

AN INDICTMENT OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Are not the American people justified in bringing an indictment against the republican party? The record warrants the assertion that that party is the greatest pretender and the greatest dissembler of all political organizations.

For years it posed as the friend of bimetalism and charged the Cleveland administration with having completely demonetized silver. Its presidential candidate of 1896 while serving in the house denounced Mr. Cleveland for his partiality to the single standard and charged that it was his purpose to "make money scarce and therefore dear,"—to make "money the master and everything else the servant." And then in 1896 the party declared for bimetalism, through international agreement, pledging itself to bring about that agreement, and saying that in the meantime the existing standard would be maintained. No sooner had the votes been counted than republican leaders declared that the victory won on that platform was a victory for the single gold standard! They made no serious effort to fulfill their pledge as to an international agreement. On the contrary they proceeded in the effort to fasten the single gold standard more thoroughly upon the country.

The republican party sent a special envoy to the coronation of King Edward, a thing therefore unheard of in the history of our government.

In the war Great Britain waged against the Boers it gave all the aid and sympathy it dared to give to the monarchy, and refused the smallest word of cheer to the republics. The British freely used our ports for the shipment of horses and mules.

Pretending to be anxious for the preservation of the American system the republican party has created colonies and governs them as King George governed the American colonies, adopting the very policies against which our own forefathers fought. And now Porto Rico as well as the Philippines is in revolt.

Pretending to be the special champion of the soldiers and the sailors, the representatives of that party have repeatedly snubbed and sought to humiliate Dewey, Schley and Miles, heroes of our latest war.

In its name elections have been purchased through the enormous campaign funds contributed by trusts and voters dependent for a living upon their wages have been intimidated by employers.

Enormous and unnecessary expenditures have been made until the deficit for the last fiscal year was \$24,000,000 and the deficit for the coming fiscal year is estimated at \$40,000,000. And now when it is proposed to meet that deficit by depriving the trusts of the shelter they find in the tariff, we are told that we must not interfere with "business interests!"

Republican leaders boast of the integrity of their party's foreign policy; yet they violated the rules of nations when they interfered in Panama, and by force wrested that strip from its constitutional possessors. They have boast-

ed that they would build the canal, but recently it has developed that Senator Morgan and others were right when they charged that the Panama route was chosen at the dictation of the trans-continental railroad companies, and that the purpose was not to build a canal but to delay the building of a canal.

Secretary Taft announced that the trusts were endeavoring to "hold up" the government in the purchase of Panama canal supplies, and he said that in order to avoid these impositions the government would purchase supplies abroad if such a course were necessary in order to protect it from extortion. While many republicans applauded Secretary Taft for this act, it is noticeable that, although the popular demand for tariff revision has been constantly growing, the people have not heard anything of Secretary Taft's plan for these many months. In spite of the fact that many republicans are demanding tariff revision, it is plain the republican party will not give to the individual consumer the same privilege Secretary Taft at one time claimed for the government.

The republican party pretends to be willing to give the people relief from trust impositions. That party is in control of every department of government; yet no relief is in sight. The boasted Northern Securities merger case was said to have been won for the people, but it develops that the only result is a change in the method of organization, and the same old men continue to place upon the people the same old burdens.

We are told by republican newspapers that the railroad managers feel confident that they have averted the danger of any serious railroad legislation.

The republican leader in a recent speech condemned the able lawyers who for a price give their talents to great corporations in order that the people may be oppressed; and then within a few days after delivering that speech he appointed as his secretary of state Elihu Root, one of the most famous and successful corporation lawyers and a man who retired from the post of secretary of war to resume the practice of law in the interests of corporations. And when he retired, as he did, for the purpose of "mere gain" Mr. Roosevelt gave him a fine certificate of character and said that he was the greatest man in all the world in Roosevelt's time. That was quite different from the statement Mr. Roosevelt made when Engineer Wallace retired from the service of the government to accept another position for "mere gain."

There is no question as to the popular demand for the election of United States senators by the people, and four times the house of representatives has been forced to pass a proposed amendment to that effect. In each instance the republican senate has blocked the reform. Whenever the republican leaders conclude that the people are determined upon some sort of relief the house passes some sort of measure, its leaders knowing full well that the senate will not adopt it or will (as it did with respect to the Esch-Townsend bill) appoint a committee to investigate in the effort to discover whether the people are entitled to relief—and in the effort, also, to see that they don't get what they are entitled to.

Garfield reported that there was no beef trust, and then the federal grand jury at Chicago returned an indictment against the members of a beef trust, and then Mr. Garfield was assigned

to make an investigation of the Standard Oil trust, which it was announced was to be "just as rigid as his investigation of the beef trust had been."

Bonaparte, the new secretary of the navy, a man who ought to get out of the republican party just as quickly as he can, returned the passes which had been sent to him by railroads, saying that he did not feel that in the official position he held he should accept such favors. Does any one believe that Mr. Bonaparte is the only member of the cabinet who has been offered passes? Has any one heard of any other member of the cabinet refusing passes?

The republican leaders sneer at government ownership of railroads in America, and adopt the plan in Panama. They reject an income tax in our own land, and adopt it with respect to the new railroads in the Philippines, while a federal judge in Hawaii has upheld the income tax in that territory.

They authorize Messrs. Judson and Harmon to investigate the violation of the anti-rebate law, and they assure the people that the investigation will be "thorough and vigorous" and the prosecution "swift and certain." The investigation was thorough and vigorous, but the prosecution lacked considerable of being "swift and certain." When Messrs. Judson and Harmon reported the republican administration refused to act upon their report; it threw the protecting arm of the republican party around a conspicuous offender and laid down the rule, which it will find difficult to reverse, that when the anti-rebate law is violated the soulless and fleshless corporation must be held to account, while the powerful Paul Mortons go free and unmolested.

Under the authority of the republican party trusts have multiplied to the extent that since 1896 more trusts have been organized than existed in all the history of our government prior to that year. By its authority powerful violators of the law have been protected; men who have spent their lives in helping great corporations to defy the law have been advanced to high public places; and the president's cabinet has come to be the Alma Mater for corporation chiefs.

Under the republican party congress, as the representative of a free people has abdicated, and congress under the control of the great corporations of the country is now doing business at the old stand.

Pretending to promote the general welfare the republican party enriches the few at the expense of the many. In dealing with the people of our new possessions it stands for force where our forefathers would have stood for love. In its relations with the people of our own land it is snivelling and hypocritical; the arguments of its newspaper representatives are those of the sophist; the pretense of its so-called leaders is patriotism, but the purpose of the men who dominate it is plunder.

Who will say that there is error in the statement of fact in this indictment? If its conclusions are not justified, then the republican party, now in control of every branch of the government will provide the people with relief from the impositions that have been put upon them.

But does any man acquainted with the character of the influences which dominate the republican party today believe that the people have anything to expect in the way of relief at the hands of that political organization?

THE RELIGIOUS DRAMA

In the October Fortnightly Review Mr. B. W. Findon utters a strong plea for what he calls "the religious drama," basing his appeal upon the ground that such a drama would appeal to people of little or no faith, and to people who, because of spiritual inclination, are not attracted to anything devoid of religious ideas. Several of the so-called "religious plays" have been financially successful, as for instance the "Sign of the Cross," dramatic enough in itself but having a thin veneer of religion over a body of very worldly materials.

A well known western minister recently declared in a public address that if he were not a minister of the gospel he would be either a newspaper man or an actor. These three professions talk to and teach more people than all other professions combined. This being an acknowledged fact, why should religious people object to using the stage as a factor in the moral uplift of the world? Man's love of the dramatic

is instinctive, and lessons that would soon be forgotten if merely read are impressed upon the memory by the actor's art. The early church used the stage as an adjunct and the old miracle and morality plays were only sermons acted out by a number of ministers instead of being read by one minister. Some students of biblical literature even claim that at least two books of the Old Testament were intended for dramatic presentation.

That the people want dramas that deal with the morals, that teach lessons of truth and justice and that champion virtue instead of glorifying vice is amply demonstrated by the survival of those that deal with these things and the early demise of all so-called problem plays that pander to the baser passions. And if the stage is to fulfill its mission in the highest sense of that term, must it not more and more deal with those questions which have to do with religion? Every drama worthy of the name that has pretended to be "religious" has been financially successful, as instanced by the dramas of "Ben-Hur," "The

Sign of the Cross" and "The Prodigal Son." And yet even these have been lacking in many respects. What might not be accomplished both financially and religiously if one of the many grand subjects in the Old Testament should be thoroughly handled by a master dramatist who, by training and inclination, sought to impart wholesome lessons to the people of his time? If the stage is decadent, if it has become, as many Christian men and women declare, antagonistic to the Christian life, is it not possible that the fault lies with Christian people and not with the stage itself? The Salvation Army seizes upon all the popular airs of the day and fits them to religious words. When a straightlaced sectarian reproved General Booth for this and asked him how he reconciled dance hall tunes to Godly hymns, General Booth replied: "I do not believe in letting the Devil have a monopoly on all the good music." The same answer might be made to those who object to the theatre—why let the Devil have a monopoly on those things which appeal to humanity?