

## Questions Governor Harmon Did Not Answer

In his open letter to E. H. Moore of Ohio, Mr. Bryan submitted several important questions for Governor Harmon to answer on his visit to Nebraska. Mr. Harmon spoke in Omaha, spending several days in Nebraska, but he did not undertake to answer Mr. Bryan's questions. For the benefit of Commoner readers the following extract from Mr. Bryan's letter to Mr. Moore is reproduced:

You demand proof that Wall street is back of Governor Harmon? You know enough about politics to know that Wall street acts in secret and that it is difficult to furnish written proof of the movements and indorsements of those who control the financial affairs in our business centers. Circumstantial evidence is good enough to furnish a ground for a conviction even for the crime of murder, and it ought to be sufficient to guide public opinion in the nomination of presidential candidates.

You are the manager of Governor Harmon's campaign in Ohio. Are you not aware of the fact that he has been attorney for corporations in which Mr. Morgan was interested? Do you not know that the fees collected for such legal services amount to considerable? Do you not know that Mr. Morgan is favorable to the nomination of Mr. Harmon? And do you believe that at such a time as this the democratic party can afford to let its presidential candidate be selected by Mr. Morgan when the public attention is focused upon the fact that Mr. Morgan collected sixty-nine million dollars as his compensation for organizing the steel trust conspiracy against ninety millions of people? Do you think that Mr. Morgan is the proper person to pick out a candidate at this time when the democratic party is championing the cause of little children who have been mistreated by protected employers—mistreated even to the extent of being charged five cents a week for the water they drank while at work?

Do you deny that Mr. Hill—who organized the merger that was declared unlawful and yet was not destroyed—favors the nomination of Mr. Harmon? Do you think that he is a good man to advise the democratic party in regard to nominations when he has been conspicuous in opposing our party on every progressive measure? Do you not know that the predatory corporations are deeply interested in the selection of a president who will honor their recommendations for men aspiring to the United States judgeships? Do you not know that almost without exception the members of the plunderbund favor Mr. Harmon as against any progressive who can be named? Are these men mistaken in their man? Do you not know that the Wall street controlled papers are almost

without exception presenting Mr. Harmon and urging his nomination as against any progressive? Are these men mistaken in their man? May we not judge a man by his supporters when we find him supported by those who want to convert the government into a private asset. Can the people take the chance involved in putting such a man in supreme control of the party and the administration of the government when men can be found equally competent and who have the merit of being opposed by Wall street?

You assert that another candidate whom you mention is spending more money than Mr. Harmon. I am not interested in any one progressive against other progressives—I am for that progressive in each state, whatever his name may be—who can make the strongest fight against any reactionary candidate, whatever may be the name of the reactionary, and I am urging—and have been for some time—the passage of a law requiring the publication of contributions made to the funds that are used to secure presidential nominations. I believe that the people should know the sources from which these contributions come. Are you and Governor Harmon trying to secure the passage of such a law? So far as I have been able to judge, a great deal more money has been spent in behalf of your candidate than in behalf of any other. If you deny this, you have a chance to find out. Publish a list of the contributors to the Harmon fund and challenge the other candidates to do likewise. You can thus smoke them out, or if they refuse, you will then be in a position to use their silence against them. Until you do this, why should people give weight to your words when you make charges against other candidates? If Wall street has any other candidate, Governor Harmon has a right to complain and the people have a right to know.

In conclusion allow me to say that I am glad that you are coming to Nebraska. You will find no more real Harmon sentiment in Nebraska than there was in Oklahoma and Kansas. Do you know of any reason why there should be? You will find that Governor Harmon's support in this state is confined, first, to reactionaries, and, second, to those who favor him not because they believe he is a progressive but because I incurred their hostility by opposing them in 1910 on a local issue. You will find that the supporters of Governor Harmon do not expect to secure a majority of the democratic votes even with the support that auxiliary organizations are giving him on local grounds. The most that Governor Harmon's supporters here hope for is to defeat the progressive forces—divided between two candidates—and thus enable a minority to triumph over a majority.

### MR. BRYAN AND THE CHURCH

The following letter is reproduced from the Lincoln (Neb.) Journal:

Des Moines, Ia., April 8.—To the Editor of the State Journal: In your issue of Tuesday, March 26, 1912, I read a letter of John P. Sutton in which he refers to the opposition of Mr. Bryan as a candidate for the presidency by the Catholics, and in which he refers to the cold blooded ingratitude of Mr. Bryan's paper toward the Catholics at the close of the campaign in 1908. The letter also states that Mr. Sutton is a personal friend of Mr. Bryan and apparently wishes him well. It does not state whether or not Mr. Sutton voted for Mr. Bryan in that campaign. The letter does, in a veiled manner, criticize the action of Mr. Bryan after the campaign closed with reference to publications by Catholics in his paper, The Commoner. I have known Mr. Sutton by reputation and have met him at Irish land league conventions and recognized him as a gentleman who believes in uprightness and integrity. I can not agree with Mr. Sutton that Mr. Bryan has refused to publish utterances from Catholic papers and others who maintain their loyalty, not only to Mr. Bryan, but to the cause of democracy. The Western Watchman of St. Louis, Mo., edited by the talented Father Phelan, did, after the presidential election in 1908, publish an article announcing that democratic Catholics had refused to support Mr. Bryan, and that President Taft should recognize those who departed from their party to vote for him in the appointment of Catholic republicans to office. It particularly urged the appointment of R. C. Kerns to an ambassadorship by reason of the splendid services he had performed for Mr. Taft. Not on account of his republicanism, but in the interest of those

Catholic democrats who voted against Mr. Bryan. The article states "We stated at the time, that we were voicing the sentiments of that multitude of Catholic democrats who had voted for Mr. Taft and that they would not be satisfied with anything less, for the noble old soldier, who kept the bridge alone."

The article further stated, "We are informed that Mr. Taft fully recognizes the debt he is under to the Catholics of the United States. This being so, we can assure him that he could do nothing that would better please that great body of loyal citizens than the appointing their honored fellow Catholic to a distinguished foreign post."

This editorial from the Western Watchman was published in The Commoner on June 11, 1909. If it correctly states the facts it does indicate there was a large body of Catholic democrats who refused to vote for Mr. Bryan, and by reason of that fact a Catholic should be appointed to office by the president of the United States. I am and have been all my life an humble member of the Catholic church attempting to be faithful to its teachings and observing its laws and rules. I protest that this is not a day or time in which the religious scruples or principles of any citizen should be made a matter of political dispute. If men vote against Mr. Bryan because not believing in the policies he advocates, well and good, it is not only their duty, but their privilege so to do. No one in this great nation of ours can truthfully say that Mr. Bryan ever uttered a single word against the Catholic church or its adherents. I have known him since 1891, been engaged with him in every political contest since that date. Have taken his paper from the first issue; have traveled with him, been a

guest of his home and I can truthfully say, without fear of contradiction, that during this entire period of time I never heard an expression that would indicate Mr. Bryan had anything but the kindest feeling toward the members of our church. Mr. Bryan has ever stood for the people in every contest, and no one has had or can have a higher regard for him than members of the Catholic church. Catholics have not received, even in this free land their just reward for loyalty to country and institutions. The last man that a Catholic should utter a word against is the great commoner of Nebraska. I do not know the purpose of Mr. Sutton's letter. I hope it was not to raise a religious question concerning Mr. Bryan before the primaries in Nebraska. I wish to give expression to my feeling toward one of the ablest American citizens now living, who does not destroy, but builds up and whose political career is based upon equality and the right of the people to rule. Defeat Mr. Bryan if the policies of our country require it, but in the name of God let no Catholic vote against him because of any thought that he is untrue to the basic principles of the American government, unfettered conscience and untrammelled right to live. No one can question the Catholicity of the Western Watchman. It is not so far south as to be lacking in influence. It gave expression to ill feeling towards Mr. Bryan in unmistakable terms. Does Mr. Sutton want a religious issue? Will it be said Catholic democrats are not to support Mr. Bryan? One whose voice and pen has ever been for equality and religious right? Mr. Editor I am not one of those who will remain quiet when my friend is so foully slandered. I ask the 133,000 Catholics of Nebraska to not let it be said they raised a religious issue against the truest and purest of our country's citizens.

JERRY B. SULLIVAN.

### THE PERIL IN A MONEY TRUST

Governor Woodrow Wilson at Harrisburg, Pa: "The plain fact is that the control of credit is dangerously concentrated in this country. The money resources of the country are not at the command of those who do not submit to the direction and domination of small groups of capitalists, who wish to keep the economic development of the country under their own eye and guidance. The great monopoly in this country is the money monopoly. So long as that exists our old variety and freedom and individual energy of development are out of the question. The industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men who, even if their action be honest and intended for the public interest, are necessarily concentrated upon the great undertakings in which their own money is involved and who necessarily, by every reason of their limitations, chill and check and destroy genuine economic freedom. This is the greatest question of all and to this statesmen must address themselves with an earnest determination to serve the long future and the true liberties of men."

### GOOD WORK

S. R. Roberts, California: You asked me to send you five subscribers for The Commoner. I not only sent in five but thirteen and I enclose herewith another club of five, together with postoffice money order of \$2.50 to pay for this club at your campaign rate. I am about to take a trip through the county and it will be little trouble for me to secure from fifty to seventy-five additional names, and to interest live democrats into good work.

### "PROTECTION"

Some of the committeemen who voted for Guffey are now explaining that they did it in order to protect the seat of the Tennessee committeeman. That is a sufficient excuse for Tennesseans but the blanket can not be stretched to cover committeemen from other states. Mr. Guffey will be found a heavy load to carry. Every committeeman who represents the same interests ought to be retired.

### A GOOD START

With Dunne to lead the ticket in Illinois and Ralston in Indiana the democrats are making a mighty good start in the middle west. Now if the other states will only do as well.