

monopoly" plank different interpretations have been made of that platform. Some republican leaders have contended that it does not mean that the tariff provides shelter to monopolies; but in a speech delivered at Chicago on the evening of October 9, Governor Cummins, who led the forces through whose efforts that plank was adopted, made it very clear that the "no shelter to monopoly" plank meant exactly what it said:

In that speech Governor Cummins declared:

"Corporations and combinations to which the Iowa platform refers, are those brought together, not to outstrip competition in a fair race, but to destroy competition by the actual obliteration of independent establishments and which establish their purpose either by purchase or by piracy. They are invariably accompanied by the issuance of vast quantities of stock which have no basis save the audacity of promoters and which serve two ends equally objectionable, first to enrich beyond comprehension the movers of the nefarious enterprises, and second to cloak the enormous profits which may be extorted from their hapless victims.

"While I believe that the plan they adopt is as weak as it is vicious and that the ordinary operation of the immutable laws of commerce would in the course of time overthrow them, nevertheless it is the duty of the government to hasten their disintegration and downfall by every power within the scope of organized society. There are but two forces that can be trusted to fix prices, competition and the regulation of organized government. The latter is totally inadmissible and we must preserve the former. Therefore the high and imperative duty of the government is to so adjust the laws that there will be the least possible motive for the destruction of competition.

"The experience of the past few years has shown us that ambitious spirits are able to establish and maintain monopolies in some of the important products of industry, and with respect to these things it is self-evident that the tariff duties in a measure are a shelter, because they deprive us of the ability to invite competition from other lands."

Evidently the governor of Iowa is not disposed to mince words in the statement of his opinion. In that opinion "it is self-evident that the tariff duties in a measure are a shelter because they deprive the American people of the ability of inviting competition from other lands," and when the Iowa republicans in state convention assembled declared themselves in favor of "any modification of the tariff schedules that will prevent their affording shelter to monopoly," they meant to give indorsement to the plan provided in the Kansas City platform; and yet it is interesting to observe that while many of these republicans are engaged in giving cordial support to what they call the "Iowa idea," they are giving equally cordial support to republican candidates for congress in the state of Iowa—even of those candidates who have openly repudiated the "no shelter to monopoly" plank contained in the republican state platform.

### Revised by Its Friends.

A familiar statement that appears these days in republican papers is that the tariff must be "revised by its friends." This is meant to impress upon the voters the desirability of electing a republican congress and depending upon such a congress to give the people relief on the tariff question. In some quarters the Iowa platform is referred to as an evidence of the republican party's intention to revise the tariff in the public interests. The Des Moines Register and Leader in a recent issue says that the Iowa shelter plank which appears in the republican platform of 1902 and which also appeared in the republican platform of 1901 was approved by President McKinley after that plank had been adopted. But those who may be disposed to place confidence in the claim that the people may hope for relief at the hands of the republican party will have their confidence shattered

by a glance at the Burlington Hawkeye for October 21. The Hawkeye has never taken kindly to the shelter plank in the Iowa republican platform, which plank has come to be popularly known as the "Iowa idea." The Washington correspondent of the Hawkeye, under date of October 20, says:

The "Iowa idea" for the revision of the tariff will never be accepted or put into operation by congress. It has become plainly evident that this is a fact since Governor Cummins' Chicago speech has had time to permeate political circles. This speech was regarded as the official explanation of the Iowa idea and while it made plain many of the inexplicable features of the proposition it still gave unmistakable emphasis to the fact that the Iowa idea means a revision of the tariff at once and a revision that is personally conducted by the congress of the United States.

Allowing for some probable changes in the coming election politicians who claim to know the situation do not hesitate to emphatically state that this is something that congress will never do.

The Hawkeye correspondent says that it begins to look as though the tariff may be revised "in some way," but he explains that if it is revised the result will be accomplished in one of two ways; "by a commission appointed by the president or through the medium of reciprocity with foreign countries." Now it is well understood that revision through a commission would mean indefinite postponement of revision. That has been the people's experience with these commissions on every question with which a commission has been chosen to deal.

So far as revision "through the medium of reciprocity with foreign countries" is concerned, such a "revision" would not provide the people with relief from the trusts that find shelter in the tariff.

This same correspondent quotes from Mr. Payne, the republican chairman of the ways and means committee. Mr. Payne says:

"Our experience has been that the tariff cannot be changed without an attendant stagnation of business. The revision of the tariff will involve a complete reconstruction of the schedules. The suggestion that it might be done gradually is impracticable. The work must be done thoroughly when it is done. This, as I have said, involves a stagnation of business. Therefore it should not be undertaken until the demand for the change is so great and the benefits accruing will be so pronounced as to overbalance the evil effects on business until the culmination of the legislation."

It will be seen from Mr. Payne's statement that the republican leaders are not only opposed to what is called the "Iowa idea," but that they do not intend to give the people any measure of relief either through the medium of reciprocity treaties with foreign countries or through a tariff commission. Whatever may be done by republican leaders on the tariff question it is fair to infer from Mr. Payne's statement that it will be done simply for the purpose of avoiding the popular judgment at this time and going through the form of pretending to give the people relief when in fact it is not the intention of the republican leaders to interfere in the least with the shelter which the trusts find in the republican tariff.

### Desperate Straights.

The Nashville American, which falsely claims to be a democratic newspaper, says:

"If the democratic party had a wise, courageous and resourceful leader, one who has nothing in common with populists and populism or their visionary ideas, who does not believe that every man that has a dollar should be put in the penitentiary or that every corporation is a menace to the country, there might be a new chief in the White house after March 4, 1905."

Such statements show the desperation of the plutocratic press. It would be a reflection on the

intelligence of the editor of the (Un) American to say that he did not know better. The fact that he accuses the party or any prominent leader of the party of believing "that every man that has a dollar should be put in the penitentiary or that every corporation is a menace to the country" is proof positive that the editor has no sound argument to advance. There is not a line in the democratic platform of 1896 and 1900 that in the remotest way tends to discourage the making or saving of money. In fact those platforms offer the best stimulus to industry and economy by guaranteeing to the toiler protection in the enjoyment of his earnings. A man may have money—any amount of it if he honestly earns it—and still be a democrat, but if his money has him he naturally gravitates toward the republican party, which is now the representation of plutocracy. It is only a question whether money shall be the master or servant. With the American and papers of its class money is the master and its voice has a metallic ring whenever it speaks on any subject. Neither does the democratic party believe "that every corporation is a menace to the country," but it does believe that a corporation is a menace when it becomes strong enough to monopolize an industry. And, it may be added, next to the trust itself, nothing is a greater menace than the newspaper corporation whose stock is owned by a railroad and whose policy is dictated by men who use the paper to beguile the public while the paper's managers conspire against the public welfare.

### A False Hope.

The Denver Republican is deluding either itself or its readers when it insists that the republican party will reform the tariff. It says:

"Mr. McKinley's Buffalo speech, Mr. Babcock's declaration last spring, the attitude of Iowa republicans today and last, though not least, President Roosevelt's declaration in favor of reciprocity and of a permanent tariff commission, all point towards a proper change of tariff schedules by the republican party. The "infant industry" cry is no longer forcible or effective, nor is that of "pauper labor of Europe," and it is the republican party that recognizes changed conditions and the necessity of changing laws to meet them."

It admits that the "infant industry" and "pauper labor" arguments are worn out, but it betrays a strong ignorance of the influences which control the republican party when it assumes that it is free to act. The beneficiaries of protection—not its victims—will write the tariff laws so long as the republicans remain in power. To borrow a forcible simile from the columns of the Republican "one might as well try to blow perfume through an onion stem" as to expect to get a tariff reform measure through a republican congress.

### The Republican Idea.

In a speech delivered at Lancaster, Wis., recently Senator Spooner said:

"If we could elect a good strong republican president like Theodore Roosevelt and a strong republican senate and house for a term of twenty years it would be better for the country.

"I believe this demagogic tear-up comes too often in this country."

Suppose "we could elect a good strong republican president like Theodore Roosevelt and a strong republican senate and house for a term of twenty years," does any one imagine that during that twenty years the people could obtain any relief from trust impositions?

The coal strike of 1900 would not have been settled but for the fact that that strike threatened republican success in the presidential election of that year and soon after the republicans were victorious the workingmen found it necessary to once more enter an organized protest in order to obtain justice.

The coal strike of 1902 would not have been