

MORE INGRATITUDE

While the Wall street sympathizers are expressing their indignation over Governor Wilson's "ingratitude" in relieving himself of the Harvey support, why do they ignore a much more prominent case of ingratitude. Mr. Harvey can not claim to have created Mr. Wilson. He was an early supporter and doubtless contributed some to the early advertisement of Governor Wilson's availability. But Governor Wilson's candidacy is based upon what he himself has done, not upon what anyone has said about him. But in the case of President Taft, he owes his nomination and election to the active support of Mr. Roosevelt. The general opinion is that Mr. Taft was impressed with the idea that his intimacy with Mr. Roosevelt was a political burden, and so it is reported that Mr. Taft never consulted Mr. Roosevelt at all in regard to cabinet appointments. In fact, there is a grave suspicion that Mr. Taft, in compliance with assurances given before the election, turned the cold shoulder to Mr. Roosevelt as soon as the election was over, and now he has the temerity to run as a candidate for re-election without asking the aid or consent of the ex-president. If critics are looking for a case of ingratitude, here is a very much more pronounced one than the Wilson-Harvey case. But no one seems to question Mr. Taft's right to throw the ex-president overboard or the ex-president's right to throw President Taft overboard, notwithstanding their long and intimate relationship. Why is Governor Wilson picked out for special condemnation?

PATRIOTISM VS. MONEY

According to Mr. McCombs, Governor Wilson's manager, Colonel Watterson suggested the propriety of an appeal to Mr. Ryan for funds, and warned Mr. McCombs that it required a great deal of money for campaigns. When Mr. McCombs rejected the Ryan offer and seemed inclined to underestimate the necessity for money, Mr. Watterson is reported to have declared that money was more essential than patriotism in winning nominations. If Mr. Watterson is correctly reported, he has announced a doctrine which will not find universal indorsement. Money used to be more potent than it is now. Both of the parties financed their campaigns from the treasuries of the interests and then consulted the "interests" in regard to governmental policies. A change has taken place, and an increasing number of the voters insist that the president shall be free to take the side of the people on public questions. Patriotism is playing a larger part now and money a smaller part, and the politicians ought to know it. When we have publicity as to contributions to the funds of aspirants for the presidential nomination, we will find patriotism playing even a more prominent part than it does today, and money will then be still less essential to success in politics. The Wilson-Harvey-Watterson controversy may be productive of a great deal of good if it results in the throwing of more light upon the contests that are going on for nominations, and the people will be the beneficiaries.

PUBLICITY

The excitement attending the Wilson-Harvey-Watterson controversy is additional proof that the doctrine of publicity should be extended to include contributions in the assistance of candidates for the presidential nomination. Mr. Watterson thinks that Mr. Ryan is a disinterested patriot whose contributions ought to be gladly received, but a great many people will honestly differ from him, and there is no reason why the facts should be concealed. Let the public know who contribute and they will need no code of honor to decide whether the contribution is a proper one. Congress ought to pass a law immediately requiring publicity as to the expenditures of the aspirants for the presidency.

IS IT THE VICE PRESIDENT?

The announcement of Senator Cummins' aspirations for the presidency would indicate that he would like to be the vice presidential candidate on the Taft ticket. But is it fair to La Follette for a progressive republican to begin trading so early?

WHY WOOL?

So iron ore, a raw material, is to be put on the free list and this makes it more difficult to explain why a tax was left on wool. Are the ore producers less numerous or less clamorous than the wool growers?

MR. BRYAN'S MONEY-MAKING

Mr. Bryan was astonished to read a criticism uttered by Senator Bailey against him on the ground that he (Mr. Bryan) had made money out of politics. It is surprising that the senator should raise a question of ethics in regard to money making and especially against Mr. Bryan, whose accumulations—modest as compared with what he might have made—have come from sources both open and legitimate. He saved about one thousand dollars per year during his four years in congress and since that time has held no office and made no money out of politics. His income is derived entirely from lecturing and writing. His lectures have, for the most part, been non-political and much of his writing also. Except that the presidential nominations have given him advertisement and acquaintance politics have been an expense to him. He receives no pay for political speeches and speaks to more people at free meetings than from the lecture platform. He employs scarcely more than one-quarter of his time at money making and enjoys gratuitous work more than work that brings a remuneration. He hopes to give an increasing proportion of his time to the public as the years go by.

PUBLICITY AS TO APPOINTMENTS

Congress Cullop of Indiana won a signal victory last week when he proposed the following amendment to a bill creating a judiciary office:

"Before the president shall appoint any district, circuit or supreme judge, he shall make public all indorsements made on behalf of any applicant."

The amendment brought consternation into the camp of the plutocrats, and many timid democrats would have been glad to dodge the issue, but when the roll was called nearly all the democrats voted for the amendment, and the insurgents voted with them. A few democrats joined the stand-pat republicans in opposing the amendment. Thus the line was drawn closely between those who represent the people and want light and those who represent the interests and prefer darkness. The Commoner congratulates Mr. Cullop most heartily upon his great victory, and hopes that the democrats and progressives of the senate will push the bill through and give the president a chance to go on record with the people or against them.

"FEELINGS" COME HIGH

According to Col. Harvey's friends "feelings" come high. They ignore the question whether Col. Harvey's support was hurting Governor Wilson and insist that he forfeited respect when he admitted that Harper's Weekly was a burden to his candidacy. Well, it depends upon the emphasis we place upon the individual as compared with the public. Governor Wilson's friends believe that his nomination and election would advance the public welfare—upon no other theory would they be justified in supporting him; are the interests of the public to be sacrificed to the feelings of Col. Harvey? And suppose the governor had heroically insisted that he would carry the colonel even if it broke his back, had he any assurance that the colonel would not slide off voluntarily at a critical time, or be pulled off by Wall street? The Wilson-Harvey episode shows how little excuse men need when they are looking for a cause for criticism.

"NOT SURPRISING"

"It seems that in 1907 Mr. Woodrow Wilson wanted to knock Mr. William Jennings Bryan into a cocked hat. However, inasmuch as he wanted to do it in a dignified and orderly manner, we can't see that he is any worse off than many others who wanted to do the same thing, but were afraid to say so."—Denison (Texas) Herald.

"It seems to us that the people of the United States knocked the peerless leader into a cocked hat three different and distinct times, and it is therefore not surprising that one so observing as Governor Wilson should have ventured the same disposition in 1907."—Beaumont (Texas) Enterprise.

It is, however, just a bit strange that the very people who once agreed with Mr. Wilson on the "cocked hat" matter are now just as busy attacking him as they were in attacking Mr. Bryan.

FINDING THE WEAK POINT

The first caucus under the new rule has been held; the steel schedule was approved and the press dispatches report that after the free pig iron amendment was voted down an effort was made to secure a roll call BUT FAILED BECAUSE LESS THAN ONE-FIFTH DEMANDED IT. That is the weak point in the rule. All who voted against free pig iron would naturally oppose a roll call and the cry of harmony always influences some. We have no way of knowing how many and who opposed free pig iron. The democrats will find that it will be difficult to secure a roll call even when a large minority oppose the action taken. The secret caucus has been abandoned—many thanks—but we still need a compulsory roll call in order to find out how the members vote.

IN INDIANA

The Indianapolis Star has been taking a straw vote on the presidential question. In its issue of January 23rd, the Star printed the following announcement:

The democratic primary is now closed and no more ballots will be received. The final returns are as follows:

William J. Bryan.....	3,403
John W. Kern.....	3,128
Woodrow Wilson.....	1,629
Thomas R. Marshall.....	723
Judson Harmon.....	166
Champ Clark.....	96
Joseph W. Folk.....	93
Theodore Roosevelt.....	59
Thomas Taggart.....	23
O. W. Underwood.....	13
W. S. Gaynor.....	7
Henry Watterson.....	6
Lew Shank.....	5
F. L. Feick.....	4
Scattering—One vote each for Jacob S. Coxey, Mark Little- ton, James O'Gorman, John A. M. Adair, Augustus O. Stanley.....	5

Total.....9,360

The republican primary will be opened next week, first ballot to appear Monday morning, January 29th.

IN COLORADO

The Denver News has just finished a poll of its readers and it describes the result in this way: Woodrow Wilson, 3,473; William J. Bryan, 2,999; Champ Clark, 1,714; Judson Harmon, 436; Thomas R. Marshall, 303; Governor Joseph W. Folk, 214; O. W. Underwood, 191; Mayor William J. Gaynor, 22; Mayor R. W. Speer, 12; William R. Hearst, 11; Governor John A. Dix, 10; Levina C. Mattison, of Colorado, 1; John W. Kern, 1. Total, 9,387.

The leading conservative candidate, Governor Judson Harmon of Ohio, is not popular among Colorado democrats. He only polled 436 votes, or less than 5 per cent of the total poll.

Every town in the state of Colorado large enough to be worthy of the name of town participated in this remarkable contest, and ten states, including Colorado, were represented by votes, although the contest was limited to Colorado. There were about 400 of the outside votes from Wyoming, North and South Dakota, western Kansas, Nebraska, Arizona, Oklahoma, New Mexico and Texas. Every vote that came in on the News ballot, printed every day in the News for one week, with the name and address of the voter attached, was counted.

The most remarkable feature, perhaps, of the contest just ended is the strength which William J. Bryan, hero of three battles for the presidency as leader of the democratic ticket, has shown. The war horse of democracy pressed Wilson hard. Another amazing fact is shown in the vote for Harmon. Although Colorado is known for progressive tendencies, and the fights against monopolistic government here have been and are fierce and Titanic, yet few would have believed that Harmon was so weak as this test vote would indicate. If the ratio remained the same, Harmon would lose Colorado in a heavy republican landslide.

A PRECEDENT

Both President Roosevelt and Candidate Taft expressed indignation when Rockefeller, just before the election, declared for the republican ticket. No protest was made by Wall street; must Col. Harvey's feelings be handled more gently?