganda of confiscation must be fought out on the lines prescribed by the railroad if it took all summer. The Southern railroad would protect the constitution at all hazards. Unconditional surrender by Governor Glenn, and no compromise that kept in force the two and one-fourth cent per mile rate prescribed by law, were the watch-words of the railroad. As long as understrappers were arrested and sentenced to jail the railroad company was passing bold. The positions of subordinates are easily filled, and a few months in jail would do a common employe good. But when the law laid its hands on the man higher up, what a difference it made. All of which goes to show that if you want to make a monopolist obey the law and play square, you must go directly to the fountain head of corruption and law-defiance, and lay a heavy hand of justice upon the big offender. Enforce the state and criminal statutes against the heads of trusts, and give a few of them a taste of the imprisonment clause, and it will do more good than a million investigations that at their conclusion only leave the investigated in a position where they can laugh at the impotence of their inquisitors. Get after a few Finleys, and get after them in the right way, and such episodes as that in North Carolina would not recur often. It is simply the veriest humbug for a railroad paying such dividends and making such profits as the Southern itself claims, to contend that a two and one-fourth cent passenger rate per mile is confiscatory. It is to the lasting credit of Governor Glenn that he would not be fooled by such a patent fraud, and that he went direct and let the man higher up know that the jails of North Carolina still yearned for a violator of the laws even if he is a president of a railroad company. And it worked.

A press dispatch of a few days since reports attacks upon various meat shops in Philadelphia by women, which before they were quelled amounted to a good sized riot which it took all the facilities of the police department to put down. The cause of disturbance was the raising of the price of meat from ten and twelve cents to fourteen and sixteen cents a pound by the retail butcher. Investigation proved that the butchers were forced to do this by the action of the packers in raising the price of meat. Evidently the beef trust is not disposed to learn anything by past experiences. Not satisfied with having run their establishments in such an unsanitary manner as to make them an absolute menace to public health, not satisfied with having the exposure of their method cost them over \$5,000,000 in foreign trade and no one knows how much in domestic trade, they are now trying to retrench by methods which certainly will bring down upon their heads the wrath of a justly indignant public. When congress passed the meat inspection law it was more than just to the packers inasmuch as they charged the expense of inspection to the nation. But the beef trust seems to show no disposition to reciprocate.

The republican party has been singularly