

THE ALLIANCE HERALD

Published Every Thursday by
The Herald Publishing Company.

T. J. O'KEEFE, Editor
J. B. KNIEST, Associate Editor

Entered at the postoffice at Alliance, Nebraska, for transmission through the mails, as second-class matter.

Subscription, \$1.50 per year in advance.

Democratic National Ticket



FOR PRESIDENT
WILLIAM J. BRYAN
OF NEBRASKA

FOR VICE PRESIDENT
JOHN W. KERN
OF INDIANA

STATE TICKET

Governor..... A. C. Shallenberger
Lieutenant-Governor..... E. O. Garrett
Secretary of State..... John Mattes, Jr.
Auditor..... Edwin H. Luikart
Treasurer..... Clarence Mackey
Superintendent of Public Instruction..... N. C. Abbott
Attorney-General..... H. B. Fleharty
Commissioner Public Lands and Building..... W. B. Eastham
Railway Commissioner..... Wm. H. Cowgill
Congressman Sixth District..... W. H. Westover
State Senator, Fourteenth District..... George M. Adams
Representative, 53d District..... Fred W. Johansen

COUNTY TICKET

For County Attorney, Eugene Burton
For Commissioner, Second Dist., J. P. Jensen

ANNOUNCEMENTS

For County Commissioner, Second District.

I desire to announce to the people of Box Butte county that I am the regular nominee of the second district for commissioner on the Democratic-Independent ticket and will appreciate sincerely any support the voters see fit to give me at the polls. J. P. JENSEN.

For County Attorney.

I hereby announce myself as a candidate for the office of county attorney of Box Butte county, Nebraska, on the democratic-independent ticket, and solicit the support of the voters of Box Butte county. EUGENE BURTON.

Beginning Tuesday morning of this week Mr. Bryan made a three days' tour of eastern Nebraska. The trip was made on a special train and Mr. Bryan spoke an average of twenty-five times a day. Everywhere he was greeted by large and enthusiastic audiences.

The republicans of the west have builded great hopes on the western tour of Governor Hughes. While they profess to believe that the tour has strengthened their cause, they really know that because of his evasions and his false witness Governor Hughes has weakened rather than strengthened them. He avoided any reference to the bank guaranty and refused to refer to his veto of the two-cent fare law after using several hundred thousand dollars contributed by railroad managers to his campaign fund. Everywhere he was asked to explain it. But he ignored all questioners. He made a specious attack upon the trust plank of the democratic platform and declared that the 50 per cent clause would ruin the man who tried to manufacture under a patent. He evidently thought that westerners are so ignorant that they do not know that patents are a constitutional right, and paraded the fact that he does not know the difference between an incentive to individual genius and an incentive to corporate greed.

By this time probably every newspaper reader in the country is wise to the Omaha Bee joke. The Omaha Bee is edited by Victor Rosewater, a Nebraska member of the republican national committee, member of the executive committee of that organization and chairman of the bureau of publicity. Recently Mr. Bryan quoted from the republican tariff planks, but in the printed report of his speech the quotation marks were left off. Reading the following the Bee editor took it for granted that it was what Mr. Bryan said:

"In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries."

Then the editor of the Bee proceeded to denounce that principle as "sheer demagoguery" and declared that an attempt to put it into practice would result in endless strife between employer and employe; precipitate panic and do untold injury. The Bee really had hard work expressing its hatred for such a "demagogic utterance." Now that its editor, republican national committeeman from Nebraska, has learned that he was denouncing a republican platform plank, the silence that reigns in the Bee office could be cut with a knife.

The Portland Oregonian, another republican organ, made the same foolish mistake. So did the Boston Transcript. And Mr. Bryan says he no longer reads books of humor when he wants to laugh. He just reads a republican platform.

Mr. Bryan spent several days in Lincoln last week catching up with his correspondents and receiving reports about the progress of the campaign. Just before starting back to Chicago to resume his tour, Mr. Bryan spoke at Havelock, a suburb of Lincoln, and the site of the big Burlington shops. A few days before Mr. Taft spoke at Havelock, and the shops were shut down thirty minutes in order that the shopmen might here the republican candidate. Later the shopmen were notified to either make up the lost time or be docked the thirty minutes.

The Lincoln newspapers and the press associations heralded it forth that Mr. Taft was introduced to the Havelock crowd by "the president of the local boiler-makers union," and this gave the republican organs another excuse to say that Taft is not being opposed by organized labor. This is a sample of the deceit practiced by their republican committee. Mr. Taft was introduced to the Havelock audience by a man named Holmes, who is a gang foreman in the Havelock shops. Holmes is not a member of any union, and never was.

Every effort was put forth to get a big crowd for Taft at Havelock. The morning was ideal and the meeting had been advertised far and wide. Yet Taft talked to less than 500 people, and not half the shopmen turned out to hear him. Monday night of last week Mr. Bryan spoke at Havelock. It rained all day, and rained at night. The city park, where he spoke, was a sea of mud. The streets were almost impassable. Yet Mr. Bryan spoke to upwards of 3,000 people, and the enthusiasm was intense. A big delegation of union shopmen occupied the speaker's stand, and Mr. Bryan's analysis of the labor planks in the two platforms was greeted with wild enthusiasm.

Judge Westover's Position

Believing that the voters of the Sixth Congressional District have a right to know where their candidate stands on the issues involved in this election, and believing that candidates before election should state publicly and unequivocally what they are in favor of, and what they will undertake to do if elected, I hereby pledge myself as follows:

1. I will support any and all measures which will bring about the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people.
 2. I will support a law making it compulsory upon all political parties to publish a complete statement of campaign contributions before election.
 3. I will favor a law providing that in all cases of indirect contempt of court, the party so accused shall be tried by a jury, the same as any other person accused of crime.
 4. I will favor a reduction of the present tariff to an extent that foreign competition will compel American manufacturers to sell their products to American consumers as cheaply as they sell them to consumers in any foreign country; and that all agricultural machinery, fencing, building material, and all household utensils be placed on the free list.
 5. I will favor an amendment of the so-called Railroad Rate Bill, now in force, which will provide that pending an appeal to the federal courts, the order of the interstate commerce commission, whether making a new rate, or which is made for the purpose of preventing an existing discrimination, shall be and remain in force pending the appeal in the federal courts.
 6. I shall favor an amendment to the federal constitution providing for an inheritance and income tax.
 7. I shall favor an amendment to the present homestead law, now in force and applicable to this district, which will give the homesteader the same rights of commutation, and making final proof, as are enjoyed in other localities by homesteaders under the general homestead law of the country.
 8. I shall favor a law under which deposits in all national banks will be guaranteed, as proposed in the Denver platform.
 9. I shall devote all of my time, energy and what ability I possess, to attending to the business of the people of this district, and to guarding their rights individually and collectively.
 10. I shall favor an amendment of the rules of the house of representatives, which will deprive Speaker Cannon, or any other speaker of the house, of the power to throttle legislation which is demanded by the people.
- If the above and foregoing propositions meet with your approval, I respectfully and earnestly solicit your support at the coming general election.
- W. H. WESTOVER.

AN OPEN LETTER TO M. P. KINKAID BY CAPTAIN AKERS.

The writer, W. R. Akers, is a prominent republican and has served the party in public office. He served in the state senate and was the author of the present irrigation law; he was elected the first secretary of the state board of irrigation and held that position until he was appointed receiver of the U. S. land office at Alliance by President McKinley, in which place he served for eight years. He is still a republican but refuses to support Moses forever.

Hon. Moses P. Kinkaid,
O'Neill, Nebraska.

Dear Sir:—I am in receipt of a letter from James H. Hewitt of Alliance in which he informs me that you have made the assertion on the train between here and Alliance that I was going around the country electioneering against you. Now this is absolutely untrue. The fact is that I have not been able the past year to go around the country to any considerable extent. I have been as far from here as Mitchell, Merrill and Gering. And I believe I have stated in each of these towns that I was not going to vote for you. Is that electioneering? If so, then I am guilty. Mr. Hewitt also informs me that you stated that both Wilcox and I were opposed to him for reappointment. Now, if you said that, you knew at the time it was false, because I have talked to you by the hour in his interest as clerk and as successor to myself. The general land office records will show that I always supported him for clerk, and Senator Burkett will tell you that I made a trip to Lincoln to urge his appointment as receiver to succeed me.

I did not intend to do or say anything in a public way against your nomination, but intended to be satisfied in saying that I did not intend to vote for your nomination. But since you have rushed in the open and set your tongue wagging, allow me in this very unsatisfactory way to make some statements as to why I will not support you.

In the first place, I believe your whole life has been a bundle of deceit. I do not believe you ever made an honest statement in your whole life, or ever fulfilled a promise unless you saw some gain for yourself. You deny any responsibility for every failure on the part of securing any other benefit in Washington.

You claim all the credit for every favor which anyone receives in Washington. You claim credit for every pension or increase of pension of every old soldier in the country, notwithstanding they had their attorneys and you knew nothing of the case until it had been allowed, then you rush in and notify the soldier that you secured it. I wonder how many old soldiers you think you have hoodwinked in this manner?

You state in your announcement that "several years after his legislative experience Mr. Kinkaid became district judge." Now, Judge, why did you make that statement? Did you want to deceive someone? Is it not a fact that you as senator introduced and passed the bill which formed and established the 15th judicial district in the state of Nebraska? What was the district doing all these several years without a judge? Why did you say "several years after," if not to convey the idea that you had not always been in public office since you came into manhood? Now, Judge, if I am mistaken in this matter, I am ready to acknowledge the error when the proof is forthcoming. And again, I ask if you have not been in public office ever since, except at the most four years? And were you not a candidate at every election after that until you were finally elected? If not, I stand corrected—when the proof is shown.

I may be mistaken as to the year 1896. But I believe you thought you would make an excellent supreme judge, and of course you could not be a candidate for supreme judge and congress at the same time. While you were judge you rendered your decisions as a grand stand play to the litigant and bystanders, and you had the faculty of making the fellow upon whom you sat down think you had rendered him a great favor. You have the faculty of deceiving the unsophisticated and making them believe that you remember and hold them in high esteem, when in fact you do not know them at all or remember their names. How many hundred times have you approached men, whom you did not know, and point out some fellow on the other side of the street and ask, "Who is that fellow?" and, as soon as informed, make a rush with extended hand and exclaim, "Hello, Hank," or hello Jim, or Charley, or whatever his name might be. What did you do that for, Judge, if not to deceive someone? You never deceived anyone in this way but the unsophisticated.

I understand, or at least am informed, that when you finally went off the district bench you left cases which you had under consideration and advice-ment you were afraid to decide for fear of making enemies in politics, and which had to be retried—enough to cost the litigants several thousand dollars to retry. Do you think that a record to be proud of?

Why, then, when you were making up your record, did you not tell us that you left a number of cases undecided because they smacked of politics, and would have injured your chances?

Why did you write this record as if the editor wrote it? Did you think that the dear people never saw but one paper, or did you think we were so thick-headed that we would not notice that the language was the same in each paper? How does this sound for an article written by the candidate himself?

"The congressman's greatest legislative achievement is his one-section home-stead act, generally known as the Kinkaid act." That sounds much like something which happened a long time since in this country. Christopher Columbus discovered America, so acknowledged by historians, but Americus Vesputius stole the name. Hon. Wm. Neville, democratic congressman, conceived the idea of the enlargement of the homestead bill, introduced it into congress; but because he was of color with congress, politically, he was not able to pass it. When you came into his shoes you inherited the bill, and I have been informed that you and Judge Norris took this matter up and prepared this bill together, and it was to be introduced jointly by you, and it would then be known as the Kinkaid-Norris bill, or Norris-Kinkaid bill. How is this, Judge, have I been misinformed? I wait to be shown.

While you actually got the credit for the passage of this bill, it would seem better if it should have received the name of "Neville Bill," because Bill Neville wrote the bill and tried to pass it, and would have done so only for the reason that a democrat must not be allowed to get any credit. Why give Roosevelt any credit? Did not you, judge and congressman Kinkaid, pass the bill yourself? Did one of the other congressmen from Nebraska have anything to do with its passage? Did you get over into the senate and pass it there alone? Oh, come now, judge, just be fair and say that you and Norris dug up Bill Neville's bill out of the files and remodelled it, and then you took advantage of Norris and passed it without his assistance and got the name. Want you to say if this true; and, if not, don't say so, but say that it is not true.

I have a few questions which I desire to ask you, and I want you to answer them through some newspaper in this district.

Did you not lead Henry Reynolds to believe that you intended to support him for the position of receiver of the United States land office at Alliance on my retirement? Did you not say to Henry Reynolds in Washington, when he and Charles Cornell, of Valentine, were sent down there by the Western Nebraska Cattle Association to assist you (and at your request) in passing a lease bill, that "now you are here, we will have that land office matter fixed up." And did you not pretend to him that you were alone for him and that you might have difficulty to get the senators to agree with you? Did not Henry Reynolds come back to you the same day and tell you that both senators had informed him that they had agreed that you should settle the matter alone? And did you not say, "Oh, they are lying to you"? And did you not, before he left you in Washington, admit to him that the senators had agreed that you should make the appointment, but you state that you must give it to Ellis? Is this true or not? I believe the story. If I am wrongly informed, I am from Missouri—show me.

Now, you told Hewitt that you could not control that appointment. Did you not make it alone, without the intervention of any man on earth, and with the consent of both senators? If not, show the proof. You presume to tell Hewitt why I oppose you, without anyone in Mitchell telling you. Do you remember a long talk I had with you at your own desk, in which I told you of the trouble with the register of the office about the appointment of one Roderic Williams as clerk in the land office? And do you remember that I told you that I believe that the object in getting him into the land office was to educate him to take the place of Jim Hewitt. And do you remember that you voluntarily said that you did not think Hewitt should be interfered with? Did you not know that Wilcox and I had disagreed about the appointment of Williams? And did you not know that Williams could not be appointed over my protest without congressional interference? And did you not as congressman from the sixth district, in obedience to the command of a democratic boss, your democratic boss, go up to the general land office and interfere and secure the appointment of the said Roderic Williams? Answer this.

I see, Judge, that this letter is already much longer than I intended, and yet I am not near done telling you the reason why I do not support you this nomination. I do know why you should take umbrage. I always supposed I had a right to choose between candidates who were asking the suffrage of my party.

I was fool enough over at Crawford to turn down Judge Grimes—whom I now consider a much better man than you—and voted something like a hundred times for you, for which I have been trying for the last four years to hire some cheap guy to kick my pants.

W. R. AKERS.

ROOSEVELT DYNASTY.

Son-in-law Longworth's Startling Proposition.

WHY THE CAMPAIGN DRAGS

Republican Party Seems to Depend More on Personalities Than Advocacy of Principles to Elect Its Candidate. How the Election of a Democratic House Would Affect Bureaucracy at Washington.

By WILLIS J. ABBOT.

As we approach the end of this presidential campaign, with only a few weeks yet of political agitation to be conducted, I am inclined to wonder whether the campaign was made after or before the conventions of the two great parties. Except in a general way I cannot claim any special knowledge of what has been done at the Republican national headquarters. But friends there, for of course you understand that active political opponents may be intimate personal friends, tell me that with the exception of circulating literature there has been little work of a distinctly political nature done. As I write this the information comes that the members of the Chicago headquarters of the Republican national committee are laying off clerks and reducing their force and expenses in every possible way.

The Democratic national headquarters have been busy, but for not more than three or four weeks. Nor at the present moment does there appear to be anything like the activity or the earnestness that was shown in 1900 or even in 1904.

Now, what is the reason of this situation in both of the national committees? All I can suggest is a personal opinion. The two men who are candidates for the presidency are themselves so well known, have themselves so well pressed in the past their claims upon the American people, that there is little left for a political committee to do except to plead with state leaders to get out the votes. This is the first campaign that I can recall in which not a single campaign biography was on sale. It is the first campaign that I remember in which it was not necessary to be continually expounding who the candidates were and what they stood for. I am writing a Democratic letter, but I wish to be fair. If there is anybody in the United States who does not know who Judge Taft is and for what he stands it must be a voter to whom it would be useless to send a campaign biography or a text book. And in the same way on the Democratic side Mr. Bryan is his own platform and is known to and of all men. Campaign headquarters might be closed without materially affecting the outcome. It might be worth while to adopt Mr. Carnegie's plan of a universal disarmament and leave the candidates to fight out their own battles without the aid of battleships, thirteen inch guns, press bureaus or speakers bureaus.

Personalities Rather Than Principles.

It appears to be the fixed policy of the Republican party to press to the front during the few weeks left of this campaign attacks upon persons rather than either defense or advocacy of fixed principles. There is more said about Haskell than there is about tariff, more bitter attacks upon Bryan the individual than there is upon Bryan who stands for certain fixed ideas. How far this system of tactics may prevail cannot be told as yet. It is true that Governor Haskell has withdrawn one scintilla of proof against him been driven out of the campaign. But so, too, have on the other hand, Foraker, Du Pont and Nagel, all men of high standing in the Republican organization. But into a great organization, whether Democratic or Republican, there will occasionally come men whose entire lives have not been ordered according to the highest ethical principles.

Macaulay once said that he knew of no spectacle so ridiculous as the British public in one of its occasional spasms of morality. I know nothing so absurd as the violent outbreaks of the partisan press in the United States about election time when some one on the other side is accused of conduct which could not be, even if proved, put in complete accord with the Golden Rule. Great editors like Mr. Hearst discover no moral obliquity in buying stolen letters and using them to expose some one whom they accuse of being either a thief or a briber. Great statesmen like Mr. Roosevelt find no reason why they should not implore the "practical" Mr. Harriman to collect \$200,000 from trusts and monopolies for political purposes and thereafter denounce the collector as an undesirable citizen while denying on the eve of a campaign that the collection was ever made. In my judgment, until Mr. Roosevelt has had the manliness and the courtliness to admit he was wrong when he denounced Judge Parker as a willful and malicious falsifier when the judge exposed his trade with the plutocracy he has no right to continue his pose as a moral appliter and an ethical teacher.

A Continuing Dynasty.

Mr. Nicholas Longworth, the son-in-law of the president, has contributed materially to the interest of this campaign and somewhat to the gaudy of the president's opponents by his speech in which he declared that President Roosevelt would be a candidate in 1916. Mark how this figure out! The president succeeded President McKinley in 1901, he served out that term, was elected again in 1904. In 1908 he

re-elected himself, if the American people will permit it—his successor. That successor serves two terms. Thereupon Mr. Taft's sponsor in politics returns cheerfully to take up the politician's burden and to become once more the president. This cheerful proposition for a self continuing dynasty must appeal strongly to the American people. There is no reason why it should stop with the return of Roosevelt to office. Even if he were willing to retire at the end of one term his son-in-law Longworth would be able to take up the heavy task of governing the American people, and by the end of his term Quentin or Kermit or some other Rooseveltian youth would be of age to accept the scepter handed down to him.

But, seriously, it is a matter for the American people to give careful thought to when the proposition is made that a political combination which has had twelve years of uninterrupted power should be given twelve or sixteen years more. The management of affairs at Washington is not so wholly beyond and above suspicion that an occasional change in those who have control of it would not be a good thing. A change from any change in the economic policy of the government, I believe that every right thinking citizen will hold it well to have an occasional housecleaning. You who read this may not believe in the immediate reduction of the tariff. You may not believe in the guaranty of bank deposits. But if you knew your Washington as I do you would believe in a clearing out of the cobwebbed offices in which clerks who have outlived their usefulness are housed and, even more important, the trim and gorgeous offices in which department heads who draw salaries of \$2,500 a year and spend three times that much are luxuriating.

What Might Be Done.

The election of a Democratic president who would install a new set of department heads would accomplish this reform and, besides saving millions of the people's money, would make for greater efficiency in all executive departments. But my old friend Champ Clark pointed out to me the other day that even though we should have the presidency—which neither he nor I believe we will—the election of a Democratic house of representatives would contribute to the same result. Mr. Clark pointed out that a Democratic house would elect a Democratic speaker—a course he would be that speaker—and that the Democratic speaker could appoint seven committees made up of the proper kind of men, each one of whom would undertake the investigation of one of the executive departments. No Republican speaker would do this, or if he did he would appoint whitewashing committees in every instance, but a Democratic speaker who, like Clark or like Rainey of Illinois or like Lloyd of Missouri, would be untainted by any sort of traffic with the Republican side could make such trouble in the powerful bureaucracy of Washington that the Republican party would be put out of power for as long a time as it now has been in power.

Concerning the Bureaucracy.

And, speaking of this same bureaucracy, it has been built up and gained its present powerful position through the abandonment by President Roosevelt of the principles upon which he founded his original fortunes in politics. Today we learn that all federal officeholders who "resigned" in order to take up political work have been ordered to report at their posts if they expect to be reinstated. Now, do you know what the significance of that phrase is? Men from the postoffice department, the treasury or the interior department were permitted to resign to join in the joyous task of nominating and electing Taft. Ordinarily when a man resigns from a job that ends it. But they have an arrangement at Washington and, for that matter, in other federal offices by which the man can resign and after having completed the work he goes out to do be reinstated. It is perfectly obvious that the purpose of this arrangement is to circumvent the civil service reform law which prohibits federal officeholders from taking an active part in politics.

The republican national committee is ordinarily pretty prosperous. I think it is this year. If it can secure the services of a number of practical politicians—like, for example, Frank H. Hitchcock, who, it is said, has "resigned"—it can well afford to pay them salaries equivalent to those they were receiving from the government. And then if after five months of political activity on the part of these retired officials the president of the United States, the old time civil service reformer, Theodore Roosevelt, sends word just before the election that they must all hurry home or fail of reinstatement, how fine the moral effect upon the country is!

Can you imagine a better bit of political bunko than this? If federal officeholders must not take part in politics, let their resignations be final when handed in. But to say that the first assistant postmaster general can step out of office long enough to manage a campaign in which all his subordinates are interested and at its completion return again to his old place is to give the lie to every protestation of civil service reform that Theodore Roosevelt himself ever made.

Algoa and Delagoa.

The names Algoa bay and Delagoa bay are derived from the outward and homeward voyages of the old East Indianmen who on their voyages to Goa, in India, were wont to call at Port Elizabeth on the outward voyage and at Lourenco Marquex on the homeward voyage; hence the names Algoa (to Goa) and Delagoa (from Goa).