The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 12, NO. 16, Lincoln, Nebraska, April 26, 1912 Whole Number 588

Mr. Bryan's Ohio Text

At each of his twenty Ohio meetings, Mr. Bryan read the following:

The issue this year is exactly the same that it was in 1896—namely, the people versus Wall street. The money question was merely an incident of the campaign of '96, just as the tariff question is merely an incident of the present campaign.

THE REAL QUESTION IS WHETHER THE GOVERNMENT IS TO BE RUN BY THE PEOPLE, IN THE INTEREST OF THE PEOPLE, OR BY WALL STREET, IN THE INTEREST OF WALL STREET.

The fight made by the democratic party in 1896 was the first great protest against the control of the government by the predatory interests. The Wall street democrats then joined the republican party and, with the aid of the largest campaign fund ever used, and by means of coercion, such as was never practiced before, defeated the democratic ticket.

Governor Harmon, who was then 50 years old, and a member of President Cleveland's cabinet, joined with President Cleveland and the rest of the cabinet in opposing the democratic party and in electing as the republican president, William McKinley, the high priest of protection.

I affirm that Governor Harmon has not changed in heart since that time. I affirm that his sympathies are with Wall street today, as they were then, and that his nomination would put the control of the party in the hands of Wall street.

If Governor Harmon denies this let him show where he has ever publicly admitted that he and President Cleveland were wrong in assisting the republican party in 1896.

If he was right in '96, then the nearly half million democrats of Ohio who voted for me that year were wrong. If he and the democrats of Ohio are together now, either he has changed or they have changed, and I am here to show you that he has not changed.

The vote at the primaries, May 21, will show whether the democrats of this state, after the gallant fight they have made for the protection of the people against the Wall street plunderbund, are ready to put their necks under the yoke and surrender the government into the hands of those who have, for a generation, resorted to every means of deception, corruption, and intimidation to exploit the masses.

This is the issue in Ohio as it is all over the country.

I wish it were possible for you to vote directly for presidential candidates in the districts, as well as in the state at large. But in the districts you must vote for delegates committed to candidates instead of for the candidates themselves.

In this state your choice is limited to Harmon and Wilson and I urge you to vote for Wilson and for Wilson delegates.

If the issue were between Harmon and Clark, I would urge you to vote for Clark and for Clark delegates.

If the issue were between Harmon and any other progressive, I would urge you to vote for the progressive whoever he might be and for progressive delegates.

In other words, I am for any progressive against any reactionary—for the people and against Wall street all the time.

Mr. Bryan proceeded to furnish proof showing Governor Harmon's constant and continuing devotion to Wall street and Wall street's confidence in him.

MORGAN'S PERSONAL CHOICE

New York, Feb. 24, 1910.—Special to the Cincinnati Enquirer.—A Washington dispatch to the Newark Evening News is as follows:

"Believing that Theodore Roosevelt will be the republican nominee for president in 1912 and that it will be impossible for the standpatters and reactionaries to retain control of congress and the federal government through the republican organization, Wall street interests are preparing to dominate the democratic national convention in that year and nominate a man of their selection on the democratic ticket.

"J. Pierpont Morgan has taken a directing hand in the program and Francis Lynde Stetson, a prominent corporation lawyer, closely identified with big financial interests, is in charge of the work of capturing the democratic organization. Governor Judson Harmon, of Ohio, is Mr. Morgan's personal choice for the presidency."

Two years ago last February J. Pierpont Morgan picked out Governor Harmon as his PERSONAL CHOICE. How do the plain democrats like to have Morgan pick our candidate?

PATENT LEGISLATION

It seems likely that congress will at last take some action on the subject of patents. On another page will be found an outline of a bill now under consideration. It should be so amended as to fix a money limit as well as a time limit to patents. Why not provide for the termination of a patent when it has earned a reasonable amount—the amount to be fixed arbitrarily in the law? A patent is intended to stimulate invention and to reward the inventor; when it has served that purpose the monopoly which it confers should end. A value limit is more defensible than a time limit but there is no reason why we should not have both.

KERN'S GREAT SPEECH

On another page will be found Senator Kern's great speech on pensions. Read it. It shows his power as an orator, and more than that, it shows his sense of justice and breadth of sympathy. Senator Kern is justifying the hopes of his friends; he is one of the growing democrats—watch him grow.

CONTENTS

MR. BRYAN'S OHIO TEXT
MORGAN'S PERSONAL CHOICE
"A DICTATOR"
SENATOR KERN'S GREAT SPEECH
OWEN ANSWERS JONES
"BIG BUSINESS" WANTS THE COURT
GOVERNOR HARMON'S CONFESSION
HOME RULE FOR IRELAND
MR. BRYAN'S NEW YORK INTERVIEW
PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCES
A TERRIBLE DISASTER
HOME DEPARTMENT
NEWS OF THE WEEK
WASHINGTON NEWS

"A Dictator"

Editorial in The Commoner of February 19, 1904: The reorganizers are with one voice accusing Mr. Bryan of trying to "dictate" to the democratic party. What has Mr. Bryan done to justify the charge? He has expressed it as his opinion that the Kansas City platform should be reaffirmed, and for this he is now being censured by the bolters and by those who are trying to put the bolters in control of the organization. If Mr. Bryan had declared himself in favor of abandoning the Kansas City platform would they have accused him of dictating? Not at all. He would have been praised by the gold organs and they would have abused any one who dissented from him. "Dictating," it would seem, is defined, not as the offering of suggestions, but as the offering of suggestions objectionable to the men and newspapers to whose opposition the party owes its recent defeats. Mr. Bryan has a right to agree with them, but no right, they think, to differ from them.

Mr. Cleveland has been offering advice: he has declared that the party ought to return to what he calls "sanity" and yet none of these organs have denounced Mr. Cleveland as a dictator. They have not even questioned the propriety of his expressing an opinion on party policy. The fact that Mr. Bryan has twice been the candidate of his party would, according to their logic, compel him to keep silent, while the fact that Mr. Cleveland has twice thrown his influence to the republican party gives him a right to speak. Even republican papers can seriously counsel the democratic party without arousing a protest from those editors who mask their plutocratic designs under a democratic name, but it is regarded as utterly reprehensible that a former candidate should confer with those who voted for him.

What is the explanation of this bitter and unreasonable criticism? Simply that the reorganizers are attempting to deceive the public and it makes them angry to have their plans exposed. Mr. Bryan has not sought to force his opinion on any one. He has expressed himself, as every citizen has a right to do, and he has no desire to influence his co-workers except insofar as his arguments are found to be sound. It is not Mr. Bryan that they have to meet, but the honest conviction of the millions of democrats who have maintained their integrity in spite of threats and bribes. A little child can, by quoting the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," throw a crowd of would-be burglars into confusion. They would fear not the child, but the doctrine he proclaims. And it would seem that Mr. Bryan's suggestion of an honest platform has brought similar consternation among the men who are plotting a betrayal of the people. If theirs was an open and an honest work they would not abuse Mr. Bryan—they would be content to announce their platform, give their reasons for it and appeal to the voters of the party, but instead of that, they fly into a passion and deny the right of any one to differ from them. They may as well know that their scheme will be opposed and that they will be compelled to come from under cover.

For seven years the corporation newspapers and the leaders of the reorganization movement have been working for the most part under ground—they have lauded every tool of organized wealth and attempted to assassinate the character of every one who would not join them. They have made a constant assault on democratic principles and were expecting to complete their plans at St. Louis, but they now realize that they must face the indignation which their repeated perfidy has aroused.

Their chief argument is that they can point the way to victory and they have impressed a few who have forgotten the disastrous defeat of 1894 when the reorganizers last led and the rout of the Palmer and Buckner ticket which they supported. They have won over a few whose hunger for spoils is stronger than desire for re-