

assumption that his only interest is in the suffrage laws of the south. No republican speaker discusses economic questions before a colored audience, and yet the negro is interested in every economic question that affects the white man. With most of the negroes raising cotton and scarcely any employed in factories a high tariff would be hard to justify before a negro audience. It is an insult to his intelligence as well as to his patriotism to suggest, as the republican leaders constantly do, that he thinks of no questions except those that arise between the races.

The republican platform deals with the tariff question in a way that closes the door of hope to the tariff reformer. It authorizes "a revision of the tariff by a special session of congress to be held immediately following the inauguration of the next president." Revision does not necessarily mean reduction. In fact, Secretary Taft has himself said that he thought some of the schedules were too high and others too low. There is nothing in the republican platform to give any assurance that the average tariff will not be higher after revision than before. An attempt is made to lay down the principle upon which the revision will be conducted, but the principle is not a new one, it is merely a restatement of the principle upon which the present high duties were established. When has the republican party asked for more than "the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad?" That is all that it has asked for for ten or fifteen years, and yet while it only asked for that it has built up prohibitory duties. The new platform not only asks for a tariff sufficient to recover the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, but it also asks for "a reasonable profit to American industries." If, on the pretense that they were giving us a tariff only sufficient to cover the difference in cost of production, the republicans make it high enough to cover the entire cost of labor twice over, how much more will they add to satisfy this new demand for "a reasonable profit to American industries?" The trouble is that they start out with the proposition that we must have a protective tariff and then they ask the manufacturers how much they need and, as the manufacturers accompany the answer with a campaign contribution, the ordinary taxpayer gets little consideration. The government has been made a private asset by the protected interests and they have capitalized their ability to control the law making power. The fat has been fried out of the beneficiaries of the high tariff and the beneficiaries have then been given a chance to recoup themselves out of the pockets of the people. Public opinion has been corrupted by the studious circulation of the idea that the taxing power can be farmed out to a comparatively small fraction of the population and that the rest of the population must pay constant tribute to the few.

The plan for a maximum and a minimum tariff is delusive. Senator Dolliver has testified that the Dingley law, according to the confession of the author of the law, fixed the rates unnecessarily high in order that they might be used to secure reciprocal agreements with other nations. But having been secured, they were maintained for the benefit of the protected industries.

It is a fact worthy of notice that while the convention wants to give the president power to retaliate against foreigners who discriminate, no complaint is made of the American manufacturers who discriminate against Americans and sell to foreigners at lower prices than they sell at home.

As usual, the advocates of a high tariff insist that the wage-earners are "the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system." And yet these very advocates of the high tariff show their disregard of the wage-earners whenever the wage-earners present a petition or ask for a reform.

The platform endorses one proposition that has not before found a place in a republican national platform, namely, the postal savings bank. This is a good plank, yet this proposition is in a platform that declares that the "trend of democracy is toward socialism while the republican party stands for a wise and regulated individualism." What greater extension of the power of the government have we had in recent years than that proposed in the establishment of the postal savings bank? The postal savings bank is demanded because the republican party has failed to regulate the national banks. The democratic party has insisted upon regulation that would increase the security of depositors and thus restore confidence. The minority leader in the

senate and the minority leader in the house proposed systems for securing depositors against loss. These systems left the banking business in the hands of the banks, but gave to the depositors assurance that their money could be withdrawn at any time. This plan is less socialistic than the republican plan, and yet after the republicans refused the less socialistic system, the republican platform accuses the democrats of socialism while endorsing the plan that more largely extends the sphere of governmental activity. The democrats believe that the depositors in both state and national banks should be guaranteed against loss and they favor the postal savings bank if security can not be secured in any other way, but the democrats prefer a system, such as that adopted in Oklahoma, which leaves the banking business in the hands of the banks, and compels the banks to assume the duty of protecting depositors.

The Philippine question is given a little more than an inch of space, and none of that space is devoted to a statement of the policy of the republican party. Strange that so many inches of space can be given to a boastful exaggeration of what the republican party has done and no space given to a statement of the purpose of the party in dealing with eight millions of people who are denied the guarantees of the constitution, taxed without representation and governed without regard to the principles set forth in the declaration of independence.

Nowhere in the platform does partisan bias show itself more clearly than in the attempted enumeration of the differences between the two parties. The platform says that democracy "stood for debased currency," the republican party "for honest currency;" "the one for free silver, the other for sound money." It is not true that the democratic party stood for a debased currency or that the republican party stood for an honest currency, nor is it true that the republican party stood for a currency more sound than that advocated by the democratic party. In 1896 both stood for bimetalism, but the republican party was pledged to international bimetalism, while the democratic party was pledged to independent bimetalism. The republican party used the pledge of international bimetalism to deceive western republicans and abandoned its efforts to secure an international agreement soon after the election. Unexpectedly to republicans, as well as to democrats, an increase in the production of gold has removed the money question from the arena of politics, but the beneficial results that have followed an increase in the volume of money have vindicated the democratic position rather than the republican position. And it was not the republican party, but these unlooked for discoveries of the yellow metal that gave the high prices which have followed an increase in the volume of money.

The platform says that the democratic party stands for "free trade and the other for protection." The democratic party does not stand for free trade. It stands for a material reduction of the tariff, and wants it immediately. No party proposes the abolition of the customs house, and those who wrote the republican platform were compelled to misrepresent the democratic position because they could not successfully assail it. To have stated the subject honestly, the platform ought to have said, "the democratic party stands for a reduction of the tariff, the republican party for revision," but as the platform does not say whether revision is to be up or down an honest statement of the real difference between the parties would have been embarrassing to the republicans. The platform says that the democratic party stands "for contraction of the American influence, the other for its expansion." That is palpably untrue. The democratic party believes in the expansion of American influence, but it does not believe in carrying the flag to any place where the constitution can not accompany it. Why did not the platform writers say that the democratic party opposed colonialism and that the republican party favored colonialism? Why did they not use language that correctly states the difference between the positions of the parties? But here is the choicest contrast: "the one (the democratic party) has been forced to abandon every position taken on the great issues before the people, the other (the republican party) has held and vindicated all." Three republican congresses have declared in favor of the election of the United States senators by the people. Has the republican party held and vindicated that? For answer read the vote of seven to one in the republican convention by which this reform was repudiated. The dem-

ocratic party has not abandoned its position in favor of tariff reform, but it has compelled the republican party to advocate tariff reform during this campaign, even if there is every indication that the republican leaders have no intention of fulfilling the promise. Has the democratic party abandoned its position on the trust question? On the contrary it has forced the republican party to admit that the trust is an evil. Has the democratic party abandoned its position on imperialism? On the contrary its position has been so vindicated that the republican party does not dare to announce its purpose to maintain a colonial system. Has the democratic party abandoned the position that it has long taken in denouncing favoritism and privilege as the sources of great injustice? On the contrary, it has forced a republican president to recognize the danger of swollen fortunes and to cry out against them. It can even congratulate itself upon the endorsement of the income tax, a democratic doctrine, by a republican president.

Here is another piece of rhetoric in which the convention indulged: "In experience the difference between democracy and republicanism is that one means adversity while the other means prosperity; one means low wages the other means high; one means doubt and debt, the other means confidence and thrift." We might have expected the republican party to avoid the panic question. At least, we might have expected it to sing low on prosperity with the memory of the recent panic still fresh in the minds of the people and the discussion of high wages ought not to become boisterous while wages are being reduced in the east. And why speak of "doubt" and "debt," and "confidence" and "thrift," when doubt on the part of depositors who are the debtors of the banks has provoked the republican party to advocate a postal savings bank as a means of restoring confidence among those thrifty enough to have something to deposit.

Here is another specimen: "In principles, the difference between democracy and republicanism is that one stands for vacillation and timidity in government, the other for strength and purpose; one stands for obstruction; the other for construction; the one promises, the other performs." Again the writers of this platform sacrifice truth to phrase-making. "Vacillation and timidity" are characteristic of the conservative, and the republican party is conservative in that it obstructs progress. "Strength and purpose," on the contrary, are the characteristics of the reformer and the democratic party stands for reform. The democratic party in defeat has been strong enough to coerce the republican party into a reform advocacy of some remedial legislation. The democratic party has had a purpose strong enough to furnish inspiration for whatever reforms the president has attempted. The republican party has been the obstructionist and the democratic party has been the constructive party. The republican party has been long on promises while the democratic party, even while in a minority, has supported the president in the reforms that he has accomplished and urged him on to others.

The platform attempts to make the republican party the champion of individualism and the democratic party the advocate of socialism. It says: "The present tendencies of the two parties are even more marked by inherent differences. The trend of democracy is toward socialism, while the republican party stands for a wise and regulated individualism. Socialism would destroy wealth, republicanism would prevent its abuse. Socialism would give to each an equal right to take; republicanism would give to each an equal right to earn. Socialism would offer an equality of possession which would soon leave no one anything to possess; republicanism would give equality of opportunity which would assure to each his share of a constantly increasing sum of possessions. In line with this tendency, the democratic party of today believes in government ownership, while the republican party believes in government regulation. Ultimately, democracy would have the nation own the people, while republicanism would have the people own the nation."

During what years did socialism show the greatest growth? During the four years that intervened between 1900 and 1904. So great was the growth of socialism during those four years that the actual numerical increase in the socialist party was greater than the increase in the strength of the republican party. Between 1900 and 1904 the socialist party gained more votes than the republican party did, and that, too, in spite of the fact that the republican party boasted of its great victory in

(Continued on Page 6)