

izers' movement, told what the purpose of this movement was. Here is what is said:

"Those democrats who oppose Bryan and who advocate the reconstruction of democracy with Bryanism expunged, are about to carry that issue into the south and west. One of the principal battlegrounds will be in the state of Nebraska, where Mr. Bryan still retains, nominally at least, the control of the machinery of his party.

"It is proposed to crush Mr. Bryan's influence in his own state and to prevent at all costs his control of the Nebraska delegation to the next democratic national convention.

"Mr. Hill's is the executive mind in the scheme of reorganization. For more than a year that skillful politician has been building up an anti-Bryan, conservative, sound money machine in the democratic party of the east to be used as the nucleus of the general reorganization movement planned for next year."

#### PROCLAIMED BRYAN'S POLITICAL DEATH

The reorganizers were prepared to take full charge of the party in 1904. They had proclaimed Bryan's political death, and awaited only the assembling of the national convention of that year to inter him so deep that there could be no resurrection. One of the first men in Nebraska to give his endorsement to the program of the reorganizers, at least so far as taking control of the party and formulating its policies was concerned, was Gilbert M. Hitchcock, now senator. I am not guessing at this. I was told early in 1901 or the fall of 1900 by Senator Hitchcock personally, that he approved the general plan of the reorganizers, and I heard him declare that the success of the democratic party nationally depended upon the carrying out of the plans of the reorganizers under the leadership of Senator Hill of New York. I do not know that at that time the purpose to repudiate or crush Bryan had been publicly announced, but the purpose to repudiate what had been the party's attitude on important questions in the campaigns of 1896 and 1900, had been stated. From that time on Senator Hitchcock was apparently in full sympathy and accord with the plans and purposes of the reorganizers. He was for Parker and in accord with the views of the men who dominated the national convention at St. Louis in 1904, and so far as he gave support or assistance at all he gave it to that element prior to and during the national convention. This was not true of his newspaper. While it did not criticize the reorganizers, and no word against them appeared in its columns during the three years preceding the national convention of 1904, in the contest in Nebraska, the paper in a general way supported Bryan and his followers.

#### THE CONTEST IN 1912

In 1908, of course, there was no question of conservative and progressive so far as Nebraska was concerned, as the democrats were practically unanimous for the nomination of Bryan. The next opportunity to divide along progressive and conservative lines so far as national issues and politics were concerned, was in 1912. In that contest three distinguished democrats were candidates at the primaries in Nebraska. Champ Clark, recognized for years as a progressive; Woodrow Wilson who, as governor of New Jersey, had been strikingly so, and Governor Harmon of Ohio, whose record, in the opinion of progressive democrats had been conservative on vital questions and who, measured by association and political affiliation, did not belong to the progressive wing of the party. He had been elected governor in 1908, by a coalition of the liquor and other special interests in Ohio, who threw their support to him for governor and to Taft for president. This resulted in the state going republican on the national ticket, and democratic so far as the head of the state ticket was concerned. Mr. Bryan took the position in 1912 in the Nebraska primaries, that Clark and Wilson were both progressives and that Harmon and Underwood were reactionaries, and that the nomination of either would put the special interest influences in control of the party.

The issue was presented in the campaign, between conservative and progressive, and Senator Hitchcock and his newspaper supported Harmon, appealing to the democrats of this state to say to the nation that Harmon was the kind of a democrat Nebraska was in favor of nominating, and that Harmon was sufficiently progressive to suit the World-Herald and its owner. Senator Hitchcock was elected as a delegate at large to the national convention.

This state was progressive if the vote meant

anything, as each Clark and Wilson received more votes than did Harmon. It turned out later that Harmon's campaign had been largely financed by the forces, represented in the national convention by Ryan, Belmont and that class. The first contest in the convention was whether the temporary chairman should be a progressive, or a reactionary. If there was in the convention, or in the party in the nation, a democrat of prominence outside of Ryan, Belmont and Murphy, who could be pointed to with unerring certainty as a conservative, that man was Alton B. Parker of New York. The reactionary forces in the convention, feeling that they had full control, determined to show to the world from the first meeting, that Bryan was beaten, that his influence representing progressive democracy was at a low ebb, and that no regard was to be paid to the so-called progressive democrats either in the convention or in the nation. Parker was put forth as the man to sound the keynote of democracy for the campaign of 1912, as temporary chairman of the convention. Bryan challenged the right of the reactionaries to select the temporary chairman, or to voice the will of the democracy of the country. To make the fight it became necessary for him to become a candidate for temporary chairman of the convention. This involved the issue squarely as to whether the democratic party, speaking through its national convention would proclaim by its temporary chairman, that it stood for the things that Bryan had advocated for twenty years, voiced by the man who had been three times the candidate of his party for president, or whether it would declare that it had repudiated progressive principles and that the convention was to be dominated by Ryan, Belmont, Murphy and their followers. On this momentous question Senator Hitchcock and his two followers in the Nebraska delegation voted against Bryan and for Parker. He voted with the forces that stood for Parker and against Bryan and Wilson and the progressives in that convention, just as he stood with the forces that nominated Parker and dominated the St. Louis convention in 1904.

#### PROGRESSIVE DEMOCRACY TRIUMPHS

Let it be kept in mind that when the question whether a progressive or a reactionary should be chosen as temporary chairman, Bryan demanded that a progressive be selected, and invited the candidates for the presidential nomination to join with him in the demand; that Woodrow Wilson alone endorsed Bryan's position, stood by him in that contest, and side by side Bryan and Wilson battled against the forces of reaction and greed in the contest for temporary chairman, and they and their friends and followers fought the good fight, for ten days, which finally resulted in Woodrow Wilson's nomination, the triumph of progressive democracy, and the complete overthrow of those with whom Senator Hitchcock had worked and voted. Now it may be that those forces whose first choice was Harmon, with whom my opponent stood in that convention, represented progressive principles and Wilson and Bryan did not, they certainly did not stand for the same things. I, too, was a member of that convention, a delegate at large, and throughout the convention I stood with Bryan, aided and supported him from the hour the convention opened until it adjourned.

When I became a candidate for delegate at large, I announced that I would aid him in any kind of a fight he might make for a progressive candidate and platform. I voted for Bryan for temporary chairman, and my opponent voted against him. From the thirteenth ballot on until he was nominated, I voted for Woodrow Wilson for the democratic nomination, and my opponent voted against him. I announced when I became a candidate for delegate at large that I was in favor of the nomination of Wilson. My opponent announced that he was in favor of Harmon, and he did all he could to secure Harmon's endorsement in this state. In the convention at Baltimore, I lined up with Bryan and Wilson and their followers. My opponent lined up with the supporters of Harmon, led by Murphy, Ryan and Belmont. True, he voted for Champ Clark, while I, after the thirteenth ballot voted for Wilson. When it became apparent that the reactionary element in the convention had made Clark its candidate, I voted for Woodrow Wilson, whose nomination was secured without the aid of Wall Street.

In announcing my candidacy for delegate at large to the national convention in 1912, I said:

"If selected as delegate I shall endeavor to aid W. J. Bryan in whatever manner he may

see fit to lead the fight for a progressive platform and candidate."

In another statement published over my signature during the primary campaign of 1912, I said:

"The one campaign in sixteen years when the democratic party repudiated Mr. Bryan's judgment and accepted the advice of those who agreed with Hitchcock, as to who should be chosen as the standard bearer of the party, Nebraska went republican eighty thousand strong. We are this year, as in 1904, invited to reject the judgment of Bryan and accept that of Hitchcock. The attempt on the part of Hitchcock and the World-Herald to shift the issue from that of a vindictive warfare against Bryan, in the interest of Harmon and big business, to the cry that Bryan is trying to destroy the primary and defy the will of the people, won't succeed. The contest here is whether democrats favor a progressive candidate and platform, and a delegation that will fight for them, or whether they are willing that the representatives of big business shall again write the platform and nominate the candidate as they did in 1904, when Mr. Hitchcock's views were fully carried out by the national convention of that year."

#### THE FIGHT TO CARRY OUT PLEDGES

Congress was called together in special session by President Wilson in the early part of 1913 to carry out the pledges of the Baltimore platform with reference to tariff and banking and currency. When the tariff bill had been passed, it was the judgment of the President and a majority of the democrats in congress, that the banking and currency question should be taken up at once. A few democrats and the republicans were opposed to doing anything on that subject at the special session. Senator Hitchcock took this view. He announced that he was in favor of congress adjourning, without undertaking to pass a banking and currency law, and that that question ought not to be dealt with until the next session of congress. Congress went ahead, however, and a banking and currency bill was passed in the house by a practically unanimous vote of the democratic members, and went to the senate for consideration. If the democrats of Nebraska will read the currency bill introduced by Mr. Hitchcock himself, they will find that he favored the issue of bank notes in connection with the reserve system—the Wall street idea—instead of government notes, as provided in the administration bill as it passed, thus showing that he agreed with the big bankers, and not with the democratic position. Senator Hitchcock was a member of the banking and currency committee of the senate. Before the committee he insisted upon numerous amendments to the house bill to which the democratic members of the committee would not agree. He endeavored to have the committee amend the house bill so as to provide for a central bank. All of the republican members of the committee it seems, joined with him. Senator Hitchcock claimed that the Baltimore platform did not denounce the central bank principle. For instance, the World-Herald, in a leading editorial on November 10, 1913, referring to the Baltimore platform, said:

#### THE CENTRAL BANK IDEA

"For example, the platform did not declare against a central bank. It declared against the so-called Aldrich bill for the establishment of a central bank, which is quite another thing."

Whether the editor had not read or did not care to read the Baltimore platform covering the banking and currency feature, I do not know. In the same editorial was published as the banking and currency plan of the Baltimore platform the following:

"We oppose the so-called Aldrich bill for the establishment of a central bank."

The language quoted is not the language of the Baltimore platform as it appears in the official proceedings of the convention published by authority of the officers of the convention. The plank reads as follows:

"We oppose the so-called Aldrich bill or the establishment of a central bank."

In an editorial published September 29, 1913, Senator Hitchcock's paper, in defending his course before the committee, particularly with reference to the delay in reporting the banking and currency bill from the committee, said:

"The clamor for its passage, immediately and without change, appears to come largely from those who have not taken the trouble to