

"STAND BY ROOSEVELT"

A G. O. P. Shibboleth That Will Not Bear Analysis

Republican leaders have been partial to "catchy campaign phrases." These leaders act in accordance with the belief generally entertained in circles where politicians most do congregate, that in American politics the battle is lost or won by the campaign phrase. Nearly every politician will tell you that the republicans lost the battle in 1884 and James G. Blaine failed to realize upon his life's ambition because Burchard, delivering an address of welcome to Mr. Blaine referred to the democratic party as "the party of 'Rum, Romanism and Rebellion.'"

It can not be doubted that the campaign phrase has done much to give victory to the republican party in years gone by. In 1896, republican leaders made liberal use of the phrase: "Preserve the National Honor." In 1900, the republican phrases were "Four Years More of the Full Dinner Pail," and "Let Well Enough Alone."

But the American people now know that many of the men conspicuous in 1896 in the use of the phrase "Preserve the National Honor" had no more concern for the national honor than they had for their own and no more concern for their own honor than to sacrifice it upon the altar of greed.

The American people now know that the dinner pail, "Four Years More" of which we were promised in the event of republican victory, has lacked considerable of being "full;" that whatever food it did hold had, because of the trust system, undergone an increase in price while the wages of the consumer had enjoyed little or no increase whatever; and they know, also, that the small amount of meat in that dinner pail may have been poisoned by a trust as unscrupulous in preparing food for its consumers, as it is in conspiring to fix an unjust price upon its products.

They know, also, that "Let Well Enough Alone" covered a multitude of sins. And although that is one of the best known of republican campaign phrases, in this day few republicans organs or orators would have the hardihood to employ it in making appeal to the people.

The people must have learned in recent months that it will not do to accept a republican campaign phrase at its face value. They must have learned that it is the part of wisdom for the party appealing for their votes to give them something more substantial than the phrase.

But now that the people are beginning to feel and to understand, the republican leaders avoiding—as is the republican habit—a defense of their party's record in congress and in executive office, have resorted to another campaign phrase. We are told by republican papers that the congressional campaign for 1906 is to be fought out upon the campaign shibboleth "Stand by Roosevelt."

It is more than likely that the voters will require from the republican organ or the republican orator something more explicit than the not altogether descriptive phrase "Stand by Roosevelt." They may want to know what the republican party—now that it is in control in all departments of government—intends to do with the great questions confronting the American people. As an argument for thoughtful citizens of the popular form of government, the phrase "Stand by Roosevelt" will not bear analysis.

Without intending to become liable to the charge of lese majeste, one would be justified in saying that the appeal to "stand by" the president is less definite as applied to the record of

the present occupant of the White House than if applied to that of any of his predecessors.

Without seeking to detract in the least from Mr. Roosevelt's personal worth, let us analyze the "Stand by Roosevelt" argument.

By which Roosevelt shall we "stand" in complying with the 1906 phrase? Shall it be the Roosevelt whose words have stirred the American people to enthusiasm, and drawn from them declarations of affection for the chief magistrate, demonstrations the like of which have not been known since the days of Jackson if even then? Or the Roosevelt whose acts of omission or commission have prompted many of those who were disposed to be his warmest friends to doubt whether, after all, he is a man who may be depended upon to back fair words with substantial deeds?

By which Roosevelt shall we "stand?"

By the Roosevelt who called the trust magnates "captains of industry" to whom the American people owe a debt of gratitude? Or the Roosevelt who likened them to masters of cunning whose disposition toward wrong doing must be "shackled, as in the past we have shackled force?"

By the one who called the democratic platform adopted at Chicago "anarchy" because of its criticism of the courts? Or the one who publicly reprimanded Federal Judge Humphrey for his decision in the beef trust cases, and expressed the hope that Humphrey's bad example would not be imitated by other occupants of the bench?

By the one who permitted it to be understood that he indorsed Secretary Taft's order that the Panama canal supplies be purchased abroad, if such a course were necessary to protect the government from extortion? Or the one who bought for the canal service two American ships of 5,700 tons each for \$1,300,000 when he was offered two foreign ships of 6,000 tons each for \$750,000?

By the one who approved the law passed at the last session of congress directing the canal commission to purchase its supplies from American manufactures whenever the prices were not "unreasonable or extortionate?" Or the one who, within a week after he signed that law, awarded to the Maryland Steel company a contract for two dredges at \$362,000 each, when a foreign concern had offered to built these two dredges for \$70,000 less?

By the one who refused to withdraw the brand of infamy he had placed upon the late James H. Tyner in response to Tyner's dying request, and after Tyner had been acquitted by a jury? Or the one who gave Paul Morton, upon that gentleman's retirement from the cabinet, a clean bill to the defense of which even partisan republican editors with all their agility have not dared to go?

By the one who favors economy in the expenditures of public money? Or the one whose four years of administration cost—exclusive of all expense in Panama—\$434,104,699 in excess of the cost of the four years of the McKinley administration, although the McKinley administration conducted the Spanish war?

By the one who, in a speech at Harvard college, condemned the able lawyers who for a price give their talents to great corporations in order that the people may be oppressed? Or the one who, within a few days after delivering that speech, appointed as his secretary of state Elihu Root, one of the most famous and successful corporation lawyers and the man who had formerly

retired from the post of secretary of war to resume the practice of law for the special interests?

By the one who resents the interference of trusts in politics and insists upon free government? Or the one who sent a telegram of congratulation to Dupont, chief of the powder trust, on the occasion of Dupont's election to the United States senate from Delaware?

By the one who, in his message to congress, said that it was important to have laws prohibiting corporations from contributing to campaign funds and providing publicity with respect to the receipt and expenditure of such funds? Or the one who, at the time when he was pretending to exercise jealous care over every bit of pending legislation, permitted bills relating to these reforms to die—even though his attention and that of other leaders in his party was repeatedly called to these measures?

By the one who protested from the house-tops concerning the shortcomings of the beef trust magnates? Or the one who, in his boasted proceedings against the Standard Oil Trust, failed to call to account the Rockefellers and the Rogerses and permitted it to be made known by one of those mysterious "unofficial but reliable statements" that the department of justice has no hope of catching the more conspicuous offenders in its Standard Oil drag net.

By the one who insisted upon a just meat inspection law, providing for a tag showing the date on which the product was canned and providing also that the expense be borne by the packers; the one who wrote in such vigorous words to Chairman Wadsworth of the house committee, making it known that he would be satisfied with nothing other than a measure giving relief? Or the one who tamely submitted when the bill was passed giving the packers the inspection which they really wanted—all at the expense of the government and failing to require the date on the can; the one who, in the face of the defeat of everything for which Senator Beveridge pretended to stand with respect to the meat inspection law, sent to Mr. Beveridge the pen with which he had approved the measure and with a note congratulating the Indiana senator upon the great "victory" he had won?

By the one who talks about restraining the influence of the trusts in politics? Or the one who congratulated the people upon the election to the United States senate of Philander S. Knox, who was admittedly the choice of the Pennsylvania trusts and railroads?

By the one who vigorously protested against the court review in the meat inspection bill? Or the one who consented to the court review in the railway rate bill?

By the one who prosecuted the famous Northern Securities Merger case, winning a formal victory? Or the one who failed to take advantage of the logical consequences of that victory and permitted the same old Northern Pacific monopolists to continue to do business at the same old stand?

By the one who insisted upon due recognition being given to the faithful soldiers and sailors? Or the one who systematically snubbed and sought to humiliate Dewey, Schley and Miles?

By the one who professes devotion to American traditions? Or the one who violated American precedent by sending a special envoy to the coronation of a king?

By the one who insisted, as in the beef trust cases, that the men of flesh and blood, rather than