

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Vol. 4, No. 35.

Lincoln, Nebraska, September 16, 1904.

Whole Number 19,

.... Mr. Roosevelt's Letter

Although 12,000 words are consumed in Mr. Roosevelt's letter of acceptance, that epistle is well described by one paragraph therein: "We intend in the future to carry on the government in the same way that we have carried it on in the past."

A considerable portion of the letter is devoted to the tariff and there is brief reference to reciprocity; but it is plainly shown that if the republican party is given a new lease of power, there will be no tariff revision and little is to be expected in the way of reciprocity. In many of his letters and speeches Mr. Roosevelt has referred to reciprocity and protection as "twin measures," also to reciprocity as "the handmaiden of protection;" but in his letter of acceptance there is no such reference. One is justified in believing from the tone of that letter that the tariff will be revised whenever tariff revision suits the purposes of the tariff barons and that the prospects for reciprocity are just about as hopeless.

Mr. Roosevelt dismisses the trust question with a comparatively brief reference and this reference plainly shows that so far as the trusts are concerned, the sentence hereinbefore referred to describes the purpose of the republican party: "We intend in the future to carry on the government in the same way that we have carried it on in the past."

In a rather timid way Mr. Roosevelt endorses the ship subsidy plan, begging the privilege of adding "a word of cordial agreement with the policy of in some way including within its benefits (the protective system) by appropriate legislation, the American merchant marine." It will be observed that Mr. Roosevelt wants this done "in some way" and then he wants the legislation to be "appropriate"; but he shows a bit of his old-time strenuousness when he makes bold to intimate that this should be a part of our protective system.

Mr. Roosevelt devotes a long chapter to the Philippine islands, and very clearly shows that it is his purpose not to abandon the policy of imperialism.

The letter reads more like a lawyer's brief than a presidential candidate's letter of acceptance. It is full of specious pleading, of false deduction and in some instances, with reference to the position of the democratic party and the democratic candidate, it is, to put it mildly, not entirely frank.

Actions and Words

In the beginning of his letter Mr. Roosevelt says: "Our actions speak even louder than our words for the faith that is in us." Mr. Roosevelt's words have been very strong, indeed, and yet, we think it not unfair to say that the actions of the Roosevelt administration do speak louder than the words of that administration's chief.

In some of his speeches he gave reason for the hope that he would not contend for the maintenance of tariff shelter for the trusts; and yet, in his actions he has set himself resolutely against tariff revision.

He has loudly spoken about the blessings of liberty and the advantages of self-government to which Mr. Roosevelt has eloquently referred and yet he is an imperialist.

He has spoken against extravagance with the public money; and yet, his administration has made an unparalleled record for extravagance.

He has spoken of the exposition of wrong doing and the fearless enforcement of law against public officials who have been guilty of misconduct; and yet, under his administration extensive frauds were committed in various departments and the statute of limitations was permitted to operate in favor of the former secretary of the republican national committee and other influential politicians.

He has had much to say about "shackling cun-

ning in the future as in the past we have shackled force;" and he has applied this to a proposed treatment of the trust evil; and yet, he has not made a serious effort to provide the people with relief from trust impositions.

He has boasted loudly of his so-called campaign against the trusts and has pointed with pride to his Northern Securities merger suit and his civil proceedings against the beef trust; but as "actions speak even louder than words," the people know that no material benefits have resulted from the merger proceeding and no material change has been brought about so far as the merger interests are concerned. They also know that since the proceedings against the beef trust were commenced that trust has added imposition to imposition upon the consumer.

As "actions speak even louder than words," it is significant that while Mr. Roosevelt has made loud boasts of his anti-trust campaign, he has made no effort to enforce the chief feature of the Sherman anti-trust law, which is the criminal clause; nor has he explained, nor permitted anyone to explain for him, why he has failed to invoke the criminal indictment in his pretended effort to protect the public interests.

"Scrupulously Fulfilled"

Mr. Roosevelt says: "In 1896 the republican party came into power, and in 1900 it retained power on certain definite pledges, each of which was scrupulously fulfilled." If anyone doubts that this is an unwarranted boast, let him read the republican national platforms for 1896 and 1900.

Among the "definite pledges" in the 1896 platform were the promise of reciprocity; the promise to promote the free coinage of silver by international agreement; the promise to give veterans of the Union armies preference in the matter of appointments to office; the promise to honestly enforce the civil service law; the promise to create a national board of arbitration; the promise to admit the territories to statehood; the promise to give Alaska representation in congress. Not one of these pledges has been fulfilled.

Conspicuous among the "definite pledges" in the republican platform for 1900 was the promise that the party would restrain and prevent all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies and to limit production or to control prices. Another "definite pledge" was to maintain "the associated policy of reciprocity." Another "definite pledge" related to the enforcement of the civil service law. Another "definite pledge" related to the admission to statehood of the territories. Not one of those "definite pledges" has been fulfilled.

The Reason for Arbitration

Mr. Roosevelt says: "In certain great centers and with certain great interests, our opponents made every effort to show that the settlement of the anthracite coal strike was by the individual act of the president and the successful suit against the Northern Securities company (the merger case) undertaken by the department of justice were acts, because of which the present administration should be thrown from power. Yet they dare not openly condemn either act."

Then, referring to the coal strike, Mr. Roosevelt says: "It was only this action by the president which prevented the movement for national ownership of the coal fields, from gaining what might well have been an irresistible impetus."

We have all along been told that Mr. Roosevelt suggested the arbitration of the coal strike for the protection of the people who were then suffering because of lack of fuel. But now Mr. Roosevelt points out that but for his action the movement

for national ownership of the coal fields might well have gained an "irresistible impetus."

Are we to understand, and indeed is not the inference a fair one, that in the suggestion for the coal strike arbitration, Mr. Roosevelt was moved more through fear of public ownership of the coal mines than because of any serious concern for the people?

"Irrevocably Settled" and "Definitely Established"

Mr. Roosevelt plainly refers to Judge Parker's famous gold telegram when he says: "The fundamental fact is that in a popular government such as ours, no policy is irrevocably settled by law unless the people keep in control of the government men who believe in that policy as a matter of deep rooted conviction." Also, "It is idle to say that the monetary standard of the nation is irrevocably fixed so long as the party which at the last election cast approximately forty-six per cent of the total vote refuses to put in its platform any statement that the question is settled."

It is interesting to compare this statement with Mr. Roosevelt's idea of the "irrevocable" theory of the tariff question.

In another portion of his letter, referring to the tariff question, Mr. Roosevelt says: "It is a matter of regret that the protective tariff policy which during the last forty odd years has become part of the very fibre of the country is not now accepted as definitely established. Surely we have a right to say that it has passed beyond the domain of theory and a right to expect that not only its original advocates but those who at one time distrusted it on theoretic grounds should now acquiesce in the results that have been proved over and over again by actual experience."

If it is so idle to say that the monetary standard is "irrevocably" fixed so long as a party of the democratic party's standing refuses to put in its platform any statement that the question is settled, is it not all the more idle to say that the protective tariff system which the democratic platform boldly denounces has so become part of the very fibre of the country that it must now be accepted as "definitely established?"

When Mr. Roosevelt contends that the protective tariff has been "definitely established" and that it has "passed beyond the domain of theory," with what reason does he deny to his opponent the privilege of believing that the gold standard is "irrevocably" established?

A Forgotten Plank

The republican national platform for 1904 contains the following plank: "We favor such congressional action as shall determine whether by special discriminations the elective franchise in any state has been unconstitutionally limited, and if such is the case, we demand that representation in congress and in the electoral colleges shall be proportionately reduced as directed by the constitution of the United States."

In his letter of acceptance Mr. Roosevelt makes no reference to this plank, although some republican newspapers in the north tell us that this is of the greatest importance. To be sure, he asks: "Can our opponents deny that here at home the principles of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments have been in effect nullified?" and he says: "We at home can well profit by the example of those responsible for the actual management of affairs in the Philippines;" also "In our several commonwealths here in the United States we as a people now face the complex problem of securing fair treatment to each man, regardless of his race or color." He adds that this problem