

# The Nebraska Primary Election

Comments from the State Press on the Results of the April Contest

## AFTER THE PRIMARY

\* \* \* Progressive democracy went down to defeat. The democratic party of Nebraska has been turned over to the reactionary interests. It is up to those who now have possession to sufficiently interest the people to win at the November election. It will be a hard job. Frankly, we consider it an empty victory. Not because progressive democrats will try to wreak revenge, but because there is nothing left in the democratic party worth fighting for when you take out of it those things which we refer to as "progressive democracy."

Turn back to the democratic party in Nebraska before Bryan, and it wasn't much of a party and it didn't deserve to be. It was merely a protest. It never went forward; it never proposed any reforms in government; it did not set itself up against special privilege or selfish interests—it merely opposed the republicans, criticizing but offering nothing.

Then one day the democratic party was revived and made a real party. Following the wave of populism that swept the nation, the democratic party of Nebraska became a real party, and thousands of independent voters flocked to it and it became a power in the land. But it has started on the return track and it is with sorrow and not with anger that the Journal witnesses that backward flight.

What is the democratic party of today in Kansas? There is none. In that state, when the populists left the party, there was no longer any division between democrats and republicans but only between progressive republicans and standpat republicans. The democrats are a poor third in Kansas, and when Bryan and the progressive principles which he stands for are taken out of the democratic party in Nebraska, the same situation will prevail here.

In the language of the street, the democratic party in Nebraska, with Bryan left out, won't get to first base. It is painful to contemplate but it is so plainly apparent that it might as well be faced now as later.

A great many democrats may sorrowfully vote their ticket, but they will do it without enthusiasm, without hope, without spirit, with a feeling that nothing worth while is being accomplished.

Nevertheless, progressive democracy is not dead. In the minds of hundreds of voters, some who call themselves democrats, some who have been known by other names, there is firmly fixed the true principles of government of the people, for the people and by the people, as opposed to government of the interests, for the interests and by the interests. It may be several years and it may be but a few months until those who have these principles fixed in their minds will rally shoulder to shoulder in defense of those principles.

These warlike times, the wet and dry issue, the unrest and jealousies of the day have split the democratic party of Nebraska into fragments but there still exists a love for true democratic principles which will yet in some manner find expression and force. Such is our hope.—Fairbury Journal.

## AS TO BRYAN'S DEFEAT

M. D. Tyler says he has seen more happy democrats since the defeat of W. J. Bryan than ever before in his life. The Press has been coming in for more than its share of "jolly" as a result of that defeat, we folks being pretty well identified with the interests of the great Commoner. We love Bryan no less today than we did in the years gone by. His glory is no more dim, his power no less great. His enemies choose to translate his defeat as a repudiation of the first Nebraskan and his policies, but long, long after those enemies and their attempts to belittle Bryan are forgotten he and his policies will brighten history's pages.

Mr. Bryan attempted a herculean task, that of dry cleaning the democratic party. He worked manfully, but we could never see where he could hope to win. Primarily, we feel it is to Nebraska democracy's discredit that Bryan shall not head the delegation from this state at the St. Louis convention. Without Bryan, just what would democracy be in Nebraska today?

Without Bryan where would Wilson be? Bryan is the man who made Wilson and democratic success—Bryan drafted and originated most of the progressive policies of the party, and it would seem to us that the party, state and nationally, loses much in not having his counsel and influence as a delegate when the next great convention gathers. But Mr. Bryan will be at St. Louis, and no man elected as a delegate from this or any other state shall have the following that will be. Bryan is greater today in defeat than his enemies in their victory. — Norfolk Press.

## WARNING TO NEBRASKA DEMOCRATS

This paper wants to see democrats successful in Nebraska this fall, and in order to be successful we have got to face some issues. We have got to get past the idea that he who advocates the liquor interests is going to get the most votes in Nebraska. Let's face the cold facts. The democratic party can not win this fall by catering to the wet element. We say this because we want to see the party win in November and not whether we are for or against the issue. A little investigating will reveal that the democrats in Idaho lined up with the wets, the republicans with the drys, and the republicans won. In Colorado the same thing took place. Democrats there took sides with the wet issue and the republicans with the drys, and the result is a republican governor for Colorado. In Ohio and Indiana almost similar results have been the case with the democrats losing heavily. Over in Iowa the democratic party has been championing the wet side, and the result is that the democrats in that state feel highly elated if they can elect a road overseer. We could go on by naming more states with similar results. Now it is a question whether the democrats really want to win this fall, or lose. Not whether you are against the amendment, but whether you want the democrats to win. The republican party in Nebraska, judging from the primary election, is about two-thirds or better dry, while the democratic party is about two-thirds wet. Normally this state is from ten to fifteen thousand republican. We are working for democratic success this fall and want no more obstacles in the way than possible. Is the state convention which convenes at Hastings going to go on record as lining up against the amendment?—Sherman County Times-Independent.

## LAUGHING TOO EARLY

While some of the brethren are endeavoring to make much ado about W. J. Bryan's terrible mistakes in the recent campaign, we can not see it in that light. Bryan made no mistake. Apparently on the face of the returns it is shown that he was defeated as a delegate to the national convention. But what of that? Out of defeat has come some of the greatest victories the world has ever known, and out of apparent defeat will eventually grow a victory of great moment. And those who have been branding Bryan sorely because he refused to acquiesce in the demands of the liquor interests of Nebraska, will soon be aroused again because this same man refuses to stand hitched to their beer sign when the real campaign is on in earnest. Bryan may not have had the best of opportunity to exert his influence in a shut-up-tight primary campaign, but see how the beer signs wobble when the open-ballot-campaign is placed in the hands of the voters of Nebraska. Then it will be more plainly seen who wins the victory and who is the victor. The practice is dangerous to laugh before the joke in the story is reached.—Kearney Democrat.

## NOT THE RIGHT WAY

Some of the democratic newspapers which so brutally opposed W. J. and C. W. Bryan in the late primary campaign are now acting as if the democratic state ticket will not need the help of the Bryan boys in November.

That is some mistake, brethren. We can elect the state ticket all right, from governor to the bottom, if we employ horse sense. We must all remember that the late primary caused some sore spots which will not heal in a minute. You

fellows on the other side must remember that you shot some pretty nasty torpedoes at the Bryan ship, and you ought to have sense enough to quit shooting after the primary.

The Bryans will support the state ticket all right, because the record reads that no Bryan ever refused to support a democratic nominee, save only when the nominee plainly said he did not want their support. We do not know any nominee who is saying he doesn't want Bryan support in the coming campaign, but some of the anti-Bryan newspapers appear very much in the attitude of trying to drive the Bryan vote away from the ticket.

This ought to be a democratic year in Nebraska, and it will be a democratic year if the anti-Bryan newspapers will only give the Bryan boys half a chance to help the ticket.—Columbus Telegram.

## A FIGHT FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT

This fight in Nebraska within the democratic ranks, is something more than a contest between men. It means more than the political life or death of individuals. It is a fight for good government and good men to administer that government. It is a fight to establish ourselves upon the side of all those things that tend to the upbuilding of society and home. That is what the fight within the ranks of democracy means at this time, and it is a fight worth fighting. The late primary contest was a contest between the forces that stood for good government and the forces that stood for unbridled license; between those who revered strong, robust manhood and womanhood and those who care but little for the perpetuation and elevation of their own race, between those who believed in a democratic faith founded upon a citidal of integrity, sobriety and uprightness, and those who would trail the party's standard mid the spawn of hell's own corruption and the wreckage of mispent life. Stripped of all its verbiage—that was the issue in the democratic and republican primaries. So far as the democratic party is concerned, its members went on record as opposing the higher and nobler attributes of the race and turned the hands upon the clock of democratic life—back. The republican party, speaking through its membership, declared for sweeping progress in its relation to a vital question that touches both state and home. It declared that the hands of the organized liquor forces could not touch its garments with its contaminating touch. That it wished to be free to serve the people and not the special interests that always work in conjunction with the organized liquor crowd. To fortify themselves they nominated a candidate for governor and for United States senator who are free men. Men who owe nothing to the special interest gang nor to their allies—the organized liquor crowd. Indeed they stand clean handed from their polluting touch. Not so with the democratic party. It nominated a man both for United States senator and governor who owe their nomination to the liquor forces and the special interest crowd. Indeed, they would not have been nominated at all had they not been the beneficiaries of such a vote. It is hard to conceive that the republican nominees will not serve those who nominated them. It is equally hard to conceive that the democratic nominees will not serve the interests that nominated them. The question then comes: Whose interest do the people want served—theirs or the interests of the special interest crowd under the guise of the breweries, the stockyards, the telephone trust and the insurance combine? Under the leadership of Mr. Bryan, thousands of democrats wanted the democratic party to stand right where the republican party is now standing in its relation to these special interest varmint. It was not the will of the party, and Mr. Bryan was disbarred from the party council. Today it marches forth candidates nominated for high position bound and bounden to the services of their masters. Nebraska democrats will be asked to ratify the selection before the final court of approval. Will they approve? Will they declare themselves favorable to any such a debauchment of the party as they have already witnessed? Will the Bryan democrats of the state who have witnessed the humiliation of Mr. Bryan by an alliance of special interest servers and wet goods vendors o. k. the compact? We think not. We think the parting of the way is at hand. The dividing line is clean cut. The issue is a grave and important one not easily compromised with honor, or else there would not now be the humiliating aspect of Nebraska's