

perfectly justified in doubting his own good faith upon this vital question.

Attorney General Wickersham in his address at Milwaukee on the 19th inst. plainly demonstrated the republican line of attack upon this weak spot of the democratic lines.

He showed 44 actions under the Sherman anti-trust law were brought under the administration of Roosevelt; 33 suits filed and 37 criminal indictments returned under the administration of President Taft, and this record of republican enforcement of that statute will be proclaimed in every republican newspaper, by every republican orator, and its effect upon the voters of the union if a democratic derelict is nominated can easily be foretold. The democrats of Ohio want to help win the presidency for the democratic party of the union.

They want to help gain federal power that they may have democratic policies adopted and supporters of democratic principles placed in federal positions.

Is there any sane democrat in the state of Ohio, or in any other state, who believes that any man who failed to enforce the Sherman anti-trust law, when he held the power to do so, can be either nominated for or elected president this year?

To nominate a democrat who was derelict in that enforcement would be to hand over the election to the republicans by default.

Loyal democrats will see to it that the democratic party is kept from such a fatal selection and they will cut clean away from the men who offer such dangerous advice.—Cincinnati Enquirer.

BRYAN'S ATTITUDE

Louis F. Post in The Public (Chicago): William J. Bryan is under a constant fire of charges from all directions, mostly from old enemies or cold friends, the substance of which is that he is "butting in" to boss the democratic party in the choice of its presidential candidate for 1912. But if there is one man whose duty it is more than any other's to "butt in" at this time, that man is William J. Bryan.

Some protest that Bryan has had honor enough in three nominations, and should now be a "silent sage." Whoever looks upon Bryan's nominations in that way exposes himself as a politician instead of a patriot. An honor, yes; three times an honor, yes; but only as it is always an honor to be trusted by millions as the representative of their interests and aspirations. A mere offer of office, by preference of one man over others, just to please his pride, simply for the sake of the office—a presidential chair or a kingly crown—there would have been no honor in that. If the man accepted his nomination in that spirit, it dishonored him; if his constituents proffered it in that spirit, it dishonored them. But if both were actuated by a better spirit, then and only then were the nominations honors. But in that case the honors rest upon both. The fact that this honor was bestowed thrice, imposes no obligation upon Bryan to retire or upon those who trust him to retire him. In fact it makes his participation in politics now all the more imperative as a duty, and his advice all the more valuable.

But what is it that Bryan is doing over which old enemies and cold friends make such an uproar? They say he is trying to dictate the presidential nomination. Let's see. In The Commoner of September 1, Mr. Bryan's position is stated, doubtless, by himself, in these terms: "Mr. Bryan has but one desire in the matter, namely, that the best man may be chosen. He has hesitated to urge any one man over others because he is anxious to have the benefit of all the light possible. Many have already reached a decision for one candidate or another and Mr. Bryan is glad to see such organize and present the claims of their choice." This is precisely in accord with the attitude Mr. Bryan has maintained from the start.

As to one person, and only one, has Bryan discriminated. This is Governor Harmon; but he discriminates against Harmon. We can therefore understand why Harmon's supporters roar. They know that with Bryan's advice hostile, Harmon can hardly be nominated, and if nominated will certainly be defeated at the polls. But how shall the other roar be explained? Supporters of any of the four men Bryan has named favorably and with no discrimination, upon what theory do any of them complain that he is dictating the nomination? We can think of none except that he names four men instead of one. But if that is their reason, are they not in effect asking Bryan to do the

The World-Herald Did Not Explain--- An Unpublished Letter

1430 Elm St., Lincoln, Neb., April 2, 1912.—
To the Editor of the Omaha World-Herald, Omaha, Neb. Dear Sir: I have been a subscriber to the World-Herald for many years, during which time I have ardently championed Gilbert M. Hitchcock as a true progressive and the World-Herald as the principal paper in Nebraska advocating the people's cause.

I am one of those who originally espoused the principle of the initiative, referendum and recall more than twenty-five years ago. I have been gratified to watch this idea grow as people learned about it. First the populists advocated it; next the democrats took it up; and, finally, it has percolated through the skulls even of republicans, until now it is a burning issue with all classes and shades of political opinion regardless of party.

It is opposed by those entrenched behind special privilege, and who are afraid of the popular verdict.

I therefore, can not understand how Mr. Hitchcock or the World-Herald conscientiously advocate the candidacy of Judson Harmon since he has come out flat-footed in opposition to this most far-reaching and important of all reforms.

This is the keystone to the arch of popular government and is worth more than all the other issues combined which are now before the people.

It seems to me that at this late date, when it is so well understood by the common people

very thing for their candidate which they mistakenly complain of him for doing for some other candidate? Bryan has no right to be a boss, of course; but on the other hand hasn't he the right not to be bossed?

THOROUGHLY DEMOCRATIC

Fairbury (Neb.) Journal: Sober second thought on the declaration of Mr. Bryan that he will not serve as a delegate if instructed to vote for Harmon, convinces us that he is absolutely right.

To do otherwise would be to secure votes under false pretenses.

That is exactly what the Harmon candidates are trying to do right now.

Representing that they will vote for any candidate the voters instruct for, they are at heart for Harmon; hence will work for Harmon and with his friends and against the very candidates the voters of Nebraska might otherwise choose, if they are given seats in the convention.

To secure votes of men who favor Wilson or Clark, these candidates for delegates are eager to go on record as willing to go to the convention under instructions. Yet the net result of such a condition is to actually defeat the peoples' will. Their real object is to go to the convention—not to carry out the peoples' will.

Mr. Bryan frankly states that he wants no votes of Harmon men. He warns then in advance that if they send him to the convention, it will not be tied hand and foot for Harmon. He will let some other man cast the Harmon vote.

Could anything be more fair?

Could anything be more democratic?

All this talk that Mr. Bryan is trying to defeat the spirit of the primary is pettifoggery. Trying to muddle the minds of the people so they can not see the real animus behind the movement. It is a politicians' game which should be checkmated by the voters at the coming primary.

WHERE CLARK STANDS

The following letter explains itself:

Washington, D. C., April 9, 1912.—Hon. R. F. Pettigrew. Dear Senator: In answer to your query as to my opinion as to the reading of the word "reasonable" into the decision of the supreme court, I will say that while I am slow to set my own opinion up against that of the august tribunal, I am firmly persuaded that this position is untenable. To my mind to talk about a "reasonable" restraint of trade is preposterous. Moreover it seems to me that it leaves honest business men in an incurable muddle as to whether they are violating the

and is so simple and easy of demonstration that politicians, statesmen, and even professors of political economy are beginning to understand and appreciate its benefits; when university fossils can forego rooting in the dust of old sepulchers long enough to study this popular weapon of defense, it is surely no longer an experiment but an accomplished fact. It ill behooves Mr. Hitchcock and the World-Herald to belabor Mr. Bryan for boldly standing by his guns, as he has consistently done during the last twenty years. Had he done otherwise, he would have forfeited all the respect that his followers have for him.

I think that the World-Herald owes to its readers a full and candid statement of its position in regard to this issue and to tell them whether or not a candidate who has not yet progressed to the point of understanding where he can comprehend the simple facts of the initiative, referendum, and recall, is of sufficient caliber for the presidency.

If the World-Herald is willing to turn back twenty-five years and try to destroy all the good it has accomplished during this period, I think its readers should be informed immediately. I may be mistaken somewhat in my estimate but I think about three-fourths of the people of all parties are for it. The other fourth will be so as soon as they find out that Lincoln is dead, the war is over, and that there is no longer danger of Jeff Davis invading the north. Very truly yours, A. J. PLUMER.

law. If that decision stands a business is lawful or unlawful owing to the opinion of five judges and everybody else is left guessing. Your friend,
CHAMP CLARK.

WHERE WILSON STANDS

New York, April 15.—In an interview in the Outlook last August Governor Wilson said that he has "not given sufficient study to the question of currency reform," but adds, "I am afraid that any measure of that character bearing Mr. Aldrich's name must have been drawn in the offices of a few men who, through the present system of concentrated capital, control the banking and industrial activities of the country." In a speech at Chicago on April 6, 1912, Governor Wilson said: "The plain fact is that the control of credit is dangerously concentrated in this country. The great monopoly in this country is the money monopoly. So long as this exists our old variety of freedom and individual energy of development are out of the question."

BUT THEY WOULD NOT FOLLOW HIM

Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer: "Governor Harmon's recent declaration before the constitutional convention amazes those who regard the fight for the initiative and referendum as won," says Mayor Baker in his statement.

"It has had the further effect of irritating democrats throughout the state who felt that his acceptance of the party platform indicated a willingness on his part to lead in the movement for a restoration of the powers of government to the people. If he entertained the views which he seems to have expressed, he ought to have stated them before accepting nomination on state platforms which pledged him to the principle of the initiative and referendum.

"He was silent while the people of this state were electing a constitutional convention pledged to the carrying out of that principle. He now has no right to appear before the convention and in effect counsel disregard of the pledges upon which they were elected.

"The duty of the constitutional convention is plain. It should give us both state and local initiative and referendum, and we should also have the right, with a slightly higher percentage, to bring about amendments to the constitution itself by the use of the initiative. Neither the openly expressed and timid doubt of Governor Harmon, nor the more subtle and less frank attack made by those who advocate high percentages ought to be permitted to prevail. If the convention disappoints the just expectation of the people, and the constitution submitted by it does not contain the initiative and referendum with reasonable and practicable percentages, it ought to be defeated, and I hope will be."