

That Harmon "Majority" --- What the Official Statistics Say

Editorial in the Cincinnati Enquirer, April 5: The friends of a candidate who is named for the democratic nomination for the presidency frequently refer to 100,000 plurality which their favorite received at the election in the state of Ohio in 1910, and in telling part of the truth, falsify the essential record by failing to state that he received 75,492 votes less that year than he did running for the same office in 1908.

In other words, his vote fell off 75,492 from his first record, and 100,000 plurality was shown, not by an increased vote for him, but by a decreased vote of 75,492, and a falling off on the republican vote for Governor of about 156,000 votes.

Was this a test of his popularity that he should receive 75,492 votes less than he did two years before?

If he should drop off another 75,000 at the election, if he was nominated for president, would he still have 25,000 left of that famous 100,000 plurality?

Or would he be able to rely upon another drop of the republican vote to an extent that would still leave him with that 100,000 plurality?

There has been much varnishing and polishing up of that 100,000 plurality, it has mislead so many democrats in the state of Ohio and other states, that a plain, direct statement of the whole truth, as shown by the official statistics of the state, is exceedingly appropriate at this time.

The vote for governor in 1908 was as follows: Harmon (dem.) 552,569; Harris (rep.) 533,197; Randlow (soc.) 28,573; Martin (pro.) 7,665; Scattering 1,194; Democratic plurality 19,372

In the election of 1910 the vote for governor was:

Harmon (dem.) 477,077; Harding (rep.) 376,700; Other candidates 70,686; Democratic plurality 101,377

But the democratic candidate, as seen above, received 75,492 votes less than was polled for him in 1908. It was the disorganization of the republican party, the factional struggles within its ranks, the extreme dissatisfaction with the policies and management of the party that caused their voters to stay at home and take no part in the election that permitted that 100,000 plurality upon a greatly reduced democratic vote as compared with the prior election.

The election record exhibits that clearly, and it discloses conditions that demand that the democratic party shall nominate the most popular candidate within its ranks if it would win against the republican party, backed and supported by a republican national administration.

A reactionary democratic candidate for the presidency can not poll one half of 477,000 votes in the state of Ohio under the political conditions now prevailing.

Such a nomination could split the party upon principles, and that is the most deadly of all political differences.

The great majority of the democratic party in this state and in the union is opposed to reactionary policies; do not believe in them; will vote against them and against any candidate who represents them.

The candidate should be one who will unite the democrats and not scatter them, never to unite again as this candidate of the interests certainly would do.

HARMON WAS SIXTH

From the Piqua (Ohio) Leader-Dispatch: The "straw vote" which has been conducted by the Greenville Advocate for the past three weeks, has ended.

W. J. Bryan, the great Commoner, was the choice of the voters who participated in the vote, receiving 617 votes out of the 1,033 that were cast for the democratic candidates.

Theodore Roosevelt received 419 votes and was the leader among the republican candidates. There were 1,799 votes cast in the three

weeks and votes were received from all parts of Darke county.

Wilson was second to Bryan among the democrats, while Harmon is sixth, having received less votes than Marshall of Indiana.

This is the sentiment as it exists in the democratic party over the state, the result of Harmon's failure to appeal to the great majority in the party who are progressive.

TOM JOHNSON'S OPINION OF HARMON

The Harmon bureau is sending out literature that Tom Johnson was his warm supporter and that they worked together in Ohio. No man in this country was closer to Tom L. Johnson than the editor of "The Public," Mr. Louis F. Post, of Chicago. Mr. Post, in answer to an inquiry from a friend of his, absolutely denies that Mr. Johnson was satisfied with Governor Harmon. In fact Tom L. Johnson expressed his inmost conviction and judgment of Harmon when he opposed his nomination for governor and stated certain facts which were then true and still true, in the following words:

"I am opposed to Harmon's nomination because I do not believe he stands for the principles for which progressive democracy stands. The democracy of Ohio can't go before the people with a candidate who is known as the legal representative and railroad receiver in Ohio of the Morgan interests in New York. The democracy of Ohio can't go before the people under the leadership of a man who is backed and supported by the interests that defeated Bryan in 1896 and 1900 and sacrificed the party on the altar of Mammon in 1904. The nomination of Harmon would be hailed with delight by all the big interests in Wall street."—From the circular issued by the Progressive Democratic League of Ohio.

THE ONE PER CENT PREDICAMENT

Is Judson Harmon, governor of Ohio, railroad corporation lawyer, Wall street railroad receiver and candidate for the democratic nomination for the office of president of the United States, a friend of the farmer and of the working man?

Does Judson Harmon place the interests and the welfare of the people of the state of which he is the chief executive, above those of himself and of the corporations of one or more of which he is legal adviser?

Does the Smith 1 per cent tax law, for the enactment of which Governor Harmon claims the credit, although he failed to sign the bill after it was passed by the legislature, so that the measure became a law without his signature, relieve the people of a large part of the taxes they have been burdened with for years, and which should be paid by the railroads and other public utilities, as Governor Harmon and its sponsors claimed it would?

To each and all of these questions only a negative answer can be given. To answer any of them in the affirmative would be to tell a falsehood, as the following facts and figures will prove, for facts and figures do not lie:

Before he was elected governor Judson Harmon was, and he still is, attorney for and receiver of the Cincinnati, Hamilton & Dayton Railroad company, the main line of which operates in eleven counties of Ohio, including Allen county. In 1910, before the Smith tax law went into effect the total amount of taxes paid by all of the railroads owning property in Allen county, with the exception of the C., H. & O., was \$64,686.48, while in 1911 the same roads, not including the C., H. & D., paid a total tax in Allen county of \$76,512.20, or an increase in taxes of \$11,825.72.

In 1910 the C., H. & D. under Governor Harmon's receivership, paid into the Allen county treasury a total of \$9,863.96, but in 1911 the same road with Governor Harmon at its helm, paid into the same treasury only \$6,863.34, or \$3,000.62 less than it paid the year before.

Why was it that all of the roads but the one of which Governor Harmon is receiver and legal counsel had to pay more taxes in 1911 than they did in 1910, while Harmon's road was permitted to pay \$3,000.62 less taxes in 1911 than in 1910? Did Harmon's road help to relieve the people of Allen county of any part of their tax burden? It certainly did not. Did the Smith

1 per cent tax law force Harmon's road to return all of its property in Allen county for taxation at its full value? It certainly does not look as if it did, nor does it look as if Governor Harmon, as receiver for the C., H. & D., insisted that the road's property be returned at its true value.

In the meanwhile, the Wall street men who own and control the railroads are chuckling in their sleeves over the reduction of their taxes in Ohio as a result of the Smith law; Governor Harmon is smiling his famous bland smile because Wall street is pleased with him, but the people who have had, or will have to make up the shortage in the railroads' taxes, will "smile on the other side of their mouths" when they have to dig up the cash.—Norwalk (Ohio) Experimenter.

POSSIBLE AND IMPOSSIBLE CANDIDATES

When the delegates to the democratic national convention meet next year to nominate candidates for president and vice president the names of many distinguished gentlemen will be presented that they may select the most available.

Those offering will represent all sections and while undoubtedly every one will be classed as progressive they will differ in their interpretation of a progressive policy.

The democratic party has from its very foundation been progressive in the sense of that progression which advances the interests of the majority of the people without depriving the minority of its rights under the constitution.

Jefferson was such a progressive; Monroe, Jackson and Polk were such progressives, and under each of them the people prospered and the nation developed.

Always progression with the democratic party, but that progression which abides within the lines of the constitution, and that ever respects and preserves the rights of the states and those of the individual citizen.

The democratic party, in its national convention assembled, will select the leader who will pursue this time-honored practice of the party to regard the constitution as the guide, the safe, secure, infallible guide, and who will reject all innovations that do not accord with the letter and spirit of that incomparable document.

Fortunately for the party it possesses a number of such leaders, men who have been loyal to the party in every campaign it has fought, men who are abreast of the very front line of thought of the present day, men who will carry out pledges faithfully, platforms correctly, and that neither cloak designs with silence, evade action when decisions should be practiced, nor carry water upon both shoulders to ultimately deceive both friends and foes.

The coming campaign calls for sincerity, frankness and direct speech in the candidates.

It is only with such characteristics that a candidate can secure success at the polls.

To nominate any one not in this class is to insure defeat to the party and disaster to the organization.

There were campaigns in the past when candidates could be all things to all men and win the elections, but that is true no longer in the United States.

The revolt of the rank and file of the democratic party in 1896 was their protest against what they esteemed a betrayal of the platform of 1892.

The three years of dissension in the republican party has been based upon what is regarded by the insurgents as nonfulfillment of the party pledges of 1908.

An intringer, a double-dealer, a shifty, evasive, non-committal candidate can not be successful before the people in 1912, nor can such a one secure the nomination from either of the two great parties.

Machiavellian qualities are out of order in this coming campaign and those who exhibit them have no standing before the voters.—Editorial in Cincinnati Enquirer.

All persons who may have the impression that Governor Harmon has any claim to the democratic nomination on account of being a progressive democrat, should read the April Issue of McClure's Magazine and also study the cartoon.