

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor	CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher
RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor	Editorial Rooms and Business Office 324-330 Fourth 12th Street
One Year.....\$1.00	Three Months..... .25
Six Months..... .50	Single Copy..... .05
In Clubs of Five or more, per year... .75	Sample Copies Free. Foreign Post. 5c Extra.

SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where sub-agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by postoffice money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps or money.

DISCONTINUANCES—It is found that a large majority of our subscribers prefer not to have their subscriptions interrupted and their files broken in case they fail to remit before expiration. It is therefore assumed that continuance is desired unless subscribers order discontinuance, either when subscribing or at any time during the year.

PRESENTATION COPIES—Many persons subscribe for friends, intending that the paper shall stop at the end of the year. If instructions are given to that effect they will receive attention at the proper time.

RENEWALS—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus January 21, '10, means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1910. Two weeks are required after money has been received before the date on wrapper can be changed.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give old as well as new address.

ADVERTISING—Rates will be furnished upon application.

Address all communications to

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.

reason to feel gratified. The former was heartily indorsed by name, and the latter in the only way he desired. In the republican camp the insurgents were heavily outnumbered, and in the democratic camp the Omaha brewers were unable to float Governor Harmon in on a wave of foam. A Buckeye visitor to the democratic convention explained apologetically that he had no evil intentions, but had come to town simply to look on.

In indorsing Mr. Taft and his work the republicans did the only sensible thing. To ignore him would have been folly; to praise him halfheartedly, stupidity; to repudiate him, a blunder of proportions greater than a crime. Mr. La Follette was the only man in the minds of Mr. Taft's opponents, and outside of his own state he has no real strength. Talk of him for president is thin, and confined to a few places and a comparatively small number. Were the republican party to put such a man up for national leader next year its defeat at the polls would be so pronounced the result would put it out of business permanently.

The democrats did not indorse Mr. Bryan for president, because he had expressly stated that he was not a candidate. But they indorsed the national platform of 1908, which he dictated to the letter, and upon which he stood as the party's candidate that year. They pointed with pride to Nebraska's prominence in national affairs, which is to be ascribed more largely to Mr. Bryan than to any other son of the soil. They detailed with commendation policies with which Mr. Bryan's name is more prominently identified than that of any other democrat in the whole country. They indorsed by name the house farmers' free list bill, of which Mr. Bryan approves, but did not mention the house wool bill, of which he does not approve.

Mr. Bryan could not reasonably have asked for more. If he is not satisfied it must be because he has had so much these past sixteen years he has become spoiled. No man in our history—not even Mr. Clay—ranks him in long-continued party popularity. He has not now the strength he possessed a few years ago, but still a great deal remains. This Fremont deliverance seems to make sure his appearance as a delegate to the democratic national convention. He should head the Nebraska delegation by all means. His own interests suggest it, his party's interests demand it, and the country expects it. A great drama before a house packed to the roof, with the star role in the hands of an understudy, would be a disappointment. When the name of Nebraska is called Mr. Bryan should be the respondent.—Washington (D. C.) Star.

VAIN DETRACTION

Read the dispatches from Nebraska about William J. Bryan with caution. The other day

a dispatch came out of Lincoln that told of his being denounced in resolutions by a democratic convention. On its face it seemed to show that the party was falling away from its recognized leader. As a matter of truth, nothing of the kind was happening.

So Dahlman gets his kind together in a convention and adopts resolutions denouncing his opponent. News agencies send out meager stories of "democratic" gatherings scoring Bryan. Every one of such resolutions is a badge of honor for the distinguished commoner.

Turn the picture around. Suppose you lived in Nebraska and read a short dispatch to the effect that "the democrats of Los Angeles" had met and indorsed Mushet for mayor. It would be as true—no more—as that the democrats of Lincoln or Omaha have repudiated Bryan.

Mr. Bryan is stronger today with the people of all parties the country over than when, more than fifteen years ago, he braved the epithets, "demagogue" and "populist" to advocate reforms that now the country demands overwhelmingly. The tireless fight he has made, through good and evil report, for tariff and tax reforms and against plutocratic rule has done as much as any other single agency to arouse the American people. Many leaders of today are reaping where Mr. Bryan has sown. Editorial in the Tribune, Los Angeles, Cal.

BRYAN AND NEBRASKA

Nebraska's democratic politicians have wisely decided not to throw away their best asset. Without the popularity, prestige and public confidence enjoyed by William J. Bryan, the democratic party of Nebraska would be the same impotent minority, hopeless of office and devoid of principle, that it is in other middle western states. Bryan has made its victories of the past possible, and evidently even those of his party who would like to fight him have a keen realization of that fact.

Probably a majority of local and state politicians resent Mr. Bryan's injection of the liquor issue into the campaign of 1910, but that resentment, it is quite apparent, is not to be carried to the extent of attempting to repudiate his leadership. All other considerations aside, the rank and file of the party would not tolerate such a proceeding.

For their partial defeat last year Nebraska democrats are themselves to blame. Their 1909 legislature emasculated the closed primary law, in the hope that under the new law democrats would be able to dictate republican nominations and disrupt the republican party. Governor Shallenberger, who signed this destructive measure, was its first victim. Sufficient wet republicans invaded the democratic primaries to defeat him and to nominate Dahlman, and the latter was beaten by the better sentiment of the state without regard to party lines. Level headed democrats realize that Dahlman's election would have been a monumental party calamity.

There was a manifest disposition at the Fremont convention to forget the past. The democrats of Nebraska are confident they can carry the state next year against President Taft, should he be renominated, and their victory would probably carry with it a state administration and another United States senator. But no democrat possessing the slightest atom of good judgment believes such a result can be accomplished without the hearty co-operation and moral influence of Mr. Bryan.

This recognition of an absolute fact, however, makes no difference to Dahlman and his cohorts. Now that Dahlman's state leadership has become impossible, they have little interest in state politics beyond the prevention of further regulatory or prohibitory liquor and vice legislation. They can work to that end in the republican party as well as in the democratic party. Indeed the disposition of Omaha politicians of all parties to regard their allegiance to the breweries as paramount to all other consideration is fast getting them into disrepute everywhere.

Every indication now is that the next Nebraska delegation to the democratic national convention will be headed by Mr. Bryan, and that it will cast its solid vote and wield its influence in favor of the nomination of a progressive democrat for president.—Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune.

IS THE DEMOCRACY ALL RIGHT?

"Everything is in the best of shape with the democrats," we are advised in correspondence from Washington and in the editorial columns

of certain newspapers. However, not being unsophisticated, "The Republican" which is as free and as independent as the air and sums up a situation with sole regard to the naked truth, discounts these assertions heavily and draws its own conclusions.

William J. Bryan, as usual, comes in for the hard bumps at the hands of those who have left the straight and narrow path in the democracy and who now tell us that the party's prospects are O. K. He is the disturber, the smasher, the attempter of the impossible and what not. He had no business to "butt in" at Washington and stir up strife over the wool question, we are informed. It was his place to keep his mouth shut and "go along."

And what has this man Bryan done? Simply endeavored to hold the democracy to its promise—to its faith. He, like the others, has stood at the gate and looked in on the forbidden fruit of reaction and the fleshpots of compromise; but, contrary to those others, he has refused to be tempted. He still stands at the gate, on the hard stones of his political faith, on what he believes to be true, on the pledge of his heart to the people. Resolute and firm, upright as a shaft of steel, against which the coaxing, the praying, the threatening of weak little mortals dash in vain—there he stands unconquered and unconquerable.—Landsdale (Pa.) Republican.

CHARLES W. BRYAN'S STATEMENT

Following the Nebraska democratic national convention held at Fremont July 25, Charles W. Bryan gave out the following statement:

Some of the newspaper reports sent out from the Fremont convention gave the impression that an effort was made on the part of Mr. Bryan's friends to have Mr. Bryan personally indorsed in the resolutions before they were submitted to the recent democratic state convention for adoption. This is an error. Mr. Bryan did not want his name to be the cause of friction in the convention, and his only desire was that the convention overlook the local differences that divided the democrats in the state last year and get together on the national, progressive issues that the Nebraska democracy has championed and upon which it is invincible.

Members of the Lancaster delegation understood Mr. Bryan's attitude before they reached Fremont, and those with whom we conferred upon reaching Fremont, among them being Mr. Harrington, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Shallenberger, Mr. Reed, Mr. Sutherland and many others, were advised that he did not desire a personal indorsement and that he would gladly co-operate in an effort to unite the party on the important issues that the democracy of this state has been identified with.

Some of Mr. Bryan's friends who had not heard of his wishes in the matter of indorsement prepared a resolution complimentary to Mr. Bryan and circulated it among the various delegations to the convention. I did not learn of the matter until after several hundred pledges of support of the resolution had been secured. While we were pleased by the friendly interest shown, we discouraged the movement and only dissuaded them from introducing their resolution in the convention by telling them that it was not Mr. Bryan's desire and that if the resolution was introduced, I would feel it necessary, in order to prevent Mr. Bryan's name from causing possible friction, to read to the convention a letter that I had received from him two days prior to the convention. For the purpose of advising a large number of Mr. Bryan's friends who attended the convention and who did not have an opportunity to learn of his letter, its contents are given below:

"Lincoln, Neb., July 23, 1911.—Dear Brother: If the question is raised at the convention, I wish you would say that I do not desire my name used to cause friction in the convention. We have been united on national issues for seventeen years when defeat was our portion; we should be united now when victory seems within reach. Personal differences on state issues should not be allowed to cause dissensions. Nebraska's democracy stands today as of yore for positive and progressive democracy—democracy as set forth in the Denver platform, whose principles were indorsed in Nebraska before the national convention was held and again indorsed last year. W. J. BRYAN."

The platform adopted at Fremont silences those who have accused the democratic party of receding from the advanced position that it has occupied on reform legislation both state and national and no doubt is most gratifying to all democrats throughout this state.

CHARLES W. BRYAN.