

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 7, NO. 34

Lincoln, Nebraska, September 6, 1907

Whole Number 346

CONTENTS

WHERE TARIFF BARONS RULE
TRUSTING THE INDIVIDUAL
OKLAHOMA'S FIRST BATTLE
ONLY LASHES OF LOVE
PROVE IT NOW
HOW THE TRUSTS CONTROL CONGRESS
REASSURED
THE FIRST ECHO
SILENT ON THE TARIFF
MR. TAFT ON TRUSTS
NAME ONE GOOD TRUST
WASHINGTON LETTER
COMMENT ON CURRENT TOPICS
HOME DEPARTMENT
WHETHER COMMON OR NOT
NEWS OF THE WEEK

TRUSTING THE INDIVIDUAL

Secretary Taft undertakes to draw a contrast between President Roosevelt and Mr. Bryan, saying that the former trusts the individual while the latter distrusts him. Mr. Taft may be able to speak for the president, but he shows gross ignorance of Mr. Bryan's position. Mr. Bryan, like all other democrats, trusts the individual—that is a distinguishing feature of the democrat, but the Jeffersonian democrat recognizes the weaknesses of man as well as the rights of man and the weakness of man shows itself when the representative puts his own interests above the interests of his constituents.

Jefferson declared that confidence was the parent of despotism and that free government existed in jealousy—not in confidence. The Hamiltonian republican trusts the representative but not the individual. The Hamiltonian republican thinks that a representative is elected to think for the people; the Jeffersonian democrat believes that the people should think for themselves and then elect representatives to act for them and give expression to their thoughts.

Mr. Bryan takes the Jeffersonian view and has expressed his views so often that Secretary Taft ought not to be ignorant of them. Because Mr. Bryan believes in and trusts the individual he favors the election of senators by direct vote and he also favors such checks on our representative system as will enable the individuals to control their representatives and prevent betrayal. It is Secretary Taft who, following in the footsteps of Hamilton, distrusts the individual and puts his faith in the representative. Secretary Taft has raised a question which will embarrass him—it will not embarrass Mr. Bryan.

◆◆◆◆ "MANANA"

The Spanish have a word, "manana" which means "tomorrow." Secretary Taft may yet become famous as "the manana statesman." He seems to favor putting everything off until tomorrow. He is in favor of an income tax—but not just now; he believes in an inheritance tax—but not for the present; he thinks the Filipinos will be ready for self government after awhile; and he feels that tariff reform might be a good thing—after the next election, or some other time in the future. How would it do for reformers to adopt his own language and say "Secretary Taft might make a good president—some day, but not yet, after while, say about 1912 or 1916." Present abuses need immediate treatment and "manana" is not likely to become a popular campaign slogan.



A CHANGED TUNE

WHERE TARIFF BARONS RULE

In another column of this issue is an article taken from the Boston Herald. In this article it is shown by republican testimony that the steel trust through the control it has over the republican ways and means committee of the house, blocked action upon Representative Lovering's tariff drawback bills.

The editor of Moody's Magazine says that he has for years known that the officials of the steel trust were dictating "standpatism" to the ways and means committee. Moody's editor says that he has seen letters from steel trust officials to members of the ways and means committee "advising them not to touch the tariff on any pretext."

For the second quarter of 1907 the steel trust earnings were about \$4,000,000 more than the earnings of any previous quarter. For the full year, ending June 30, 1907, the net earnings amounted to \$164,490,945. Moody's editor points out that these earnings amounted to \$500,000 a day, \$21,000 an hour, \$350 a minute, and \$6 a second—more than three men, working twelve hours a day, could count. Moody's editor then says:

"Fully half of these earnings of \$164,490,945 for the year, come from the tariff, and are really tariff taxes collected from steel consuming industries and individuals. If the steel corporation really were, as protectionists assume, a struggling infant industry that could not survive long without tariff pap, and if the good people of this country were generous, kind and foolish enough to vote this tariff tax of \$80,-

000,000 a year upon themselves, there would be no ground for criticism or complaint. If the steel corporation officials would even confine their tariff activity to arguments and to contributions to political parties, they would not be censurable to any great extent. But when these officials, by some means, gain control of the leaders of the ways and means committee and the house of representatives and use their influence to suppress discussion of the tariff, they are playing the tariff game unfairly."

It is not difficult to understand the means whereby these tariff barons "gain control of the leaders of the ways and means committee, and the house of representatives." These gentlemen are merely carrying out the policy for which their party stands.

And why should not the steel trust, or any other trust, tell the republican ways and means committee when to act and when to refuse to act upon any question affecting the trust system? The political party represented by that committee obtains its campaign funds from these trusts. Republican leaders and republican editors have for years drilled it into the rank and file of their party that the persistent championship of high protection is the purest act of patriotism and that the man who objects to the high rates of the Dingley bill has shown himself to be not only false to his party but faithless to his duty as a patriot.

The republican party can not separate itself from "the system." It can not divorce itself from that form of protection which means