

CARNEGIE'S SEAT OF HONOR

The Love Letters of a "National Honor Defender"

W. Ellis Corey, president of the steel trust, deserted the wife who had clung to him through all of his poverty, and became notorious because of his associations with another woman. For several days it seemed to be generally understood among American newspapers that these exposures meant the retirement of Mr. Corey from the presidency of the steel trust. So serious were his offenses that his father, as well as his uncle and other men and women related to him by ties of blood, publicly repudiated him.

For a time the situation looked very black for President Corey. But President Corey caused to be printed an interview in which he bluntly said that if he were held to account for his shortcomings he would take the public into his confidence and tell them a lot of things concerning his associates.

It is a bit significant that since that threat was made there has been no more talk of President Corey's retirement. On the contrary, soon after these exposures were made Andrew Carnegie gave at his New York mansion a banquet to his associates, and newspaper dispatches say that W. Ellis Corey occupied "the seat of honor" at Carnegie's right hand.

The seat of honor, indeed! Here is a man who says he has devoted his life toward the building of libraries for the people. In the fur-

therance of this plan he has contributed several million dollars, and all for the cultivation of nobler sentiments. Yet when a person holding the position of chief in a corporation over which Mr. Carnegie has control violates the highest sentiments and is convicted of the most flagrant offenses, this builder of libraries gives him "the seat of honor" at a banquet board spread in his own home.

Can it be possible that Mr. Carnegie stands in awe of the individual whom he elevated to the position of president of the steel trust?

Mr. Carnegie required Schwab to resign that place because of Schwab's gambling proclivities. Whatever men may say of Schwab's offense, it was a weakness which when compared with Corey's wrongdoing amounts very nearly to a virtue.

Was Schwab more tractable than Corey, or does Corey have a more intimate acquaintance with the inside operations of the steel trust than Schwab ever had?

Can it be possible that the man who has spent millions of dollars in order that his name shall be forever associated with the libraries of the world attaches so little importance to the infamies committed by the president of the steel trust that he stoops to accord to him the seat of honor at a banquet board?

MR. WISE AS A CRITIC

J. D. W. Greene, of De Pauw, Ind., writes: "In The Commoner of November 3 you comment upon some things John S. Wise said about William McKinley, and I wish to ask what wrong there is in one criticizing another if one tells the truth, even though the criticizer and the criticized are friends. John S. Wise was not a wise man for leaving the democratic party; but even if Mr. McKinley did 'treat him well,' should one conceal the truth on that account? The Bible says, 'Rebuke one another;' should one refuse to rebuke a little because he is treated well by the one who needs rebuking? What Mr. Wise said about Mr. McKinley may not be truthful, but may not truthful criticism about the dead help the living?"

Certainly truthful criticism of the dead may often help the living. Mr. Wise's criticism of Mr. McKinley seemed to rest largely upon the fact that Mr. McKinley did not appoint Mr. Wise to the office of United States attorney for the southern district of New York. The Commoner pointed out that according to Mr. Wise's own statement he had been well treated by Mr. McKinley, because Mr. McKinley gave army commissions to three of Mr. Wise's sons and then gave to Mr. Wise himself "a very handsome special appointment."

Whatever opinion one may have as to the correctness of Mr. Wise's estimate of William McKinley, Mr. Wise's criticisms would have been more convincing had he not sought to pose as a greatly wronged man when, as a matter of fact, Mr. McKinley had been more than kind to him.

During his benefactor's life time Mr. Wise was not heard to protest against the evil influences which he now says surrounded the McKinley administration, and it will occur to a great many people that now that his benefactor is dead Mr. Wise might well refrain from criticizing the administration which he helped to place in power, and at the hands of which he received so many favors.

Mr. McKinley's policies were and are republican party policies. The same bad and powerful influences that surrounded the McKinley administration are haunting the corridors of the White House and Capitol building today in the effort to thwart the people in their plans for relief. The republican party responds just as cordially to the demands of these powerful interests today as it did in William McKinley's day.

If Mr. Wise would "make good" as a critic, let him use his trenchant pen against the living men of his own party and against the evils for which that party is responsible.

MR. BRYAN ABROAD

Mr. Bryan has, much to his regret, found it necessary to change his route somewhat. Finding that to visit Australia and New Zealand before going to India would delay the India trip until too late in the spring and that to go to Australia and New Zealand from India would delay the trip to Egypt, Palestine, Greece and Italy, he has decided to leave Australia and New

Zealand for another trip when he can travel more leisurely and give them the time their importance demands. By reaching Europe earlier he will be able to devote more time to Switzerland, Germany, Norway, Sweden and Scotland and to the problems which they present.

NEBRASKA'S "REDEEMERS"

When, in 1900, the republicans carried Nebraska we were told that Nebraska had been "redeemed." But this was that kind of redemption for which the republican party is famous.

The man elected to the office of governor in that year was sent to the senate and subsequently indicted for wrong-doing in office. He escaped by an appeal to technicalities.

The United States senatorships filled immediately following that redemption were divided between rival railroad factions in Nebraska.

Every republican gubernatorial nominee chosen since that "redemption" was picked by the railroads, while the corporations have wielded complete control over the republic legislature.

President Roosevelt has found it necessary to remove from local federal offices at least six of these boastful "redeemers" of Nebraska.

One of these redeemers was appointed by the president to a seat upon a territorial bench, and later the president found it necessary to retire him.

Subsequently another Nebraska "redeemer" was sent to grace another territorial bench. That "redeemer" lasted about ninety days, when he was dismissed in disgrace.

These Nebraska "redeemers" are not, after all, infallible. "Things are not always what they seem; skimmed milk masquerades as cream," and the many scandals connected with the official conduct of Nebraska "redeemers" appointed to federal positions has made Nebraska a jest in political circles at the national capital.

INDIANA PRIMARIES

Indiana democrats are soon to hold primary elections and district conventions for the selection of a new state central committee. These district conventions are made up of delegates to be selected by primaries in the several precincts. The members of the committee thus selected meet January 8 to select a chairman.

Every Indiana democrat should participate in these primaries and see to it that faithful democrats are chosen as delegates to the district conventions. It goes without saying that great care should be exercised in Indiana, as in other states, in the selection of the state committee, and it is also important that the chairman be a man whose fidelity and courage may be depended upon by the Indiana democracy.

Indiana democrats as well as those of other states should get in the habit of participating in the primaries of their party, and they can not begin the cultivation of this habit at too early a day.

Let the rank and file of Indiana democracy participate in the primaries and it is safe to say that the result will be the selection of a good state committee and a worthy chairman.

Recently it was reported that J. B. Corey, uncle of W. Ellis Corey, president of the steel trust, had offered under certain conditions to make public letters said to have been passed between his nephew, Andrew Carnegie, Mr. Schwab and himself. Pending the acceptance of the terms of this offer, the Kansas City Star suggests that the American people draw on their imagination, adding that as a result of these surmises one of these letters might be as follows:

My Dear Ellis: Sorry to hear of your scrape. Still, after my experience you ought to have known better. Pierpont and Andrew and young Rockefeller and Perkins and Rogers were terribly shocked over my little plunge at Monte Carlo, though it was my own money and not plunder made by selling watered stock. But you know how scrupulous they are about everything—especially John, Jr., and Rogers. John said he couldn't face his Bible class until I got out. And you should have heard the quaver in Rogers' voice as he said, "I never expected to count a gambler among my acquaintances—least of all at the head of a corporation in which I am concerned." So I went. You should have been warned. Yours ever, CHARLEY.

"Another epistle," according to the Star, "showing marks of agitation and slightly blotted with tears it may be believed, reads something like this:

Respected Benefactor. Sir: I am greatly grieved to know that you take my little affair so much to heart. Of course, I knew that you would never have been implicated in such a thing. Your bent isn't that way. But in business I supposed that you and Mr. Rogers and Mr. Perkins and Mr. Rockefeller always went after what you wanted and got it without regard to ordinary conventional restrictions. So I had inferred that we big business men weren't bound by vulgar morality. Was Rogers in his Amalgamated Copper deal? Was Perkins in his relations to Morgan's bank and the New York Life? Was Rockefeller in going after oil competitors? I really don't see why I should be singled out as an offender to be punished. Respectfully, ELLIS.

The Star takes it for granted that in reply to this fulmination a letter of this sort was indited to show the young man his error:

My Misguided Young Friend: I am surprised that you should display such confusion of thought. Can you not see that whatever Mr. Rockefeller or my other good friends or I have done, while it may have aroused opposition, has always been perfectly respectable and, I may add in accordance with law as construed by the ablest attorneys we could hire? But yours is a disreputable offense. It is one of the first principles of business to keep within the law, or to have the law fixed by the legislature or congress, or to leave no incriminating evidence. Furthermore, one must always be respectable. Your ignorance of these principles is a great disappointment to me and, I am compelled to say, is a disqualification for the position you now occupy. I greatly regret that my training has been wasted on one so poorly prepared to profit by it. Your former well-wisher, A. C.

In the Star's view these letters show the real opinions of the writers whatever their genuine communications may contain.

Perhaps Secretary Bonaparte has been misled by precedent in his order to destroy the Constitution.

A large number of Russian students seem to have been "hazed" by the Cossacks and police recently.

To each one of its half-million readers The Commoner wishes a Happy and Prosperous New Year.

The New Year will be very largely what you make it.