

The Commoner

ISSUED MONTHLY

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

WILLIAM J. BRYAN CHARLES W. BRYAN
Editor and Proprietor Associate Ed. and Publisher
Edit. Rms. and Business Office, Suite 207 Press Bldg.

One Year \$1.00 Three Months25
Six Months50 Single Copy10
In Clubs of Five or more, per year.75 Foreign Post, 25c Extra
Sample Copies Free.

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 such 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 currency.

RENEWALS—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus January 15 means that payment has been received to and including the issue of January, 1915.

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.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, ETC.,

of The Commoner, published monthly at Lincoln, Nebraska, required by the Act of August 24, 1912:

Name of— Postoffice Address
Editor and Owner—

William Jennings Bryan . . . Lincoln, Nebraska
Associate Editor and Publisher—

Charles W. Bryan Lincoln, Nebraska
Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders, holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities: None.

CHAS. W. BRYAN, Publisher.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 28th day of March, 1915.

(Seal) J. R. FARRIS, Notary Public.

My commission expires July 19, 1918.

JUDGE FARMER OF ILLINOIS

In Illinois, on Monday, June 7, there will be elected several judges of the supreme court, the highest judicial body of the state.

The constitution of Illinois divides the state into supreme court districts, and one judge is elected from each of these districts. The present member of the supreme court from the second judicial district of Illinois is Judge William M. Farmer of Vandalia, Ill. Nine years ago he was elected for the term which expires in June; at that time he was elected without opposition from the republican party.

The framers of the constitution fixed the date of the election for judges of the supreme court in June, for the purpose of keeping the office of politics, realizing the necessity of keeping this sacred office free from partisanship. But this time the republican party has nominated a candidate. It is reported that this candidate has had no judicial experience, and the leaders of his party will probably seek to elect him by appealing to "party spirit."

Judge Farmer has made a fine record as an able, courageous, fair and impartial judge.

He is a democrat but he has never been influenced in the slightest degree as a judicial officer by party affiliation or bias. He has been independent of the control of any party or of any interest.

Judge Farmer should be re-elected; not simply because he is a democrat, but because of his high character as a man, because of his efficiency and worth as a judge, a proven by his service. He has been tried; he has been weighed in the balance and has never been found wanting.

The Commoner urges that voters of all parties in the second judicial district of Illinois join in re-electing Judge Farmer.

Senator Borah, who is mentioned in progressive republican circles as a good man for the presidential nomination, said the other day in a speech that President Wilson is greater than his party. By this he meant that the president had so conducted himself in times of great stress as to command a public confidence not bounded by party lines, showing that Mr. Borah differs from some of his eminent colleagues in that he does not allow partisan considerations and matters to color his conception of the truth with respect to the nation's chief executive.

Roosevelt vs. Barnes

The libel suit brought by Mr. Barnes against Mr. Roosevelt seems to have drifted far from its mooring. Whether Mr. Barnes is a boss seems to have been lost sight of in the investigation of Mr. Roosevelt's political methods. There is an old saying that "honest men get their dues when thieves fall out"; it is equally true that a falling out among political bosses results in advantage to those who seek to purify politics. The political literature of the country was enriched by many valuable phrases when President Taft and ex-President Roosevelt at the same time yielded to the dictates of their conscience and told what they knew about each other.

Now Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Barnes, for more than a decade co-laborers in the republican vineyard and co-partners in the rewards of political toil, fall out—"hence these tears." "Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned," and earth no anger like a politician deserted. Mr. Roosevelt testifies that he patiently bore with Barnes as long as he thought "the root of righteousness" within him could be watered and fertilized into producing a stalk, but the case was given up as hopeless when the hardhearted Barnes would not respond to the personal appeals of the ex-president—not even when Barnes was flatteringly assured that he had some such opportunity as that which fell to Lincoln.

Mr. Barnes is not contented with showing that he was no more of a boss AFTER Mr. Roosevelt cast him aside than he was when he enjoyed the confidence and smile of the ex-president, but he proceeds to call attention to certain evidences of Mr. Roosevelt's familiarity with certain "undesirable citizens." It will be remembered that Mr. Roosevelt's friends put up something like \$3,000,000 for his campaign fund. The then presidential candidate says that four or five thousand persons contributing to this fund (even at this estimate the contributors amount to less than one in a thousand voters) but a large part of the sum was made up of BIG contributions from BIG business men—that is, men engaged in business directly affected by administrative and legislative action and, therefore, personally interested in having a friend in the White house. When asked: "Q. Did you see any connection whatever between business and politics in contributions of \$100,000, \$50,000 and \$20,000?" he answered—"No more connection than there is when those same men contribute to the Y.M.C.A. I mention that because I know that Mr. George W. Perkins, who, during the time, was contributing so heavily to the campaign funds, has contributed much more liberally to the building of the Y. M. C. A.'s, and the contribution from Mr. Perkins of \$25,000 might be considerably less than a contribution of \$25 from the station agent at Oyster Bay, and I should feel as grateful to the one man for \$25 as to the other man for the \$25,000 contribution. I should be incapable of acting for either in any way because of that contribution." "Q. Do you mean to say that you would regard a contribution of \$3,000,000 to a political campaign fund from business men in a campaign where you were running for president as being in the same class and category as contributions to the 'Young Men's Christian Association'?" "A. If you mean as being given in the spirit as those same men gave contributions to the Y. M. C. A., yes, precisely, and with no more hope of reward."

How innocently confiding; how confidingly innocent! He could imagine no improper reason for making these contributions, though subsequent investigations have shown that something like seventy per cent of the contributions to Mr. Roosevelt's campaign fund in 1904 came from corporations. WE NOW HAVE A STATUTE WHICH MAKES SUCH CONTRIBUTIONS UNLAWFUL. Within four years after these contributions were made, public opinion, expressed through congress—and President Roosevelt himself signed the bill—prohibited corporations from contributing to campaign funds; and yet a candidate for president could see no wrong in these contributions being made to HIS campaign fund, and mistook the spirit which prompted them for the spirit which prompts contributions for religious purposes. It will not be forgotten that during President Roosevelt's occupancy of the White house, trusts grew and thrived more than they ever did before or have since. Is it purely accidental that immunity was granted by the man to whose election the trusts contributed? Is it merely accidental that he acted

toward the trusts in the same spirit in which the trust magnates acted toward the trust question?

W. J. BRYAN.

The influence of education is varied. When most of the men now mature were young, they gave unquestioned acquiescence to the entire truth of the stories which purported to accurately give the dying words of the nation's early statesmen and presidents. The school children of today dismiss these stories with the curt comment that they must have been written by the ancestors of the present group of moving picture authors.

Most men have the idea that the best qualification for state leadership of a party are those based upon the ability to give expression to the spirit of the organization and to enthrone its members to greater effort in the task of having its principles enacted into law. It is only rarely that men who assert their right and title to being called state leaders are found at legislative sessions listed as lobbyists on behalf of special interests.

Colonel Roosevelt's explanation of his intimacy with Barnes was that he hoped to be able to convince him of his errors in a political way and thus bring to the service of the public Barnes' undoubted talents for constructive work. The colonel seemed to be about as successful in reforming the New York boss as he was in reforming the republican party nationally.

The New York Journal of Commerce records the existence of a strong sentiment in the east for the nomination by the republicans of Elihu Root for the presidency. This is equivalent to saying that there is a strong demand in the east for the retention of the democratic party in power, since there is no more certain way to bring about the latter than to do the former.

Apparently Boss Barnes' attorneys believed that the easiest way to discredit Roosevelt was to prove that he had been on terms of political intimacy with their client. This was an easy way for the attorneys, but it was rather rough on the boss.

THE PANAMA-PACIFIC EXPOSITION

An enterprising agent of one of the transcontinental lines has hit upon a captivating phrase for advertising the Panama-Pacific exposition, namely, "two fairs for one fare." The epigram has always been highly prized because it says much in little, and the phrase referred to, though brief, is very expressive. The opening of the Panama canal is an epoch-making event and the exposition at San Francisco, according to reports, surpasses all previous efforts—"time's noblest offspring," in the way of expositions, is the last. California is a great state—no commonwealth surpasses it in enterprise and energy. Those who have attended expositions in different parts of the country have not failed to notice how splendidly the resources of California have been presented, and these exhibits give assurance that when her products are shown at home, under the stimulus of state pride, California will do her best. The president was prevented by official duties from attending the opening but he hopes to visit the fair some time during the season, and every other citizen who finds it possible to do so should avail himself of this opportunity to see the latest that has been developed in this line of work.

And the visitor who goes to San Francisco will not be able to resist the temptation to visit San Deigo also, for this enterprising city which has been built up at the extreme southern point in California has shown remarkable local spirit in the display that has been provided there. No view of California is complete that does not include the orange growing section, and San Diego shares with southern Florida the distinction of being below the frost line.

The people on the Pacific coast have from the very beginning been ardent advocates of an Isthmian canal and all of the coast cities will share in the commercial advantages that follow from the joining of the oceans. The opening of the canal, therefore, will be an event to which the people of the United States will look back with both pleasure and pride, and a visit to California will fix the date and the occasion in the memory of all those who take this journey across the Sierras.

W. J. BRYAN.