

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Vol. 4. No. 15.

Lincoln, Nebraska, April 29, 1904.

Whole No. 171.

THE NEW YORK PLATFORM

As it is somewhat unusual for a political speech to be made as this one is tonight, let me preface my remarks with an explanation. I have hired this hall and I introduce myself because I do not care to speak under the auspices of any club or organization which is committed to any particular aspirant for office. My concern is not about the name or the personality of the nominee, but about the principles for which the democratic party is to stand. While many of the papers seem to assume that the contest for the democratic nomination is necessarily between Judge Parker and Mr. Hearst, and that every democrat must either be for one or the other, such a position is illogical and without foundation. Those who are classed as reorganizers—and by that I mean those who would carry the party back to the position that it occupied under Mr. Cleveland's administration—are not entirely agreed among themselves as to the proper candidate upon whom to concentrate their votes, and so those who are in sympathy with the spirit of our recent platforms may differ as to the relative availability of those who represent the progressive element of the party. My own position is one of neutrality. I regard as available all candidates who are in favor of making the democratic party an honest, earnest and courageous exponent of the rights and interests of the masses and I regard as unavailable all who are in sympathy with, or obligated to, the great corporations that today dominate the policy of the republican party and seek, through the reorganizers, to dominate the policy of the democratic party. I have no favorites among those on our side and no special antagonism to those who represent the reorganizers. I believe that the line should be drawn between principles, not between men, and that men should only be considered as they may be able to advance or retard the progress of democracy.

I have come to Chicago because from this point I can reach a large number of voters in the Mississippi Valley, and I have expressed a desire to have the ministers attend because they can and should exert an influence in behalf of honesty and fairness in politics. When some two years ago I became satisfied that ex-Senator David B. Hill was planning to be a candidate I pointed out the objections to his candidacy. When the Cleveland boom was launched, I pointed out the objections to his candidacy, and now that Mr. Parker seems to be the leading candidate (though not the only candidate) among the reorganizers, I desire to present some reasons why he cannot be considered as an available candidate for a democratic nomination, and I find these reasons not in his personality, but in his position upon public questions. For a year he has been urged to speak out and declare himself upon the important issues of the coming campaign, but he has remained silent. If this silence meant that nobody knew his views, those who have been loyal to the party in recent years would stand upon an equal footing with those who deserted, but it is evident now that while to the public generally his views are unknown, they are well known to those who are urging his nomination. Whatever doubt may have existed on this subject heretofore, has been dispelled by the platform adopted by the New York state convention, and taking this platform as a text I am sanguine enough to believe that I can prove to every unbiased mind that Judge Parker is not a fit man to be nominated either by the democratic party or by any other party that stands for honesty or fair dealing in politics. I cannot hope to convince those who favor deception and fraud in politics, but I am satisfied that we now have evidence sufficient to convict Judge Parker of absolute unfitness for the nomination. If he did not know of the platform in advance, if he did not himself dictate it or agree to it, he has allowed it to go out as his utterance, for the convention was dominated by his friends and adopted a resolution presenting him as the candidate of the party of the state. This platform, then, can fairly be regarded as his declaration

upon public questions and what does the platform say? The first plank reads:

"This is a government of laws, not of men; one law for presidents, cabinets and people; no usurpation; no executive encroachment upon the legislative or judicial department."

This is a general plank that says nothing definitely. It is probably intended as a condemnation of the president's pension order, but the idea is so vaguely expressed that those who support the platform can deny that any criticism was intended, if they find that such criticism is unpopular.

The second plank reads:

"We must keep inviolate the pledges of our treaties; we must renew and reinvigorate within ourselves that respect for law and that love of liberty and of peace which the spirit of military domination tends inevitably to weaken and destroy."

This is probably intended as a rebuke to the president for his action in the Panama matter, but this, too, is so indefinite that the supporters of the platform can repudiate any such intention if it ever becomes convenient to do so.

The third plank reads:

"Unsteady national policies and a restless spirit of adventure engender alarms that check our commercial growth; let us have peace, to the end that business confidence may be restored, and that our people may again in tranquility enjoy the gains of their toil."

This, possibly, is intended as a criticism of the rashness of the president and of his emotional temperament, and yet it is so impersonal that those who support the platform can very plausibly insist that it has no particular reference to any person, but is intended as a very broad statement of a very general principle.

The fourth plank reads:

"Corporations chartered by the state must be subject to just regulation by the state in the interest of the people; taxation for public purposes only; no government partnership with protected monopolies."

This plank might find a welcome place in any platform. It would be difficult to conceive of a party that would object to "just regulations by the state in the interest of the people," nor is there any party that is likely to defend taxation for any other than a public purpose. Even the republican party has never declared itself in favor of "government partnership with protected monopolies." The plank, therefore, has no meaning at all as it stands, unless there is a secret suggestion that the regulation of corporations must be left entirely to the states. This is the position that is taken by the trust magnates. Whenever congress attempts to interfere with a trust the friends of the trust at once insist that the state must do the regulating—that is the position taken by the dissenting members of the supreme court in the merger case, and if this plank means anything it is an indorsement of the minority members of the court rather than an indorsement of the decision of the majority. The fact that the platform is silent about the merger decision lends color to this construction.

The fifth plank reads:

"Opposition to trusts and combinations that oppress the people and stifle healthy industrial competition."

This is the anti-trust plank of the platform! At least it is the only plank in which the trust is mentioned by name. The plank contains fourteen words, and it will be noted that the opposition is not to all monopolies, or even to all trusts, but simply to those that "oppress the people and stifle healthy industrial competition." That is the position taken by Judge Brewer in his sep-

arate opinion. He contends that the Sherman law was not intended to prevent all restraint of trade, but only "unreasonable restraint," and so Mr. Hill and the other New York friends of Judge Parker have worded their trust plank so as to make their meaning uncertain. They have so worded the plank as to present the trust view of the question, rather than the view entertained by the people at large. In order to excite the opposition of the friends of Judge Parker the trust must be shown to be "oppressive." It must be shown that it is not only stifling industrial competition, but that it is stifling a "healthy industrial competition." The trust magnates claim that the object of the trust is to stifle unhealthy industrial competition and to promote a "healthy industrial competition." The qualifying words used in this very brief and ambiguous plank destroy whatever vitality it might have had without them. The Kansas City platform declared a private monopoly to be indefensible and intolerable. It not only arraigned private monopoly as an unmitigated evil, but it pointed out specific remedies for the destruction of this evil. Compare the Kansas City platform with the cowardly and straddling anti-trust—or rather trust—plank of the New York platform, and you will understand why Mr. Hill and Judge Parker are so afraid of the Kansas City platform.

The sixth plank reads:

"A check upon extravagance in public expenditures; that the burden of the people's taxes may be lightened."

There is another plank that is as meaningless as those that have preceded it. Who advocates extravagance? Even when the republican party is guilty of the largest appropriations it insists that it is not extravagant, but that it is simply legislating for a large country.

The seventh plank reads:

"Reasonable revision of the tariff; needless duties upon imported raw material weigh upon the manufacturer, are a menace to the American wage-earner, and by increasing the cost of production shut out our products from foreign markets."

This plank is also evasive. The tariff revision must be "reasonable." What party ever advocated what it believed to be unreasonable on any subject? The duties upon raw material must not be "needless" duties. What party ever admitted that it put needless duties on anything? This plank justifies the criticism of one of the leading republican papers of the west which says that the platform "does not even dare to recommend the abandonment of the republican doctrine of protection of home industries, which had been fondly supposed by the old-fashioned Jeffersonian fellows to be about the only thing the party dared to cheep about at St. Louis."

The eighth plank is as follows:

"The maintenance of state rights and home rule; no centralization."

Now here is a plank that is a model of obscurity and brevity. Only ten words in the plank. To what issue is it to be applied? How is it to be construed?

The ninth plank reads:

"Honesty in public service; vigilance in the prevention of fraud; firmness in the punishment of guilt when detected."

As President Roosevelt prides himself upon his enthusiastic advocacy of honesty in the public service, and as his friends boast of his vigilance in the prevention of fraud and his firmness in the punishment of guilt, that plank might be regarded as an indorsement of him but for the fact that it is contained in a platform that suggests a candidate to oppose him.

The tenth plank reads:

"The impartial maintenance of the rights