

greatest democrat being denied a right to a national convention — a place where at diverse times he has brought forth to the militant democracy of the state, such magnificent acts of meritorious triumph as to challenge the plaudits, and receive them, of the entire world. In this battle soon to be waged, it will be ascertained whether the combined forces of powerful interests shall wage a relentless war against such a man as he, or whether the people will wage a relentless war to the very door of the special interests that have sought to destroy him. Whether the democratic party will die to live again or whether it shall die to forever remain dead. This is to be the issue and, judging from the wrath of a wronged democracy, those who have traduced it will live no longer politically to thus debase it. We did not cast the die that will create this chasm. The political influence of the men who will go down with the wreck, choose to make it themselves. Let them die the death they have long sought for.—Riverton Review.

#### "KILLING BRYAN OFF AGAIN"

In the Omaha Bee of April 22 is this somewhat whimsical editorial, having also a much greater proportion of truth than the average political editorial of the Bee:

"To republicans who have stood the periodic jibes and jests about killing off Bryan every time he has been defeated, the spectacle of our democratic friends gloating over having killed him off once more is as amusing as it is edifying. We interred Mr. Bryan in his political grave so many times, with these self-same democrats mocking at us and predicting his speedy return to life and power, that to have the tables turned gives the relish of novelty. So now we have it officially certified with the democratic sign that Mr. Bryan is down and out, that he is to be denied the privilege of representing his home state in the national conclave, that he has forfeited his right to party leadership, and is undermining a democratic administration while professing to support it.

"It is all very interesting, as we have said, all the more so as coming from former Bryan worshipers and champions. But will he stay dead? That is the question. Speaking from the experience of republicans who have killed Bryan off before, it certainly is not brash for us to remind these joy-riding democrats that in politics 'things are not always what they seem,' and that the show is never over until the final curtain is rung down."

Excepting that democrats are not gloating over killing off Bryan politically, have no desire for such a fate for him, in which they realize they would certainly share, and are not joy-riding at all but are calmly and sedately going about the party business, the above editorial is remarkably correct, for a Bee editorial.

More than any other one man, W. J. Bryan has made the democratic party strong and successful in state and nation. Democrats very generally appreciate this. While Mr. Bryan has done much for the democratic party, that party has done much for him. If there is preponderance of obligation it would appear to be from Mr. Bryan to the democratic party.

Mr. Bryan is not dead politically in Nebraska. The majority vote against him in this candidacy for delegate-at-large can not be attributed to any general desire to kill him off politically, for there is no such general desire. It is expressive of protest, but it is meant kindly rather than murderously. It appears to be expression of protest against his action in the democratic national convention at Baltimore in 1912 in withdrawing support from Champ Clark whom he was under instruction and obligation to vote for so long at any rate as Clark was gaining in strength and majority choice of the convention. It is a protest against his resignation from the President's cabinet. It is expressive of desire that there be no lack of harmony in the coming democratic national convention. It is expression of protest against antagonism to Senator Hitchcock, in whom democrats have confidence and for whom they have warm admiration. It is, in some cases, no doubt, expression of disappointment in not being recommended for appointment to office.

It is a clearing of the air, a "getting it out of the system," a protest made in regret rather than anger, and one which as time goes on will no doubt bring understanding and renewal of

cordial relations between those making protest and the one receiving the same.

Bryan is not dead by any means, nor is the democratic party torn up so much as it was. Factionalism is, it is hoped, more or less dead.—David City Press.

Everything points to the fact that the democratic party today is in the same position that the republican party was four years ago. The reactionaries were in the "seats of the mighty" in the republican councils; now their twin brothers occupy the same position in the democracy. Whether they will possess sufficient strength to nullify the progressive legislation that has been enacted during the past four years remains to be seen. The turning down of Bryan in Nebraska will be seized upon by the reactionaries of the Hitchcock class to make an attempt to turn the country back to the enemies of popular government.

The defeat of Bryan, who has always been at the forefront of progressiveness in the nation, will fill the hearts of his enemies with an elation that will lead them to excesses and cause them to overreach the endurance of an easy-going, short-remembered people, who, when they realize the condition that their thoughtlessness has brought about, will turn upon these same enemies of popular government and hustle them from power.

They have defeated Bryan in the primaries, but the people have another "guess" coming in November, and when they get through "guessing" the reactionaries, unless we mistake the temper of the democracy of Nebraska, will find themselves snowed so deeply under republican ballots that it will take a dozen years to exhume them. They have in their greed for temporary power made it possible for a sweeping republican victory. They have sown the winds, they will reap the whirlwinds.

Hitchcock, while pretending to be progressive, had, up till the time the progressive democrats rallied to his support and prevented the untimely demise of his paper in 1894, been a reactionary of the most radical type. After that he felt he could not afford to be anything but harmonious with his party. Now, however, that he is surely entrenched behind the liquor interests, he feels that he can afford to again throw off the mask of progressiveness and relapse into his old-time stand-patism. He seems to imagine that the democrats will stay fooled and follow him in his mischievous extremes, no matter where he attempts to lead them; that the democrats are so enamored with his apparent virtues that nothing lesser than a miracle can change them from his leadership. His attitude means not only his own defeat, but the defeat of the entire democratic party in Nebraska and the loss of Nebraska to the national ticket. This is the price he has paid to defeat Bryan; this is the toll demanded for the support of the liquor interests. His act is neither good politics nor a low rate of statesmanship, but a stumbling-block he has placed in his own way that will eventually trip him up.—Ulysses Dispatch.

A democrat asked us "to what do you attribute the defeat of W. J. Bryan in the recent primary?" Any man in public life for twenty-five years and controlling official patronage will accumulate an army of personal enemies who will oppose him for personal reasons, if nothing else. But we are asked to name the strongest reason for Bryan's political defeat, and that is "prohibition." When Mr. Bryan espoused the cause of prohibition he alienated a powerful element in the democratic party, not only in Nebraska, but in the entire country. Any proposition that injures or interferes with a man's business will meet his opposition. The liquor interests have opposed Mr. Bryan relentlessly at home and abroad. Other mistakes could be overlooked, but his war on the saloons and breweries was the limit, and could not be forgiven; his blood was demanded. Today Bryan stands a discredited party leader and his defeat forecasts the defeat of the democratic state ticket in Nebraska. No democrat can be elected to an important office in Nebraska without the support of Bryan and his friends, thousands of whom will even up the game by taking a parting shot at Hitchcock and booze next fall.—Sutton Register.

They are trying now to make the people believe that it was his resignation as secretary of state and opposition to militarism in this coun-

try which caused his defeat. It was in fact a combination of the old Grover democrats with the booze element in both parties, and the stay at home farmers, that caused his defeat at the primary.—Crete Democrat.

The Kearney Hub says that boss rule in Nebraska was shattered last week when the democrats defeated both of the Bryans at the primaries. The Lincoln Journal contrasts the democratic primary contest with the squabble that divided the republican party at Chicago four years ago where, in order to thwart the control of Roosevelt, the party chose to face certain defeat at the polls. Another editor says that Mr. Bryan attempted to lead the party in the way it did not want to go and thus proved that he no longer is the leader. This newspaper does not believe in following any man idolatrously, and as long as leaders are human they are liable to mistakes of judgment. Some men are leaders because they see farther than others into the future, and some men are accounted leaders because the strength of their personality is such that they convince men less intelligent and of less pronounced opinions with the merit of their cause. Mr. Bryan is a natural leader because he has looked into the future and forecasted issues that are not apparent to the unthinking man. The fact that those issues are not popular with the rank and file does not argue against his superior discernment. Mr. Bryan is not the popular idol of Nebraska democracy that he once was, and there is something of merit in the criticism of bossism, but his brand of democracy will never betray the party into the hands of selfish interests who thrive on favorable legislation and favorable court decisions. The democrats won the offices in Nebraska when the people of the state grew weary of the control of the corporation influence within the republican party. The corporations have no politics and, whether you will or will not, they attach themselves to the dominant party. Before the democrats became accustomed to the power of administering government these objectionable corporation influences had attached themselves to the democratic ship of state, and they made every effort to put forward men who are their willing tools. No party can command the confidence of the honest voters, the men who are too busy producing to give attention to politics, when it is controlled by selfish interests. Unfortunately the honest democrats are tarred with the same stick and must suffer the punishment that is merited by the few shysters who have been clever enough to enlist honest but unthinking men in their cause. Corporations and big business have their rights under the law, and must be respected for the things they do in a legitimate way, but they must be taught to keep their hands off from party politics, whether it be democrat or republican. With the certain coming of state-wide prohibition, the most insidiously corrupt influence, the breweries, will be eliminated from active participation in Nebraska politics.—Greeley Leader-Independent.

The cause for W. J. Bryan's defeat as a delegate to the national democratic convention are, first, that Mr. Bryan advocates the adoption of the prohibitory amendment. The democrats of Nebraska defeated Mr. Bryan's wishes several years ago because he advocated the adoption of county option in Nebraska. Second, Mr. Bryan favored the nomination of Dahlman for national committeeman and Dunn for United States senator, whose associations with the liquor interests were such that dry people could not fully agree with Mr. Bryan's choice of candidates for these places. Third, Mr. Bryan's inability to secure places for his friends by appointment, which resulted from his differences with Senator Hitchcock. He and the senator could not agree and the senator by reason of his position in the senate was able to hold up appointments of Mr. Bryan's friends. There may be other reasons, but the above are the main reasons for his personal defeat at this time. The election in November may tell another story.—Lexington Clipper-Citizen.

No one thing ever gave the democratic party of Nebraska such a black eye in the eyes of the democracy of the nation, as was given it in the defeat of W. J. Bryan as a candidate for delegate-at-large to the national convention. Bryan wasn't hurt in the least by the disreputable deed. He will be all the more exalted in the eyes of the democracy of the nation at St. Louis. It was the democracy of Nebraska that was