

labor. Today the struggle of mankind is to avoid work, to put it upon others; and, as Tolstoy has said, we no sooner shift the burden of labor upon others than we begin to look down upon them. A lack of sympathy with our fellow-men is the cause of most of human injustice and misery."

The schools, too, came in for some comment as he added: "I sometimes think that our educational system is at fault in separating our intellectual progress from our moral advancement. Too often education is sought to enable one to avoid hard work. When this becomes the prevalent idea, education ceases to become a blessing and becomes a curse. The most important thought that can be lodged in each child's mind is that education is to enlarge one's capacity for work, and not to relieve him from the necessity of it."

"About the most toil-demanding place is the farm. You evidently believe in the back-to-the-farm movement."

"Decidedly. In the cities men accept positions giving small pay because they are enabled to dress more stylishly and keep their hands clean. They consider this the badge of respectability, and they prefer it to greater pay for manual labor. It is not only labor they avoid, but the physical and often moral development which goes with it. The farm, toil and all, gives the greatest opportunity which is left to us for the development of independence and character and strength. I believe that we shall only do our full duty to ourselves, our countrymen, and posterity when we emphasize the fact that it is the idler, not the toiler, who is a disgrace. In disseminating this idea there is work for us all."

Mr. Bryan is positive in his estimate of politicians, but when he talked of various leaders of both parties it was with an understanding that he was not to be quoted.

It was characteristic of Mr. Bryan's temperament that he exerted himself to be in Lincoln on the day that President Taft visited that city. He proposed a toast to the president at the luncheon in his honor, in which he paid a courteous tribute to the man who had defeated him. "I ask you," said he, "to rise, fill your glasses with the beverage upon which the Almighty has set his approval, and drink to the health of President Taft, and may God give him wisdom to discharge aright the onerous duties imposed upon him!"

It must have been pleasing to the speaker that a little later in the day Mr. Taft, making an appeal for the support of arbitration treaties with France and Great Britain, gave him credit for making one of the most important suggestions incorporated in the pacts. He said he first heard from Mr. Bryan the scheme of appointing a commission to make a preliminary investigation prior to the actual submission of the question to a board of arbitration, with the further proviso that this investigation should continue for a year, thus giving both nations time to calm down before the final issue was reached. So it was typical of the attitude of western people toward the democratic leader that this reference was greeted with cheers.

Mr. Bryan, in discussing national politics, fits every phase to his own theory of government, which he has worked out satisfactorily in his mind, and which, in his view, accounts for all conditions. He is as sure of his position today as he was in 1896. The public always likes that sort of public man—though he may not secure a majority of the votes. That Mr. Bryan will be a most influential factor in the coming campaign is evident, as it is that he will use his utmost power to shape his party's policy and nomination in accordance with his views of democracy. With the activities of a national campaign added to present demands upon his time, it means a year with few resting-places.

But he is used to it.

The belated train arrived at 9:15 p. m. He hurried to an automobile, was driven a mile to an audience of ten thousand that had waited an hour and a half for him, and applauded him to the echo through a sixty-minute talk. Then back to the station and aboard another Pullman for a lecture two hundred miles away.

These are busy days for Bryan.

FORGETTING DEMOCRACY

The New York World quotes Mr. Underwood as saying that in dealing with the industrial question we ought to forget that we are democrats. After one reads his views on public questions it is easy to understand his advice—he illustrates it by his example.

The Commoner.

IN NEBRASKA

I. J. Dunn of Omaha, one of Nebraska's most faithful democrats and the man who placed Mr. Bryan in nomination at the Denver convention in 1908 is a candidate for delegate-at-large from Nebraska to the democratic national convention of 1912. Mr. Dunn has issued the following statement:

"To the Democrats of Nebraska: I shall be a candidate for delegate at large to the democratic national convention. I favor the endorsement of candidates for president and vice president who are known to be progressive, and the selection of delegates who will work for the nomination of such candidates, and of the adoption of a progressive platform. I favor the endorsement of the principle of free raw material, including wool, regardless of the action of the democratic majority in the house of representatives. I believe that the anti-trust law should be amended to make it effective as a criminal statute, such as it was prior to the decisions of the supreme court in the Standard Oil and Tobacco trust cases.

"If chosen a delegate I shall endeavor to aid William J. Bryan in whatever manner he may see fit to lead the fight for a progressive platform and candidates. While I have not at all times agreed with him on local state issues, I believe he is and has been right on national issues for eighteen years, and today voices the sentiment of the real progressive democracy of the nation as no other democratic leader does.

"I consider the influence of Mr. Bryan and the confidence that progressive democrats have in his leadership, courage, honesty and devotion to the principles of true democracy, the most valuable asset our party has today or will have in the coming campaign.

An effort is now being made to weaken, if not to destroy Mr. Bryan's standing as a party leader. The opposition may not, in this state, go so far as to try to defeat him as a candidate at large to the convention. His opponents, however, will endeavor to elect delegates not in sympathy with his views regarding the platform, and a fight is on to secure the endorsement of a candidate to whom he is opposed. We all recognize the right of every democrat to vote for any principle or candidate he pleases. Consequently those who agree with Mr. Bryan, and desire to send him as a delegate, together with a delegation in sympathy with him, who will work with him in the convention to secure the adoption of a progressive platform and the nomination of progressive candidates, ought to state their position plainly and invite the opposition to do the same.

"If the democrats of this state are ready to desert the leadership of Mr. Bryan for that of some other democrat, well and good. That is their privilege. But let us have the matter determined in a manner open and above board so that all democrats may know just what the issue is, and just who and what every candidate stands for.

I. J. DUNN."

Omaha, Neb., January 4, 1912.

DESTROYING THE LAW

Those democratic newspapers that have defended the supreme court decisions in the Oil and Tobacco cases on the theory that those decisions upheld rather than interfered with the Sherman anti-trust law as it was written by the lawmakers might learn something to their advantage from the opening statement made by George T. Buckingham, one of the beef trust attorneys, in the case now on trial at Chicago. Mr. Buckingham said:

"I now again call your attention to the fact that the Sherman law has been construed by the supreme court of the United States as to the meaning of its language. On its face it prohibits 'every combination, contract and conspiracy in restraint of trade.' The supreme court, however, has held that this language is not to be read literally, but that the act is to be construed as if it read 'that every combination, contract or conspiracy in undue or unreasonable restraint of trade, is prohibited.' Or to put it in another way, no act restricting competition, comes within the technical definition of 'restraint of trade,' unless it is 'an undue and unreasonable act of restriction.' Now, just what acts are undue and unreasonable may in some phases of the case become a question of fact before this jury; and if it does so become a question of fact, then I insist that you pay close attention to these facts and figures with reference to operation and to profits which will be put in evidence for the purpose of establishing before this jury that whatever has been done, is not undue and unreasonable, when the

result is to give to the packers no more than a fair, just, and reasonable profit, that is less than the profit made by any other great enterprise in the world.

MR. NICHOLS' STATEMENT

Cincinnati, O., Dec. 26, 1911.—Editor of The Commoner: My attention has just been called to an article entitled, "Like Judge Parker," published in your issue of date, December 22, 1911.

This article is a republication of an alleged interview with me purporting to have been sent out from Cincinnati. The interview is a fake, pure and simple. Furthermore, it has the badge of falsehood and malice written all over and through it. I can not imagine the source of such an interview unless it emanates from a bureau under republican auspices with headquarters at Cincinnati, now quite busily engaged in sending throughout the country false and malicious attacks on Governor Harmon.

My attention has never been drawn to the publication of the alleged interview until I saw it in your paper.

Mr. W. J. Bryan wrote me June last, that he was opposed and would continue to oppose the nomination of Governor Harmon as the democratic candidate for president, but that in his opposition he was determined to employ only fair and honorable methods. Such assurance was hardly necessary from Mr. Bryan.

In that spirit I ask publication of the refutation. Sincerely,

HUGH L. NICHOLS.

Campaign Manager for Governor Harmon. The interview to which Mr. Nichols takes exception was sent to The Commoner by a Farmersville, Texas, reader, and it was also printed very generally throughout the United States. The article as it appeared in The Commoner December 22nd, was as follows:

LIKE JUDGE PARKER?

A Cincinnati, O., dispatch credits Lieutenant Governor Nichols, Mr. Harmon's campaign manager, with this statement:

"We will not be drawn into any arguments with Mr. Bryan or anybody else on the presidential matter. This may seem a bit odd to some of the people, but it is the truth. A great many big men in this country have been pulled down to mediocrity by talking too much. However, this is one point where Governor Harmon will outdistance them all. Any of the democrats of this country who do not like him have the free will to vote for him and he will ask them no questions, and he in turn will allow these arguments to go for naught and to keep on getting delegations to vote for him at the convention next summer."

Referring to Mr. Nichols' statement, R. S. Rike, of Farmersville, Texas, writes: "Does Governor Harmon expect to outdistance Judge Parker in playing shut mouth? If he can he is a good one. However, from the attached clipping he is going to try—we had as well prepare for another Parker trouble."

A VALUE LIMIT TO PATENTS

Have we not reached a time when we need a value limit on patents? Now, a patent runs for seventeen years, whether the amount derived from it be much or little. Why should it not expire in less time if a reasonable sum is derived from it at an earlier period? Suppose a limit of one million, half a million or a quarter million be fixed, would not the reward and stimulus be sufficient? A provision for a like sum might be given to the inventor if he has not received sufficient compensation, but why permit the lucky holder of a patent a monopoly to an unlimited extent? Why?

ABOLISH THE JOB SESSION

What has become of Congressman Henry's constitutional amendment changing the day for inauguration and the date of the sessions? A later date for inauguration is desirable, both on account of weather and to give the incoming president more time to shape his policies and make necessary appointments, but it is even more important that the first term of congress should be held earlier than now and that the second term should adjourn before the following election. The second session is now the job session—it should be changed.

LOCATING BLAME

If the members of labor unions are to be blamed for the unauthorized acts of their leaders why should not the stockholders be censured for the criminal acts of the trust magnates who presided over the Oil trust, the Tobacco trust and the Steel trust?