

# The Independent.

VOL. XVI.

LINCOLN, NEB., AUGUST 4, 1904.

No. 11

## NEW YORK DEMOCRATS BOLT

They Will Support  
Watson and Tibbles

To the Democrats of New York Who, During the Past Eight Years Have in Two Consecutive National Campaigns, Been Loyal to the National Democracy, and Its Loyal, Honest and Courageous Standard-Bearer, William J. Bryan:

Greeting: The Albany county democracy, an organization of democrats, whose past is one of undoubted loyalty to party faith and party candidates, recognizing the crises in our party's affairs, presents this exposition of its views, to and asks the co-operation in its proposed efforts of those other thousand of democrats in New York who believe as its membership does.

In 1896 the democracy of this great country of ours sent its chosen representatives to the great city of Chicago to deliberate upon the condition of public affairs; to ask themselves, why in a land of such great natural resources where the standard of intelligence is so high, it was, that under a government at Washington which

was called a democratic one, the people of our poor districts in the great cities of the union were compelled to seek public soup houses to sustain life, and the small merchant and manufacturer was being forced to the wall. These representatives who represented the plain democracy of the land ascertained the fact that one Grover Cleveland had as he expressed it been "giving the public an object lesson" for the purpose of forcing congress to give the banking interests of our country into the control of that portion of the so-called "sane and safe democracy" to whom he through that almost forgotten secretary of the United States treasury, who has never returned to his native state since, sold 262 million dollars worth of government bonds on which they in turn made, millions of dollars in profit. Having found that the man, and the government, at Washington was more interested in the private gain of those who already had, than he or it was in

the general welfare of the whole people, it rose to the ideal status of an untrammelled convention of freemen and despite the fact the betrayers of public trust were called democrats, it by resolution censured the man and his government for betrayal of public duty. It then, like the body of competent political seamen it was, proceeded to clean the barnacles off the good old ship of democracy. It cleaned her thoroughly and fitted her out with a clean bill of health; made a declaration of principles for her, to be named skipper to carry which no great statesman of our country, not excluding Thomas Jefferson or Abraham Lincoln, but would be proud to carry as his charter of principles, and then it placed in command of the ship as its standard bearer one William J. Bryan, whose courage and integrity has to this very day confirmed the wisdom of the choice.

The history of the political campaign that followed in the hard to forget year

of 1856, is most familiar to every well informed man. We without means to pay for even the barest necessities of legitimate campaign, and absolutely without the aid or sympathy of any of the great metropolitan newspapers of the land barring one, made our fight. The brilliancy and the fierceness with which we assailed the ramparts of the opposition need not be told by those who were engaged in the strife. The republican campaign managers can testify to it, as in fact they did by the way they fought to prevent our success. But hard as we fought, brilliant and capable as our commander was, we fell without the breast works—defeated.

But my friends when in the history of our party was such a fight for victory waged before, and when before did a candidate of our party poll such a popular vote? We know, the republicans admit it, and the Belmonts and other "sane and safe democrats" claim it to be true, that we fell not by the power or strength of republicanism—but that we were foully shot down in every by-way of the country by men masquerading in the livery of democracy.

After our defeat in 1896, these men who openly fought and defeated our national ticket, together with those who like ex-United States Senator David B. Hill had proclaimed themselves to be democrats of "the still—very still" brand, proceeded at once to try and capture the national organization of our party—the means they resorted to were not those which would appeal to men who believe in fair play and honesty. But the end was all they fought for, and any means which would accomplish the purpose was to be commended. As we all know they just failed of their purpose, and the people still remained in control of the party when it met again in convention at Kansas City, and renewed its pledges to the plain people of our country. The convention again made that great champion of the "moral issue," Mr. Bryan, its standard-bearer.

The fight during this campaign of 1900, was not exactly similar in all aspects to the former fight, as the most of the "sane and safe" became more serpent like and on longer fought even as openly as before, but stung our candidates in secret, and declared to themselves in private counsel, that such a course would more effectively destroy Bryan, his friends, and the party and enable them to regain control, than open fighting of us.

After our second defeat caused alone by the self-named "sane and safe" aggregation of commercial and political bandits, they renewed their energies to capture our organization almost the day after the election. They used all the tactics which could be employed. They appealed to the politician who was hungry by telling him he could get next to the public crib—if he were only more conservative and had the money to make the proper kind of a campaign. He was told that they had the money and were ready to put it up and elect him and the party candidates—if he would only be sensible and recognize the fact that as far as he was concerned the goal to be sought was the crib and that the people who put up the goods to debauch the electorate were entitled to disstate and have carried out policies that would enable them to float such ship building trust schemes and railroad mergers as would enable them to earn dividends commensurate to the water in the schemes. Some ordinarily honest but woefully hungry politicians succumbed to the doctrine of "the public be damned" and said I know these tempters are wrong but we must win—we need the offices and without the money these fellows can and will put up we can not get them. Bryan is right and honest but he can not win with these money bags against him.

These and similar appeals all addressed to the personal selfishness of the individual man, produced malign results and when the national conven-

## Mistaken Remedies

SENATOR ALLEN Analyzes  
Mr. Bryan's Proposed  
Post-Election Platform

Editor Independent: Introductory to what I have to say respecting some of the mistaken remedies Mr. Bryan offers the public, I wish to utterly repudiate the charge of ingratitude made by some democratic papers of Nebraska. I question the largeness of soul of those, who, having extended what they regard as a favor, constantly remind the recipient of the fact and insist that thereafter he shall accept any view they may entertain, whether right or wrong.

I assume that I am in as good a position as any person to know the circumstances of my election to the United States senate, and to understand who contributed to it and who did not. And whether I am to be regarded as grateful or ungrateful I shall not be driven by such an accusation from opinions I know to be correct, or from a position I believe to be impregnable.

In two successive campaigns I gave Mr. Bryan enthusiastic and undivided support for the presidency; and I would rejoice at an opportunity to do so again, because I believe that, all things considered, he is the best equipped man in public life for the position, but I deny that I am justly chargeable with ingratitude because I fail to follow him in all things, or to accept his belief in all things.

I am Mr. Bryan's senior in years and as a lawyer, and while I would readily accept his opinion respecting a question of political economy, and, ordinarily, of general public policy, I would not adopt his view, or that of any other man, of a question of jurisprudence where it came in direct conflict with my experience and reading.

I think no man in the United States has a keener appreciation of Mr. Bryan's great ability and pureness of motive than I have, and certainly our relations have been such as to make me greatly esteem him for his lovable disposition and delightful personality. But, like other men, Mr. Bryan is capable of making mistakes, and I am not ungrateful because I direct attention to the fact, or dissent from his attempt to make the populist party responsible for his mistakes.

I have been asked whether in declining co-operation with the democratic party on the state ticket, I wish to give aid and comfort to the republican party? I unhesitatingly say that I do not. I go further. I have a kinder feeling for those with whom my party has worked in harmony than I possibly could have for those I believe to be promoting policies that are destructive of the republic and inimical to the general welfare.

Nor am I in favor of giving aid and comfort to that part of the democratic party, now triumphant, whose policies and measures are similar in kind

to those of the republican party and to me indistinguishable from them, by co-operating with it. And the fact that I decline to do so is not to be construed into favoring the retention of the republican party in power. I would defeat both the republican and democratic parties and enthrone the populist party if that were in my power.

As an incident of my position, the interest of one or the other of these organizations may, in a measure, be promoted; but I can not hesitate to do what I believe to be correct on account of that fact.

And now as to mistaken remedies. Since the supreme court held in *Pollock v. Farmer's Loan & Trust Co.*, 157 U. S., 601, and *Knowlton v. Moore*, 178 U. S., 41, and in numerous other cases, that the income tax clause of the tariff act of 1894 is unconstitutional, Mr. Bryan has advocated an amendment to the federal constitution.

I do not see the wisdom of an attempt to amend the constitution in this respect. Before that could be accomplished, congress would have to submit the proposed amendment to the legislatures of forty-five states and three-fourths of them would have to concur to make the amendment a part of the constitution, a thing I believe to be impossible at this time.

But the supreme court has never held that an income tax act, that is "apportioned among the several states within this union according to their respective numbers" is unconstitutional; but, uniformly, that such laws are constitutional. Now, it is clearly within the power of congress to pass such a law; and, the constitution having declared this to be the true policy of the nation, I am not prepared to say that the framers of that instrument were wrong and that Mr. Bryan is right.

Respecting Mr. Bryan's declaration in favor of state ownership of railroads, I think it indefensible on the ground of public policy and as conflicting with the federal constitution and the decisions of the supreme court. That instrument would have to be changed before state ownership could be made to accomplish any remedy, in the public interest if even then effectual. The constitution expressly declares that: "The congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

Commerce is trade and includes transportation. There are forty-five states, and if we had state ownership we would have forty-five different systems of railroads.

Under state ownership how could we legally regulate railway traffic, for instance, from California to New York, which, according to the most direct route, would embrace transportation

through eleven states? Suppose a shipper in California should ship on a state road to the eastern boundary of California and when his shipment arrived at the Nevada line the Nevada road should refuse to receive it, whereby the shipper would be damaged, what tribunal would determine the question thus arising? The courts of California could not do so as their jurisdiction is confined to California, and the courts of Nevada could not do so as their jurisdiction is confined to Nevada. There is but one judicial tribunal that would have jurisdiction of the case and that is the circuit court of the United States because it is empowered to enforce the commerce clause of the constitution. (And if congress has exclusive power to regulate commerce between the states, does not that fact confer on it the authority to make laws, and on the United States courts, jurisdiction to enforce those laws, regulative of commerce? If Mr. Bryan will look into this question more closely than he has he will see that the authority to regulate commerce between the states is by the constitution committed to congress and that the federal courts, as the judicial arm of the general government, have jurisdiction to enforce and construe federal statutes.

Nationalization is the only solution of the railroad problem. If the government should take over the roads by purchase, or by the exercise of the power of eminent domain, or should solve the question by the construction of competing lines, the railroads would be taken out of politics and not be put into politics as Mr. Bryan fears.

If the railroads were nationalized and a merit system adopted by which employes were secured in their positions as long as they were competent to discharge their duties effectually, they would become independent; and if they exercised their right to vote they could do so regardless of the wish of railroad managers, knowing that they could not be questioned. And if the son should follow the father in the railroad service what better provision could be made to develop his manhood and a sense of independence than to give him an opportunity to rise by merit? Nationalized, the railroads would not be a menace to the people; but in private hands they are.

The difficulty with Mr. Bryan's position on the income tax and the railway problem, is, that it requires quite too frequent amendment of the federal constitution.

I simply file this dissent from Mr. Bryan's opinions on these questions, retaining my admiration for his soundness on others, and for his great ability; but dissenting also from the wisdom of his course in supporting Judge Parker for the presidency.

WM. V. ALLEN,  
Madison, Neb.