

BOOSTS CHAMP CLARK

Arthur Mullen Gives Reasons Why Nebraska Should Be for the Missouri Statesman

PROGRESSIVES SHOULD COMBINE

The Herald is in sympathy with Hon. Woodrow Wilson's candidacy for president of the United States. In recent years he has been doing this country a valiant service in smashing the corrupt political machines in his own state, and has exerted a nation-wide influence for better government. However, we do not think that he is the only progressive democratic candidate.

Unfortunately the progressives of the democratic party are divided in this campaign between a number of candidates, while the reactionary element with all that they can control will no doubt center on one candidate. For this reason we believe that progressive voters should combine, if possible, on one candidate in order that the opposition may not win on a plurality.

Believing that Hon. Champ Clark is a progressive statesman and that he stands the best show of defeating the reactionary candidate in Nebraska, we give him our support for the preferential vote to be taken in the primaries which will be held on the 19th of this month.

Following is an article written by former attorney general Arthur Mullen and given to the press of Nebraska last week. While we do not fully agree with Mr. Mullen in some of the statements he makes concerning Woodrow Wilson, yet we believe that he takes a sensible view of the situation and advises a course that it will be well for Herald readers to follow. Although the article is long, we hope that every Nebraska democrat who reads this paper, will read it. It is as follows:

To the Democrats of Nebraska:

Champ Clark is entitled to the support of Nebraska in the national convention. His public record, his location, his official position are imperative demands on the democrats of this state. We should vote for our neighbor in the convention as a first choice. This state should go with Kansas and Missouri. Why go to New Jersey or Ohio for a candidate when we have the best candidate in a neighboring state? Why take up the governor of either New Jersey or Ohio when the speaker of the democratic house is a candidate.

No matter what we put in the platform or whom we put on the platform, the fight will be made on the record of the democrats in congress. The fight will not be made on the record of either the governor of Ohio or New Jersey. If the democratic party wins, it will be because the democrats in congress have convinced the public that the democratic party can be trusted to administer the affairs of the government.

As we must make this fight on the record of congress, then the only man to nominate is the democratic speaker. He is in a position to defend the record of congress. If the democratic party fails to nominate Speaker Clark, it will run away from the record that democrats have made in congress; it will lose the advantage that we have gained by having control of the house. If Speaker Clark is defeated, it will mean that the democratic national convention has failed to endorse the record of congress.

How can we nominate a governor of a state to defend the record of a democratic congress when the speaker is a candidate? In the event that Mr. Clark is defeated for the nomination how can we base any arguments in support of the democratic candidate on the record of this congress? The opposition can truthfully say that we have repudiated the record of congress by defeating the democratic speaker.

Clark Made a Record

It was under the direction of Speaker Clark, as a minority leader, that the democrats in congress, for the first time in sixteen years became united. So well did he manage things that in the election of 1910 the people of this country endorsed the democratic party and gave that party a majority in the house, the first since 1894. Under his leadership democracy steered away from the defeats of the past to the victory of 1910. Through his distinguished ability and sagacity he brought to the democratic party the only victory it has secured in a decade.

No democrat, no matter what his record might have been in the past, nor what his present ideas may be, can find fault with the conduct of Speaker Clark. He is the most popular democrat in the country. He is a real democrat, who is on good terms with all factions of the party

and with all of the democratic leaders. His nomination would bring order out of chaos; all would be satisfied; none would be disgruntled; political feuds would be at an end; the party would present a solid front to the enemy and thereby make a real fight for progressive democratic principles.

Nothing, either in the public or in the private life of Champ Clark, needs explanation or defense. The so-called "progressives" would be for Clark, for he was a radical twenty years before the word "progressive" was applied to public men. The so-called "conservatives" do not find fault with the record of the speaker. The democrats who have been voting the ticket in all the years of the past will be for Clark, for he has never sulked nor bolted at any time. He has never found fault with democratic platforms or bolted the democratic nominees.

The insurgent republicans will support him, for it was thru the wise, fair and intelligent leadership of Mr. Clark that the insurgent minority joined the democratic minority and won victories in congress. His treatment of the insurgent republicans has endeared him to them. No other democrat has been so near the insurgent republicans as Speaker Clark; no other democrat would receive so many insurgent votes.

No Flop Necessary.

Mr. Clark is a radical democrat who does not need to change his political policies, his political opinions or his political associates in order to be classed among those who are now called progressives.

His nomination will be pleasing and heartily endorsed by the radical progressives and independents of the country, such men as Senator Pettigrew of S. D., Theodore Bell of California, George Fred Williams of Massachusetts, Ollie James of Kentucky, and William R. Hearst of New York. James B. Weaver on his death bed wrote a letter heartily endorsing Speaker Clark. This endorsement is of peculiar interest to the democracy of Nebraska.

Nebraska Interested in Clark

Not only are we interested in Speaker Clark's nomination because of advantages it will give us in the nation, but it will give us a peculiar advantage in Nebraska. Speaker Clark is a western man, with Western ideas. He understands the needs and wants of the wage earners and wealth producers of the country. His nomination would settle the unfortunate controversy which has arisen between the friends of Governor Wilson and Governor Harmon. The controversy between the supporters of these men is very nearly as bitter as the regrettable controversy between Mr. Bryan and Senator Hitchcock. There is evidence on every side of anger and resentment. This is a time for cool heads and kind hearts. If the democrats of Nebraska could meet in convention and fight out their differences, no doubt they would agree on a course that would be satisfactory to all.

As we cannot hold a convention, the rank and file must settle these fights and controversies, by giving the preference vote of the state to Speaker Clark and electing both Mr. Bryan and Senator Hitchcock as delegates to the convention. The democrats need both these men in the convention. Mr. Bryan has more personal followers in the democratic party than any other man in it. Senator Hitchcock is one of the leading democratic senators. His record in congress meets with the approval of every Nebraska democrat. No criticism has been made of his official acts, none can be. Mr. Bryan has stated that the controversy between Senator Hitchcock and himself is personal. Democrats generally are not interested in the personal quarrels of leaders. The simple way out is to send them both to the national convention as delegates and instruct them to vote for Champ Clark. When Mr. Bryan and Senator Hitchcock meet at Baltimore they can fight it out or settle their personal differences without calling on all the democrats of Nebraska to act as referee.

Governor Harmon Not Available.

Notwithstanding the efforts of the supporters of Governor Harmon to prove that he is a progressive, there is a general conviction in the minds of democrats that he is a reactionary. Mr. Bryan is bitterly opposed to him. Many democrats are displeased and even angry at Mr. Bryan's attitude. Mr. Bryan's followers insist that he is right in opposing Governor Harmon. The merits of the controversy are lost sight of in bitterness and resentment.

The ordinary democrat who has a greater interest in the principles of the party than he has in the leaders of the party should look to the future and consider what the result will be if a democrat candidate for president is nominated over the protest of Mr. Bryan. Those who



CHAMP CLARK.

have undertaken to force Governor Harmon's nomination onto the democratic party over Mr. Bryan's protest should remember the disastrous election of 1904. Judge Parker was nominated over the protest of Mr. Bryan. In that election the democrats in Nebraska elected only nine members in the legislature; lost all of the state ticket and practically all of the local offices. Mr. Parker lost this state by more than 87,000 majority. Knowing these things, no matter what the provocation may be or how angry democrats become at Mr. Bryan's attitude, we ought to be patient and sensible.

It would be the sheerest folly for the democrats of Nebraska to be instrumental in nominating any candidate for president over the protest of Mr. Bryan. What advantage will be gained by endorsing a candidate in Nebraska that will not be agreeable to Mr. Bryan? The wisest thing to do is to nominate a candidate who will have Mr. Bryan's support. There is no sense or reason in throwing away the support and influence of Mr. Bryan.

No matter what the viewpoint is, in sober reflection, all know that the nomination of Governor Harmon would be a calamity to the democratic party. Mr. Bryan's opposition has already made it impossible for the democrats to carry Nebraska in the event that Governor Harmon is nominated. Seriously, why spend energy and time fighting for the nomination of a man that cannot be elected—why nominate a man that means a sure defeat for the democratic party of this state?

Woodrow Wilson not a Progressive

Many democrats in Nebraska believe that Woodrow Wilson is a progressive; other democrats, equally as honest, insist that he is not a progressive. The facts are that most of the sentiment in this state in his favor has been created because it was reported by a few leaders, who claimed to speak for Mr. Bryan, that Governor Wilson was Mr. Bryan's choice for president. Those who circulated this report had no authority to do so. Mr. Bryan has repeatedly stated within the past ten days that he has no choice as between Governor Wilson and Speaker Clark. Many become committed to Governor Wilson's support without any investigation of his record. They believed that he was Mr. Bryan's choice. Mr. Wilson's support in Nebraska is largely based on the false report that he was Mr. Bryan's favored candidate. His support is not based on his record as a democrat or his merits as a man.

Before Mr. Bryan announced that he had no choice as between Speaker Clark and Governor Wilson many of Mr. Bryan's intimate friends looked upon opposition to Governor Wilson as a species of democratic treason. Assuming that Bryan was for him, the Wilson leaders arrogated to themselves the right to say who was and who was not a progressive. Those who opposed were looked upon as "reactionaries," their honesty questioned and their motives impugned.

With all due respect to the many honest men who disagree with me, I assert that Governor Wilson is not now and never has been a progressive. This statement is made deliberately and after the fullest investigation. It is supported by the life and conduct of Mr. Wilson. It is based on his utterances as an author, his speeches and his writings. With no desire to do him an injustice or to be over-critical with him, a part of his record is here presented. What is set down here is taken from his books, from his speeches and from his writings. It is Governor Wilson's assault upon himself. In justice to him, these things ought

to be known before the primary. Democrats should know something of the record of the man who aspires to be the standard bearer in this campaign. Before nominating him, we should know what will appear in the headlines of the republican press at the event of his nomination.

Glimpses at Wilson's Record

Let us glance briefly at his record. He voted against Mr. Bryan in 1896 and in 1900. He says that he voted for Mr. Bryan in 1908. Governor Wilson has never openly supported Mr. Bryan in any campaign. Since 1892 his open support of the democratic ticket is confined to 1904, when Judge Parker was a candidate.

In other words, Governor Wilson has openly supported the democratic party on national issues once in twenty years. He was silent in all of the fights made by Mr. Bryan; he has never raised his voice or used his pen in defense of a single principle for which democracy has battled in recent years. His influence during all of these years has been against the democratic party. Since 1896 he has given aid, comfort and solace to republicans. He has found fault with the democratic platforms and criticized democratic leaders.

In 1902 Governor Wilson finished his "History of the American People." This book is an index of the political beliefs and convictions of its author. In speaking of the Chicago platform of 1896 he says:

"It uttered radical doctrines of reform which sounded like sentences taken from the platforms of the people's party."

Of the campaign of 1896 he said: "The battle was to be won by argument, not by ridicule or terror or mere stubbornness of vested interests. It was won by argument."

In speaking about the proposals of the Farmers' Alliance he said: "These were vague purposes and the means of reform proposed showed the thinking of crude and ignorant minds."

In speaking of the people's party he said:

"The people's party, which the newspapers of the country (1892) promptly dubbed 'populist,' had put forth a platform which demanded that the federal government should itself acquire the ownership of all railroads, telegraphs and telephones, the free coinage of silver, a graduated income tax, postal savings banks, and all lands held by aliens, or by corporations, in excess of their needs, reclaimed—a radical program which jumped with the humor of hundreds of thousands of working men and farmers the country over."

A Progressive View of It

This history is filled with arguments opposed to everything radical and to everything that is progressive. It is a standpat history, written by a leader of standpatism. After reading it, George Fred Williams, the most prominent of progressive democrats, made the following comment:

"This week I have been shocked at the reading of the fifth volume of his 'History of the American People,' published in 1902. It is torquism of the blackest type. It is not a history of the American people, but a history of Woodrow Wilson's admiration for everything which the radical democracy now seeks to change and a series of sneers and insults to every class of men who have sought to alleviate the injustice of capitalism. I think Senator Aldrich would have written with more charity and less bitterness. The worst is that there is no note of sympathy for any suffering and protesting class, but he seems to search for phrases to show his contempt for them. Read the volume and judge whether I exaggerate in this statement."

The "Cocked Hat" Letter

The statements made in this history are but a small part of the evidence given by Mr. Wilson himself to contradict the claim that he is a progressive. For the past sixteen years he has gone out of his way to make arguments against Mr. Bryan and the things for which Mr. Bryan stands. In 1907 he wrote the following letter to Mr. Joline:

"My Dear Mr. Joline: Thank you for sending me your address at Parsons, Kas., before the directors of the M. K. & T. Railway Company. I have read it with relish and entire agreement. Would that we could do something at once dignified and effective to knock Mr. Bryan once and for all into a cocked hat. Cordially and sincerely yours, Woodrow Wilson."

Opposed to Railroad Regulation

The speech referred to in this letter, which Governor Wilson read "with relish and entire agreement," bitterly denounced Mr. Bryan as a demagogue, violently attacked labor unions and found fault with state legislatures for passing laws regulating railroads. This speech bitterly assailed 2-cent fare laws and the laws providing for a physical valua-

tion of the railroads. The fact that Mr. Wilson wanted to "knock Mr. Bryan into a cocked hat" may or may not be important, but the fact that Mr. Wilson was in "entire agreement" with the president of a railroad who opposed 2-cent fares and the physical valuation of the railroads is important to the democrats of this state and nation.

The progressive democrats of Nebraska are not in favor of a presidential candidate who is opposed to the 2-cent fare law or to a law providing for the physical valuation of the railroads of the country. This is an important question that should not be overlooked. Mr. Wilson is opposed to the progressive democracy of this country on these questions.

In another way Mr. Wilson has shown his opposition to railroad regulation. In 1907, when democratic leaders were battling for the regulation of freight rates in congress, he stated:

"I venture a feeble protest against the blind and foolish outcry against all railroads. You and I know who are responsible for this socialistic, populist anti crusade; it is the cry of the envious against the well-to-do; the old story."

Other Stabs at Bryan

Do the progressive democrats want to nominate a candidate for president whose viewpoint is as indicated in the foregoing quotations?

Not only is Mr. Wilson out of harmony with the democrats of this country on the railroad question, but he is and has been out of harmony with practically every important thing that has been in the democratic platforms since 1896. In a speech delivered at the third annual dinner of the Virginians in the Astor gallery of the Waldorf-Astoria hotel, Governor Wilson called on the democracy of the south to demand a rehabilitation of the democratic party on old lines. Among other things, he stated:

"Since 1896 the democratic party has permitted its name to be used by men who ought never to have been admitted to its councils—men who hold principles and professed purposes which it had always hitherto repudiated."

"Until it has read them out of the party as an alien faction there will be no doubtful states again."

"There is no longer any democratic party, either in the south or in any northern state which the discredited radicals can use. The great body of one-time democrats that musters strong enough to win elections has revolted and will act with no organization which harbors the radicals—as the radicals did not in fact act with the organization they themselves have discredited in the recent campaign, when the whole country felt that the democratic party was still without definite character and makeup."

"The country, as it moves forward in its material progress, needs and will tolerate no party of discontent or radical experiment, but it does need a party of conservative reform, acting in the spirit of the law and ancient institutions."

Fools and Knaves

Just four years ago this month, when it was evident to everyone that Mr. Bryan was to be nominated for the third time as a candidate of the democratic party for president, Governor Wilson gave out an interview containing the following gem:

"I have ever wished at times that every fool could be also a knave, instead of being, as they often are, people who possess attractive manners and excellent intentions. Take Mr. Bryan for example, he is the most charming and lovable of men, personally, but foolish and dangerous in his theoretical beliefs."

Near the time that Governor Wilson made such bitter criticism of those who were attempting to regulate the railroads, he made an application to become a beneficiary of the Carnegie pension fund. As a student of public affairs he knew that the gigantic fortune of Mr. Carnegie, which was to furnish the pension, was gained by unjust privileges given to the steel trust. He knew that some service was contemplated in return for the pension.

Once Changed His Mind

For twenty years he opposed in his writings and on the platform the initiative and referendum. A few months ago he announced that he had changed his views and now believed in the initiative and referendum. His conversion on this question occurred about the time that he first became seriously considered as a presidential possibility.

The tone of all his writings and speeches shows that by education, instinct and environment he is a conservative. He is not in sympathy with the so-called progressive policies of the democratic party; he does not believe in these policies; he has not supported the men who advocated them. Just how it has

been reasoned out that Governor Wilson is a progressive and entitled to the support of progressives has never been explained. If Woodrow Wilson's record makes a progressive democrat, what kind of a record must a man have to be conservative?

Time and space forbid further quotations from his writings and utterances, but what has been cited discloses the views of Governor Wilson on some of the public questions. The statements herein made have not and cannot be denied. With this extreme conservative and standpat record, he presents himself as a leader of progressive democrats without recanting on anything he has said or done and without even making an apology.

If he now believes in the principles of the democratic party and has been sincerely converted from his errors of the past, let him go into the ranks and do penance before expecting to be the democratic presidential nominee. He should help make at least one progressive battle for a democratic presidential candidate before asking to be made the democratic leader. Democrats will know before four years pass whether or not the conversion is real or whether or not it is the buzz of a presidential bee.

Where He Can Do Most Good

Governor Wilson has work on hand in New Jersey. That state is the home of practically all the trusts. Nothing has been done to curb or stop the organization of these trusts in that state. If Governor Wilson is a real progressive, he can drive every trust out of New Jersey. No other democratic governor ever has had or now has the opportunity that he has. By making a fight against the trusts in New Jersey, he can render a greater service to the people of this nation than any man can as president.

To nominate him for president would be a blunder. The democratic party would enter upon a campaign of apology and defense. It would spend its time and energy defending the record of its nominee, instead of fighting republicans. His nomination would be a retreat from the advance position that democracy has taken. It would be a repudiation of the democratic platforms since 1896; it would be a humiliation of those leaders who have been fighting democratic battles. We would drive away from the support of the democratic ticket the radicals and independents. William R. Hearst has said that all of his fourteen daily newspapers will fight Governor Wilson to the end in the event of his nomination.

Real Democrats for Clark

It's time for the democrats in Nebraska to get the cobwebs out of their eyes and the rancor out of their minds. Let us give the preference vote to Champ Clark. We know that he is a progressive. If he is nominated, we need make no defense or apology. We can wage our fight against the common enemy in behalf of a real democrat. Democracy will triumph in the nation. After the victory we will have a man in office whose public record shows that he believes in the basic principles of democracy, that he has faith in the people and will use his influence to place on the statute books of the nation laws that will carry out all of the policies of the democratic party.

LEGAL BLANKS

A large line of conveyancing and other legal blanks is carried in stock at the office of The Alliance Herald. We can supply these in any quantity desired. Following is a list of some of the blanks carried in stock:

- Agreement for Building
- Agreement for Warranty Deed
- Assignment of Mortgage
- Application for Druggist's Permit
- Administrator's or Executor's Deed
- Bond for Deed
- Bill of Sale
- Chattel Lease
- Contract for Sale of Real Estate
- Mortgage
- Contractor's Bond
- Contract for Real Estate
- Farm Lease
- Estray Notice
- Extension of Mortgage
- Indemnity Bond
- Lease of City Property
- Lease of Personal Property
- Lease
- Mortgage Deed
- Mortgage for Coupon Notes
- Miscellaneous Bond
- Quit Claim Deed

The above list includes only a part of the blanks which we carry in stock. If there is any other blank that you wish, call at our office, or write for it, and we will supply the same in any quantity you desire.

HERALD PUBLISHING COMPANY, Alliance, Nebraska.