

# The Platform of the Nebraska Democracy.

Reported to the democratic state convention, held at Omaha, June 1, by Mr. Bryan, chairman of the committee on resolutions, and unanimously adopted:

We, the democrats of the state of Nebraska, in convention assembled, reaffirm our faith in democratic principles as those principles were set forth in the last national platform of the party, adopted at Kansas City in 1900.

Democracy means the rule of the people—a government resting upon the consent of the governed and administered according to the will, and in the interest of the people.

With an increasing love for the principles of democracy and an increasing confidence in their final triumph, we look upon the present time as opportune for their earnest and courageous promulgation. With a chief executive who has disregarded constitutional limitations, stirred up antagonism between the races, employed all the powers of his office to secure a renomination and purchased political support by turning the treasury department over to the financiers and putting the law department in the hands of the trusts—with such a chief executive and with republican leaders openly and arrogantly in alliance with organized wealth, the country imperatively needs a return of the government to positive and clearly defined democratic principles. Democracy as taught by Jefferson and exemplified by Jackson is the hope of the republic and offers the only relief from the plutocracy which now dominates the republican party, and through that party, the country.

Democracy would oppose as inimical to the welfare of the people all private monopolies, and would exterminate them by the enforcement of the remedies suggested in the Kansas City platform. The failure of the present administration to enforce the existing laws or to suggest more effective laws, is conclusive proof that it lacks the desire, the intelligence or the moral courage to attack the conscienceless combinations of capital that have flourished during recent years.

Democracy would relieve the country of the menace of militarism and imperialism by following the example set by this country in its dealings with Cuba, and giving the Filipinos an immediate promise of ultimate independence. The administration of a colonial system according to monarchical principles is repugnant to our theory of government and cannot be defended without the assertion of doctrines which, if carried out, will undermine free government in the United States.

Democracy would restore the tariff to a revenue basis and administer it for revenue only, thus demolishing the legal bulwark behind which the predatory trusts have found refuge. Protection for protection's sake is an ingenious device for the exploitation of the masses by the privileged classes; it has brought great injustice to the consumers and has been the fruitful source of widespread political corruption.

Democracy would administer the treasury department in behalf of the public, not, as now, in the interest of Wall street. It would prevent the recoinage of legal tender silver dollars into limited legal tender subsidiary coin; it would secure to the people a volume of standard money sufficient to keep pace with the demand for money; it would favor paper money issued by the government without the intervention of national banks; it would resist the attempt to establish an asset currency and branch banks, and it would oppose the loaning of government money to favorite banks—a scheme by which the people's money is employed to lay a foundation for a campaign fund and to bribe the financial interests to oppose any reduction of taxation. The present administration of the treasury department is progressively beneficial to the capitalistic class and progressively harmful to the producers of wealth.

Democracy would make taxation more equitable by collecting a part of the revenues from an income tax, secured by a constitutional amendment, and would bring the government nearer to the people by the popular election of United States senators and by direct legislation.

Democracy would strictly regulate the railroads, thus protecting farmers and merchants from excessive rates and discriminations.

Democracy would safeguard the interests of the wage-earner and the artisan by providing for an eight-hour day, by substituting arbitration for

strikes and lockouts and by restoring the right of trial by jury, now suspended through government by injunction.

Democracy would secure to the surviving soldiers and sailors and their dependents generous pensions, not by an arbitrary executive order, but by legislation which a grateful people stand ready to enact.

Democracy would construct an isthmian canal without a violation of treaty obligations and without exciting suspicion among our sister republics of Central and South America.

Democracy would regard public office as a public trust, provide for an honest and economical administration of the government, and punish with severity any betrayal of official duty.

Democracy has nothing to gain from ambiguity and nothing to fear from the light. Democratic platforms should, therefore, set forth democratic principles, policies and purposes with frankness, clearness and definiteness. Those who champion the principles embodied in a truly democratic creed can appeal to the moral sense of the country, and trust for vindication to the awakened conscience of an intelligent and patriotic citizenship.

The delegates chosen by this convention to the democratic national convention are hereby instructed to vote as a unit on all questions, provided that the unit rule may be suspended by a majority vote of the delegation.

Separate resolution introduced by Hon. Edgar Howard and also unanimously adopted:

"The democracy of Nebraska heralds to the democracy of the nation its steadfast respect for, confidence in, and loyalty to Nebraska's great champion of pure democratic principles, and bids him God-speed in his splendid efforts to prevent the national organization from falling under the baneful control of the enemies of the real democracy.

In presenting the platform as chairman of the resolutions committee, Mr. Bryan said:

I respond to the call for a speech, not because it is necessary to say anything in defense of this platform, but because I am always glad to speak to the democrats of Nebraska.

This platform, unanimously reported by your committee and so cordially received by the convention, is a democratic platform. It is brief and concise, but so clear and easily understood that "he who runs may read." Your committee recognizes, as you recognize, that the supreme issue running through the minor questions is the issue between democracy and plutocracy, the issue between a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and a government such as we have now under a republican administration—a government of the corporations, by the corporations and for the corporations. No matter to what subject we address ourselves we find the same struggle between organized wealth and the masses. In 1892 the paramount issue was the tariff question. There the issue was between the consumers, who constitute the bulk of the population, and the producers of protected articles who profit by high tariff. In 1896 the money question was paramount and there, too, the issue was between the masses of the people who desire a stable currency, and the money changers, who are interested in manipulating the finances of the government for their own profit.

In 1900 the paramount issue was imperialism, and in this the same contest between plutocracy and democracy was apparent. Imperialism disregards the right of the Filipinos to self-government and it also disregards the right of the people of this country to a government administered in behalf of the people at large, for the expenditure of enormous sums on the army and on the navy, and for carpet-bag government in the Philippines, is not in the interest of the voters of America, but in the interest of the syndicates that exploit the islands and in the interest of the few who will find official positions there.

So with the trust question, which is growing into greater and greater importance, the issue is between corporate wealth, organized in the form of monopoly, and the people who are the victims of extortion and whose sons are denied the hope of independence in the industrial world. The controversy between labor and capital distinctly involves this issue. In fact, you may turn in any direction, you may consider any subject you like, and you cannot avoid this issue between the man and the dollar. The democratic party takes the side of the man.

Those who have faith in the righteousness of democratic principles and faith in the intelligence and patriotism of the people, are glad to make

their principles known, because they believe that the better—the principles are known the stronger they will become with the people. The Nebraska platform speaks the honest convictions of democrats who have faith in the persuasive power of the democratic principles to which they adhere.

The platform presented to you reaffirms faith in the fundamental principles of democracy, and those principles are dear to the hearts of Nebraska democrats. If I were an artist I would draw a picture which would represent the present situation. It would be a picture of a tree; upon its trunk I would inscribe "Democracy." Upon the various branches of the tree I would inscribe "Anti-Monopoly," "Anti-Imperialism," "Tariff Reform," "Bimetallism," "Labor Legislation," "An Income Tax," "Popular Election of Senators," "Direct Legislation," etc. I would represent Wall street in the act of cutting the tree down, using reorganization as the ax. The Kansas City platform democrats, nurtured in the democratic faith, revering the democratic creed as the gospel of free government, and strong in their confidence in its ultimate triumph—these I would represent as a man ready to protect the tree, and I would have this representative of militant democracy entering his protest in the words of the poet—

"Woodman, spare that tree,  
Touch not a single bough;  
In youth it sheltered me,  
And I'll protect it now."

There never was a time when democratic principles were more necessary or when the defenders of the faith had more reason for earnestness and courage. The democrats of Nebraska who for so many years adhered to their principles in the face of overwhelming defeat, are not disposed to surrender now no matter what others may do. They believe that both principle and expediency demand progress rather than retrogression.

When Mr. Bryan was elected by acclamation as a delegate to the national convention, he was called out again, and in thanking the convention for honoring him, said:

"I felt complimented when my precinct selected me as a delegate to the county convention; I felt complimented again when my county sent me a delegate to the state convention, and I appreciate the honor you do me in making me a delegate to the national convention. I shall endeavor to carry out the wishes that you have expressed, and I have such confidence in the intelligence and patriotism of the voters of the party that I believe that when their representatives meet at St. Louis they will be able to write a platform and select a ticket which will command the support of those who believe in democratic principles as you understand them.

## A Popular Platform.

Do the leaders of the New York democracy know what is popular in New York? The La Crosse (Wis.) Leader-Press directs attention to the democratic vote cast in New York for 1892 and for every state election thereafter until 1902, as follows:

Year.	Democratic candidate.	Democratic vote
1892—	Cleveland, president.....	654,868
1894—	Hill, governor.....	517,710
1896—	Bryan, president.....	551,369
1897—	Parker, court of appeals.....	554,680
1898—	Van Wyck, governor.....	643,921
1900—	Bryan, president.....	678,386
1902—	Coler, governor.....	655,398

The Leader-Press says that at only two of these elections—1892 and 1897—were the democratic candidates successful and that in 1900 the democratic nominee for president received the largest vote cast during a decade for any candidate. In other words, in 1900 the democratic national ticket received 23,518 votes more than Mr. Cleveland received in 1902; 160,000 more than Mr. Hill received in 1894 and 123,000 more than Mr. Parker received when he was elected to the bench in 1897.

Do these figures indicate that the Kansas City platform is unpopular?

Can New York democrats improve the chances of success by repudiating that platform?