

The Conservative.

VOL. II.

NEBRASKA CITY, NEB., THURSDAY, MAY 31, 1900.

47.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

OFFICES: OVERLAND THEATRE BLOCK.

J. STERLING MORTON, EDITOR.

A JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE DISCUSSION OF POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIOLOGICAL QUESTIONS.

CIRCULATION THIS WEEK 7,300 COPIES.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One dollar and a half per year, in advance, postpaid, to any part of the United States or Canada. Remittances made payable to The Morton Printing Company.

Address, THE CONSERVATIVE, Nebraska City, Neb.

Advertising Rates made known upon application.

Entered at the postoffice at Nebraska City, Neb., as Second Class matter, July 29th, 1898.

GOVERNMENT.

THE CONSERVATIVE publishes this week an able article from the pen of a Kentuckian, showing the decline in the intellectual fiber of the public men of the blue grass state and the resultant retrogradation of the government. The deplorable disrespect for law, the evident inclination to maintain political supremacy regardless of right or justice, is the logical outcome of the abandonment of wise counsel and safe and tried leadership.

A government, to be just, should be for the benefit of all the people. Such a government cannot come from the feeblest intellects but requires the directing force of the best. Government cannot be judiciously administered nor can public questions be wisely determined except by careful study and sober thought. The latter, especially with the qualifying adjective, has not been greatly in evidence in Kentucky during the last few years. It is hopeless to expect good government from those whose minds have not been trained to think but whose education, after the manner popular in Nebraska just now, has been limited to a development of the powers of articulation together with more amplified instruction in the manipulation of a shot gun.

The demagogue, who tickles the popular ear with flattering phrases and piously prates, "the voice of the people is the voice of God," may win wild and boisterous applause and be unanimously voted a "good fellow," but he is not a safe man to entrust with the responsibilities of government. "Vox populi vox Dei"

affords an ideal topic for the ambitious orator who wishes to evoke the screams of the national bird, but it is not a safe principle upon which to maintain a republic. The voice of the majority at a certain specific time is not always right. Too often it is founded upon passion and prejudice and not upon reason. That leadership is safest and best promotes a country's good that thinks rather than talks, that is undisturbed by the popular will of the moment but is guided by sound logic and reason, that looks to the ultimate public good rather than to the immediate political future. Such a leadership is typical of the best courage. It requires stern qualities of manhood to stand by honest convictions when opposed to the popular will.

The "trouble" in Kentucky demonstrates the folly of deserting such men as Lindsay and Carlisle and listening to the siren voices of Goebel and "Colonel" Chinn. A bitter experience has proven that the former leadership, although unpopular at the time, would have been the best for Kentucky. What is true of Kentucky democracy applies with equal force to national democracy. Had not the party in 1896 abandoned the leadership that had contributed to give it success and prestige, it would today be entering upon a victorious campaign instead of becoming a populist annex.

PARTY CONSISTENCY.

One of the fundamental propositions of government laid down by Jefferson was his opposition to strongly-centralized power. The founder of the democratic party believed that the liberties of the people would be best conserved by retaining carefully the principle of an even balance of the powers of government between the federal and state governments, so that each would serve as a check upon the other; the national government to be endowed with sufficient power to prevent disintegration, and to leave with the local governments sufficient power to prevent tyrannical and oppressive centralization. Jefferson feared the evil of centralized power. To him centralization meant tyranny and despotism. For this reason he vigorously opposed the state governments abandoning constitutional powers and conferring these powers upon the central government. So firmly were the ideas of Jefferson implanted in the minds of his party associates that op-

position to centralization became one of the chief tenets of democratic faith, and, as such, it has been handed down to us under successive leaderships.

But with the departure from nearly everything Jeffersonian, we see today

Centralization. this vital principle of democracy abandoned by the presidential nominee of the populist national convention, who also aspires to an indorsement from the party that bears the name of the political organization Jefferson founded. This populist nominee, who now so diligently seeks democratic support, favors centralization. He advocates taking away, by constitutional amendment, from the local state governments and reposing in the federal government, the power of regulating and controlling industrial combinations. He is well aware that the evil of these combinations, or trusts, exists only because of the privileges extended by this centralized power. Yet he suggests as a remedy for their evil still greater centralization, the granting of supreme control to the body that is responsible for the existence of the evil. Such a remedy would be on a par with placing the means of preventing crime in the hands of the criminal. This is one of the pet theories of the populist nominee. Are democrats willing to accept it? Will they forsake the teachings of Jefferson and accept the new version of democratic faith as promulgated by the populist leader, who seeks to establish himself in reputable political society by occasional reference to the name of Jefferson.

That democrats may be entirely consistent in their inconsistency,

Protection. their thoughtful populist friends proffer a vice-president with a record not unlike his associate. Jefferson was an uncompromising opponent of the granting of special privileges to favored interests. This principle has been faithfully adhered to by the party he founded. The Kansas City convention will have an exceptional opportunity to do undemocratic things. It will have the privilege of indorsing, not only a friend of centralization for president but for vice president, a protectionist republican. The vice-president nominated by the populists, while a member of congress, consistently and faithfully advocated the taking of money from the people and giving it to the favored classes. He has done his mite to build up the dangerous combinations of capital which he now so vociferously denounces. This is the course outlined for democracy by populism.