

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor
RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor

CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher
Editorial Rooms and Business Office, 524-526 South 12th Street

One Year.....\$1.00
Six Months......50
In Clubs of Five or more, per year.. .75

Three Months..... .25
Single Copy..... .05
Sample Copies Free.
Foreign Post, 5c Extra.

SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where sub-agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by post-office money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps or money.

RENEWALS—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus January 21, '12 means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1912. Two weeks are required after money has been received before the date on wrapper can be changed.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give old as well as new address.

ADVERTISING—Rates will be furnished upon application.

Address all communications to

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.

the presidency—echoes this Roosevelt sentiment. The people must wait until they have cast their votes for the republican ticket before they are to be told by the republican managers of the interests by which the republican campaign is being financed!

Do you think they can fool the people again?

WHY THEY WERE AFRAID

Walter Wellman, the republican correspondent for the republican Chicago Record-Herald, prints in the Record-Herald of Tuesday, October 20, 1908, an article from which the following is taken:

"During the past week the republican national campaign fund has been enriched by contributions of several hundred thousand dollars, and James J. Hill is the man who has raised the money. Mr. Hill has thus taken the place in the Taft campaign which 'My Dear Mr. Harriman' held in the Roosevelt campaign four years ago. For the first time since the opening of this year's battle the republican national committee feels comfortable financially, and able to push the work with vigor during the last fortnight of the campaign. President Roosevelt's influence was enough to get a hundred thousand dollars from Andrew Carnegie, and some one stirred up Mr. Hill. It was James J. Hill who came to the rescue of Mark Hanna during the dark days of the first Bryan-McKinley fight, when it looked as if the west was going for silver and the nation in danger of being plunged down to the monetary basis of Mexico and Guatemala. Mr. Hill used his personal influence among the rich men of New York and procured for Mr. Hanna a considerable part of the six million dollar fund that was used in that campaign. Now he has come to the rescue of Mr. Hitchcock in a similar way. He has spoken the words in the right ears in New York which have resulted in a surprising increase of the funds in the war chest.

MR. TAFT AND CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

While at Lincoln, Neb., during September, 1908, Mr. Taft gave out the following statement in reply to Mr. Bryan:

"Mr. Bryan challenges me to take the same position that President Roosevelt takes with reference to the time when publicity should be made of campaign contributions, and I accept the challenge. I take exactly the same position that the president takes. I have always been in favor of a law which will require publicity of both contributions and expenditures immediately after election. Mr. Bryan seems to favor the publication of contributions before the election, but postpones publication of expenditures until after that time. I confess I see no reason why, if contributions are to be published before the election, expenditures should not also be published. I think that the character of expenditures is quite as important as the character and source of the contributions. I don't know of any election law, either in this country or abroad, which requires the publication of con-

tributions or expenditures before the election. The law of Nebraska on this subject only requires the publication of contributions and expenditures after the election. This was the law which the democratic managers in 1904 in Nebraska so flagrantly violated by failing to return the receipt of \$15,000 from Mr. Thomas F. Ryan.

"The most drastic law in this country on the subject is that of New York, which also makes the time for publication after the election.

"The proper object of a publicity law is to prevent the use of money for bribery and other improper purposes in elections and to enable the law officers of the government and the public to determine whether the contributions made were properly expended for legitimate purposes. The requirement that the names and amounts of the persons contributing should also be shown is for the purpose of enabling the public and the prosecuting officers of the government to judge whether subsequent official action has been improperly affected in favor of the contributors by the successful candidate. This can all be accomplished by publication after the election. The chief objection to the publication of contributions before the election is that it makes certain that in the heat of the controversy the motives of those who contribute to pay the legitimate expenses of the campaign will be misconstrued, perverted and misrepresented. The candidates in whose behalf the contributions are made will be charged in a most unfair way as being completely under the control of those who make the contributions. It is entirely natural and proper that men who are able to contribute and who are deeply interested from patriotic motives and from motives of a desire to continue the general prosperity should contribute to the party whose administration of governmental affairs is likely to be in accord with their views of proper government. It is not good policy to discourage those who desire to contribute to the legitimate purposes of the campaign from so contributing by exposing them to the bitter diatribes or unfair attacks or slanderous condemnation of partisans in an electoral fight. After the election is over and the expenditures and contributions are published, the temptation to misrepresent the motives of the donors will largely be minimized, and the public may then arrive at a just conclusion with respect to the matter. Nothing could more forcibly support this view than the illustration furnished by the attacks now made on Mr. Hughes in which he is charged with being an agent and creature of the trusts and financial institutions of Wall street because among the contributors to the fund expended in legitimate ways during his election for governor were some wealthy men prominent in Wall street.

"There is no man in the country who has demonstrated more completely his entire freedom from corporate control than Governor Hughes, by his administration of state affairs; and yet for partisan purposes and without the slightest evidence except the contributions, Mr. Bryan refers to him as being completely under trust influence.

"A rigid law requiring the publication in detail of contributions and expenditures within ten days after the election, so that the public may know where the money came from, how much came, how much was expended and for what it was expended, is all that public policy requires. The publication of such contributions will make the successful candidate most careful in deciding questions in which contributors may subsequently have a personal interest, in order to avoid any inference of improper influence thereby. The known publicity to be given to contributions after the election will greatly reduce the probability that a contribution will be made for the purpose of seeking privileges or favors at the hands of the candidate and tends to secure practical purity of motive in the making of such contributions.

"Mr. Bryan looks rather to the publication of such contributions for platform purposes and reference, than to the main purpose of a publicity law which is to secure the public against bribery in election and the improper influencing of official action."

MR. BRYAN'S REPLY TO MR. TAFT

On Thursday evening, October 1, 1908, at Lincoln, Neb., Mr. Bryan gave out the following statement:

I am surprised to find that Mr. Taft indorses the president's views on the subject of publicity as to campaign contributions, but since he holds these views, I am glad that he makes them known now. We now have publicity before the election as to his opinion even if he does not

believe in publicity of contributions until after the election. He fails to see the difference between the publication of contributions before election, and the publication of expenditures after election. The publication of expenditures is required to show whether corrupt methods have been employed in the election, and as the expenditures continue up to the close of the polls, it would be impossible to make a complete publication until after the election; the main reason for the publication of contributions before the election is to show the public the sources from which the contributions come in order that the public may know which party predatory interests are supporting. Every one who knows human nature knows that the element of gratitude must always be considered in human affairs. Ingratitude has been described as a worse sin than revenge, for ingratitude repays good with evil while revenge only repays evil with evil. Every disinterested voter knows that large contributions have been used to secure mortgages upon officials. The publication of contributions throws a great deal more light upon the influences at work in politics than the publication of expenditures, for the publication of contributions shows to whom the party is indebted and to whom repayment is likely to be made, while the publication of expenditures shows what has been paid out, and disbursements do not create obligations that affect the course of the administration.

Mr. Taft says that "the proper object of a publicity law is to prevent the use of money for bribery and other improper purposes in elections and to enable the law officers of the government and the public to determine whether the contributions made were properly expended for legitimate purposes." And he adds: "The requirement that the names and amounts of the persons contributing should also be shown is for the purpose of enabling the public and the prosecuting officers of the government to judge whether subsequent official action has been improperly affected in favor of the contributors by the successful candidate." This, he says, can all be accomplished by publication after the election. He then proceeds to indorse the position taken by the president, declaring that "the chief objection to the publication of contributions before the election is that it makes certain that in the heat of the controversy the motives of those who contribute to pay the legitimate expenses of the campaign will be misconstrued, perverted and misrepresented."

"The candidates," he also insists, "in whose behalf the contributions are made will be charged in the most unfair way as being completely under the control of those who make the contributions."

Here he makes the same charge that the president does, the astounding charge—that the voters are so liable to be misled that the knowledge must be kept from them. I insist that it is an insult to the intelligence of the voter, and it does little credit to Mr. Taft's judgment of the men to whom he is making his appeal. Mr. Roosevelt may have made his statement thoughtlessly and on the impulse of the moment, but Mr. Taft brings the same indictment against the voters with deliberation and after he has read a criticism of the president's views. It is fair to charge, therefore, that Mr. Taft is either expecting to receive contributions which would arouse just suspicion among an intelligent people, or contributions which, if known, would arouse an unjust suspicion among a people too ignorant to form a correct judgment upon the facts. This is an evasion which he can neither retract nor excuse. It can only be explained by a consciousness that republican campaign methods will not bear the light and that it would be dangerous to his party if the public knew before the election what he promises to make public after the election.

His subsequent argument that the publication before election of the names and amounts contributed would "discourage those who desire to contribute to the legitimate purposes of the campaign" by exposing them to the bitter diatribes or unfair attacks or slanderous condemnation of partisans in an electoral fight" ought to have little weight when it is considered that such publication will be efficacious in discouraging those who now desire to contribute to illegitimate expenses and for the purpose of putting officials under obligations to them. While publication after the election may enable us "to judge whether subsequent official action has been improperly affected in favor of the contributors by the successful candidate," this is of very small value compared with the benefit to be derived from the publication of contributions before election. The people have a right to form their own opinion as to the influences