

## A Weak Presidential Candidate an Injury to the Party

In its issue of Friday, December 8th, the Cincinnati Enquirer printed, under the headline, "A Weak Presidential Candidate an Injury to the Party," the following editorial:

When the democratic voters begin their work for the campaign of 1912 they should bear in mind that it is not alone the presidency, the executive branch of the federal government, they should contend for, but that if they nominate a candidate popular throughout the United States they will be able to control both branches of congress and many of the states through the strength of their presidential candidate.

Democratic candidates in townships, cities, counties, congressional districts and states, will, one and all, be injured if the democratic national convention should nominate a candidate for president who has not the complete confidence of the voters in his devotion to their interests.

The campaign of 1912 it would now appear will be largely based upon the enforcement of the Sherman anti-trust law and its application to monopolies and combines, and no man who in office was lax in executing it can expect to be the candidate of the democratic party, however much, out of office, he proclaims his attachment to the provisions of the statute.

The voters of today speedily become familiar with the records of candidates. They discuss them, analyze them, quickly appreciate their importance and make application at the polls.

The democracy desires no candidate who, if nominated, from start to finish will be upon the defensive through official failure to strenuously enforce the Sherman anti-trust law.

That law has been upon the statute books for twenty-one years.

It was put there to protect the interests of the masses of the people, and the officials of the department of justice were the persons directly in charge of its enforcement.

Is there a democratic congressman from the state of Ohio who believes he can hold his seat in the next congress if the democratic candidate for president should be one who, while in federal office charged with enforcement of the Sherman anti-trust law, failed to make a record of active work against violators of that law?

Do they not know that the voters will take no chances with any candidate who neglected or failed to use that statute against all violators or offenders?

Every democrat in the states of the union, especially every man who expects to be a candidate of the party for any office to be voted upon in 1912, must insist upon a democratic candidate for president whose actions and words have ever been in accord, whose associations are free from all suspicion that he will be controlled by objectionable interests, and whose life of fidelity to the organization and the candidates of the national party will guarantee to him the full party support.

The democratic party has many leaders who have no flaws in their steadfast devotion to party candidates, who have no records of errors of omission or commission, men whose candidacy would re-enforce our candidates for office from the lowest to the highest positions, and it is such a candidate that should be named when the national convention assembles.

### PROGRESSIVE, ANYHOW

Wichita (Kan.) Beacon: Enemies of Woodrow Wilson are in high glee because the things he now says are different from some things he wrote in 1893. Good Lord! can't a man grow in eighteen years? Why, its another century now and conditions are vastly changed.

What would you have a man accumulate in his brain between the ages of thirty-seven and fifty-five—ideas, experience and widened convictions, or just moss?

### GET INTO POLITICS

The following from the Richmond Virginian is applicable to all sections of the country:

"We heartily indorse the following articles which we have clipped from the editorial columns of the Greenville Piedmont:

"A few days since the Manufacturers' Record remarked:

"For many years the Manufacturers' Record has urged the south to cease to make politics

its business, and, instead, to make business its politics."

"The Columbia State replies:

"The advice of the Manufacturers' Record was long ago taken to the extent that the ablest men of the south became so engrossed in business that the political field was given over, in the main, to second-raters."

"The Piedmont adds this comment:

"The State is correct. What South Carolina most needs now is for some men to take enough time from their business to study the political situation. The commonwealth would be much better off."

"We join with the Piedmont and the State in the belief that the one thing that can save the political situation and result in permanent purity and patriotism in politics is the intelligent and persistent activity of citizens in the game. When the average good citizen is indifferent and inactive, by that very condition is created the opportunity of the professional politician and so do corruption in politics and graft in administration find their origin.

"Get in the game. When the citizenship generally does get in the game it will be clean and fair and the city and state and nation will discover the difference."

Pass it along.

### WHO CAN BEAT ROOSEVELT

Editorial in New York World: Who is the best man to beat Roosevelt and a third term in 1912?

This is the question the democrats of the country must face, and they might as well meet it first as last. They have nothing to gain and much to lose by shutting their eyes to the facts that confront them.

We do not say that Mr. Roosevelt's nomination next year is inevitable, but it is probable. Luck is running with him and the advantage of position is on his side, thanks to Taft's mistakes and Roosevelt's adroit disloyalty.

Mr. Taft is politically dead, and there is little hope of a resurrection. He has succeeded in alienating both radicals and conservatives, both progressives and stand-patters. His candidacy is without popular support and is sustained largely by the power of federal patronage. Scarcely one republican in five believes that the president can be re-elected unless democratic folly throws away the election. The president himself is doubtful.

Opposing Mr. Taft for the nomination is Senator La Follette, the most aggressive of the western insurgents; but outside of a comparatively small section of the country the Wisconsin senator makes no convincing appeal to the rank and file of the party. The east frankly distrusts him, and the great debatable states of the middle west, like Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Missouri, display no enthusiasm for him.

If the issue of the nomination were to lie between Taft and La Follette, Taft would unquestionably win; but here Theodore Roosevelt enters the field. He still retains a large measure of his strength with the western insurgents. Most of the federal office-holders, who are the backbone of the Taft machine, are Roosevelt appointees as well, eager and anxious to hold their position. To them Taft's nomination means defeat and the loss of their jobs. Roosevelt is at least a fighting chance.

Big business is against Taft, but Roosevelt offers it a haven and a refuge, with the White House doors wide open. His attack upon the Sherman law in last week's Outlook is Wall street's attack. He offers big business the kind of federal "supervision" that it is begging for, but chiefly he offers the destruction of the Sherman anti-trust law. It is to the destruction of the Sherman act that Wall street is concentrating all its political power. If big business could be sure that his election would mean the repeal or amendment of that statute, all of its money and influence and authority would be instantly arrayed on the side of his candidacy. In any event Wall street would accept him rather than Taft or La Follette. It has bargained with him in the past and knows how to bargain with him in the future.

Big business might consider a hidebound conservative democrat to be more desirable than Taft or La Follette or Roosevelt, but there is small chance of its obtaining such a candidate and less chance of electing him. Besides, Wall

street has done business with the republican party for many years and it naturally views new associations with distrust. It prefers an old customer, and Mr. Roosevelt is its logical choice for president. He can fool the western radicals while insuring to big business the really important stakes for which it is playing.

Democrats in congress and out of congress can not ignore this situation. They are no longer dealing with a frank, good-natured, tactless Taft. They are dealing with the most daring, audacious and practical political manipulator of his generation. They must prepare to beat Roosevelt.

### BALLOT ON PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCES

Editorial in Washington (D. C.) Post: A telegram from Cleveland, O., dated December 4, states that the results of a ballot on presidential preferences, taken by a Cleveland newspaper and a Toledo newspaper jointly, show these views on the part of democratic voters of Ohio who indicated preferences:

Mr. Bryan received 39 per cent of the whole number of votes, Governor Harmon 28½ per cent, and Governor Wilson 23½ per cent, with the other 9 per cent scattered between Speaker Clark, Representative Underwood, and others.

This would indicate that in the state of Ohio's democratic camp no one commands a majority of the preferences of the voters as yet, and what is true of Ohio seems true of the United States.

It is plainly in evidence that democratic sentiment is concentrated on no one man or even upon any two or three of the gentlemen whose names have been proposed for the democratic nomination for the office of chief magistrate of the republic.

The coming six months may bring some leader's name to the front in such a manner as will fix upon him the attention of the people of the union and give him a popularity that will demand his nomination.

The members of the congress, both those of the senate and those of the house, have, through this present session, a great advantage in this contest over persons that are not so much in the limelight of public notice.

At this writing the democratic candidacy is in no man's keeping or control, but it is perfectly apparent that the man who will be nominated must be in full accord with the views of the masses of the people if he would stand any chance for election.

The campaign of 1904 gave sufficient data upon the impossibility of polling a full democratic vote, if the electors of the party are not enthused with the candidate, or pleased with the platform or the candidate's interpretation of it.

Situated as Ohio is, in the heart of the country, acted upon by sentiment of the east as well as that of the west and south, experienced in political warfare as the voters of that state are this tabulation of preferences carries with it more than ordinary information to political observers.

It is evident that state pride has played no part in the voting.

### GOVERNOR HARMON AND TOM JOHNSON

Editorial in Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald: Supporters of Governor Harmon, of Ohio, for the democratic presidential nomination, seeking to commend him to progressive democrats, assert that Tom L. Johnson was his warm supporter and that they worked together in Ohio.

Perhaps no man in America is better qualified to substantiate this statement, if it is true, and refute it if it is false, than Louis F. Post, editor of "The Public," Chicago, who was Johnson's political confidant and friend. A correspondent in Nevada having apprised Mr. Post that "some of our democratic democrats out here place Harmon in the progressive column," and that the correspondent had received a pamphlet "which makes it appear that the progressives of Cleveland indorse Governor Harmon," Mr. Post replied:

"Tom L. Johnson did understand Governor Harmon's position; but he was not satisfied with it. There are probably few men of presidential size with whom Tom L. Johnson would have been less satisfied for the democratic candidate than with Mr. Harmon. Harmon is a reactionary, and has been such throughout the whole period of the struggle between democracy and plutocracy within the democratic party. It is not merely that he opposed Bryan in 1896. Many democratic democrats did that, upon the erroneous supposition that they were