An Open Letter to Senator Hitchcock

Papillion, Neb., April 3, 1912.—Hon. G. M. Hitchcock, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.—My Dear Sir: Acknowledging receipt of your letter of recent date in which you state your position as a candidate for delegate-at-large to the democratic national convention and in which you make certain inquiry, I think you will not object to a frank reply, although bearing kindly personal feeling.

As you well know, if you shall attend the convention as a duly elected delegate from Nebraska, the question of which person you shall support in the convention for presidential candidate is not debatable as you, in such event, will have your instructions from the people before going. Since the people instruct as to their preference for a candidate but do not instruct as to the platform, I submit that it is not of much importance which candidate you prefer but it is very important whether you will help write and adopt a progressive or a reactionary platform to be the rule and guide of our party for the next four years.

A few weeks ago Mr. Bryan took the people into his confidence and frankly told them that if they wanted Harmon for president they should send delegates to the convention who are in sympathy with him. Mr. Bryan said in effect that he could not now stultify his conscience by helping nominate a candidate whom he considered reactionary and opposed to progressive democracy after he had given twenty years of the best part of his life to working for progressive principles. But if the people prefer a progressive candidate for president then he can consistently serve as a delegate. That was manly and honorable in Mr. Bryan and consistent with his record as a progressive. He perhaps knows better than we do who the progressives and reactionaries are.

Two years ago Mr. Bryan supported a moral issue because its adoption would mean a moral and an intellectual uplift to the people and for the further reason that the immoral element had used the issue to defeat the people's wish. He was right, of course, from a moral standpoint. You and your newspaper are now playing to the gallery of his opponents in that issue and you are trying to defame Bryan as opposed to the popular primary and as a party boss but your motive will perhaps be better understood by the public later.

You are either a progressive or a reactionary. Bryan is the recognized leader of the progressives while those who oppose him and the principles he represents are recognized as reactionaries. By your opposition to Bryan you have placed yourself in the latter class as a reactionary. "Birds of a feather flock together" we should remember. If you are not attacking Bryan from the standpoint of your being a reactionary then you merely have a personal grudge against him to satisfy and in forcing your personal fight into the party you are imposing upon the party and endangering its success at the polls. In either event you are trying, by means which the people would not tolerate if they understood, to secure the political ostracism and repudiation of Bryan, the greatest and most persistent and most conscientious leader advocating the cause of the plain people at the present time. Mr. Bryan has been without the advantage and prestige that would belong with an office, yet, while only a private citizen, his wonderful advocacy of great principles of progressive democracy has made him the recognized progressive leader of a great party for twenty years. Such a popular leadership has not been duplicated during the entire history of our country-not even by Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, McKinley and others now gone. The effect of his twenty years of persistent work is partly seen in the adoption of many of the principles he advocated by somestates, in part by the nation and also by the political reforms advocated by progressive lead-

ers in both the great parties.

Shall we now submit to the ostracism of Bryan's counsel from the national democratic party by the lesser political lights in our own state? The political ostracism of Bryan would cause great joy among certain interests in New York city and Washington. When we repudiate Bryan, La Follette and Roosevelt we leave the great mass of plain people without a single great champion of their cause in this country. Whether we do so or not Bryan's fame will dwell a thousand years after his present day critics are forgotten. Shall we repudiate Bryan and progress?

"The world wants men—true men, Who can neither be bought nor sold; Men who scorn to violate trust, Genuine gold.

The world wants men—pure men,
Free from the taint of sin:
Men whose lives are clean without,
And pure within."

Respectfully yours, ERNEST L. IRELAND.

ADVANTAGES OF THE DUAL SYSTEM

The monopolists who are bleeding the country are the very ones who are constantly defying the state and belittling their rights. Of course they object to national legislation, and in making their objection they naturally present arguments in favor of the state, but these arguments ought not to fool anybody. Whenever the state attempts to do anything these same monopolists rush to the cover offered by the federal courts. The railroads have done more to build up the power of the federal courts than any other one influence, and there is scarcely a state legislature which the railroads have not defied. If the trust magnates and the railroad presidents had their way about it, state lines would be entirely obliterated, and corporations would be chartered by the federal government. That they do not have their way about it is due to the fact that the people recognize the necessity for local self-government. It is true that the states have been brought nearer together and their relations made more intimate since the adoption of the federal constitution but the need for the state is stronger today than it was a century ago. The wide extent of our country, the increase in our population, the greater complexity of our business relations and industries, all these increase the importance of the state. The federal government could not look after the multiplied interests of the people. The founders of the constitution built more wisely than they knew when they reserved to the states the powers not delegated to the federal government. Congress has all the power that it needs. In the realm of interstate commerce it is supreme. The state can charter corporations, and so long as those corporations confine their business to the state, the federal government can not interfere. but the moment those corporations step across the state line, they come under the supervision of the federal government and congress has power to fix the terms upon which they shall do business. This is a very much better arrangement than to have national corporations superior to and independent of the states. We have trouble enough with overgrown state corporations. We would have still more trouble if we permitted the creation of overgrown national corporations.

The state and the nation—both are necessary—and the doctrine of Jefferson and Jackson is the doctrine that must prevail today. We need no new principles; we need only the courageous application of old-time principles to the new conditions. We need remedies, state and national, but it is not necessary that the nation should encroach upon the rights of the state or the state upon the rights of the nation in order to secure such remedial legislation as is demanded.

ALWAYS IN THE INTEREST OF THE DEAR PUBLIC

Thomas C. Shotwell in New York American: Although the stock exchange opened and closed in a formal way yesterday, the only incident of importance in the financial district was the transfer to a banking syndicate of one-half the holdings of the Equitable and Mutual Life Insurance companies of National Bank of Commerce stock. The price was about 220, although it was not officially given. The excellence of the bargain at that price explains the strength of stock of banks participating in the purchase.

This banking deal is a further concentration of the banking power of New York City. IT

MAKES FOUR MEN ABSOLUTE DICTATORS OF THE MONEY MARKET OF THE COUNTRY. IT EXPLAINS VERY LARGELY THE RECENT STAGNATION IN THE STOCK MARKET, FOR IT IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO DEAL IN EVEN A THOUSAND SHARES WITHOUT THE IDENTITY OF THE DEALER GOING TO HEADQUARTERS. Unofficial pools are impossible in the stock market and individual trading is useless. Nobody can have any money to use unless the big people are willing.

This latest purchase of bank stock is UNFOR-TUNATE, because it will be almost certain to precipitate an investigation of New York City national banks by the democratic congress preparing to meet in extra session. Such an investigation would probably go back to the days of

the panic of 1907. IT CAN BE SHOWN UNDOUBTEDLY THAT THE BANKERS WHO HAVE ROUNDED UP EVERYTHING WORTH WHILE IN THE LAST FOUR YEARS HAVE ACTED IN EACH IN-STANCE FOR THE GOOD OF THE COM-MUNITY. Even the purchase of yesterday was forced upon them by the state law, which compels the life insurance companies to liquidate their stocks before the end of 1912. The stocks transferred to the syndicate could never have been sold in the public market at a fair price. Yet the accumulation of banking power in a few hands has gone to such an extent that even those in charge of the situation are uneasy about it.

Banking circles had reports from Paris yesterday that Atchison and American Telephone & Telegraph stock would both be listed on the parquet in the near future, the way having been opened by Philadelphia company stock. Telephone stock is one of the most substantial of the industrials and is in higher favor among investors than among speculators. Its live management has even made Western

Union a popular issue.

In railroad circles there is mysterious whispering about a disagreement between James J. Hill on the one side and J. P. Morgan and George F. Baker on the other as to the advisability of letting members of the Hill family succeed Mr. Hill in the management of the Great Northern. Presidency of the Missouri Pacific has been refused by President Harris, of the Burlington, because the Morgan people insist that he remain in his present position. It is felt that the Missouri Pacific is not the only road needing a new president, and the feeling must be intense to cause a disagreement between Mr. Hill and his old associates.

Chesapeake & Ohio is said to be planning some new financing. There is a desire on the part of the management to gather up some of the oldest bonds and retire them by making the recent mortgage larger and more comprehensive. It will take some time, however, to work out this plan.

Standard Oil declined \$10 a share on the curb yesterday, making a total decline of \$30 from the high price touched early in the week. This drop is a result of the technical denial issued by the company of reports that plans for reorganization had been perfected. Nobody believed that the company, officially, had done anything of the kind and nobody believes that the responsible men in the company, unofficially, have neglected to do it.

WHOSE MONEY?

Whose money is being used to carry on the campaigns for the presidential nominations? Who is furnishing the money for President Taft? Whose money is financing Mr. Roosevelt's campaign? Who is putting up for Senator La Follette's fight? And then there are the democratic candidates. Whose money are they using, and how much? The public has a right to know. Why not extend the present publicity law so as to throw light upon the campaigns now being waged for the nominations? What candidate opposes publicity? Let him speak out, If none, let them unite in DEMANDING publicity. Our democratic congress should not allow this congress to adjourn without the passage of such a law.

WILL YOU JOIN IN THE EFFORT ©
TO INCREASE THE COMMONER'S CIR.
CULATION FOR 1912?
TAKE IT UP AT ONCE WITH YOUR
NEIGHBOR.