

that the tariff barons shall have all that the traffic will bear—all that the patient, long-suffering consumers among the rank and file of the republican party will submit to.

The tariff barons are supreme in the republican party. Because this is so the republican ways and means committee refused to give republicans like Lovering even the small concession they asked; because this is so President Roosevelt failed to heed the warning given by Governor Guild of Massachusetts when he told Mr. Roosevelt that the republican party had a narrow escape in Massachusetts and all on account of the tariff; because this is so Iowa republicans who several years ago demanded that the shelter which the trusts find in the tariff be destroyed found it necessary to revise their platform; because the tariff barons are supreme Mr. Taft who is now seeking the republican nomination for the presidency announces that he is not in favor of tariff revision until after the presidential election of 1908.

And only two years ago Mr. Taft issued an order to the effect that Panama canal supplies would be purchased abroad in order to protect the government from the greed of the tariff barons. And only a few months ago, in a speech delivered in the state of Maine, he declared himself so strongly in favor of tariff revision that the tariff reformers in the republican party interpreted his remarks to mean "immediate revision," and hailed him as a new leader who would surely aid in the deliverance of the helpless consumers within the republican party.

But because the tariff barons are supreme in the republican party Mr. Taft's "free trade order" proved of no avail and the government, like the individual consumer, continued to be held up by the greedy beneficiaries of that tariff system which—in the very language of Theodore Roosevelt—political economists have pretty generally agreed to be "vicious in theory and harmful in practice."



OKLAHOMA'S FIRST POLITICAL BATTLE

The first political battle in the new state of Oklahoma promises to become as historic as those campaigns many years ago in which Kansas and Nebraska played such an important part, and which had such a great influence upon the nation.

The Oklahoma battle is being waged upon the issue of freedom from corporate domination and the right of a people to govern themselves. The constitution of the new state, which was written by democrats, covers the advanced ground that has been gained by a century of experience, and safeguards the interests of the people at every point. Naturally this arouses the resentment of the interests that have so long preyed upon the people, and those interests are using the political party that has always been friendly to them to defeat the party that has stood for the rights of the people and has offered them the largest measure of protection in their civil rights.

The attitude of the republican organization in Oklahoma towards statehood, and towards the new constitution is shown in the following editorial from the Oklahoma City Oklahoman:

"The attitude of the republican party toward statehood is illustrated very aptly by the plank in the Tulsa resolutions which relates to the course it will pursue in certain eventualities. In it the party is pledged to the extension of the territorial form of government over Indian Territory and a demand upon congress for a new enabling act.

"It appears very evident from this that the g. o. p. is not going to permit itself to sweat any blood in securing statehood. It boldly declares that the constitution should be defeated, thereby defeating statehood, and then pledges the party to the extensions of the territorial form of government to Indian Territory.

"In the light of these facts it will have to be admitted that our republican friends are going to find some difficulty in posing as the champions of statehood. Their expressed opposition to the constitution and anxiety for a new enabling act gives the lie to any such professions. If Frantz and the republican ticket is elected, statehood is dead. We are back to where we were more than a year ago, with another long siege of waiting in store for us."

Oklahoma now has a territorial form of government, and while the opposition to the new constitution claims to base its objections thereto upon the grounds that it is socialistic and revolutionary, it is really based upon the

fact that statehood will deprive the present territorial machine of its power and give the whole people a voice in the management of Oklahoma affairs. The opposition to the new constitution, which means the republican machine, is growing desperate in its endeavors to defeat the will of the people. It has resorted to a "certificate" scheme to raise money. It makes a specious appeal to republicans everywhere to contribute to "the first campaign in Oklahoma," and every contributor of \$5 receives a certificate setting forth that fact.

The democrats of Oklahoma have offered to the voters of the new state not only the best state constitution ever written, but a ticket that is, from top to bottom, worthy of the support of all men. The ticket is as follows:

United States Senators—Robert L. Owen, Thomas P. Gore.

Justices Supreme Court—Jesse J. Dunn, S. W. Hayes, R. L. Williams, Matthew J. Kane, J. B. Turner.

Governor—C. N. Haskell.
Lieutenant Governor—George W. Bellamy.
Attorney General—Charles West.
Secretary of State—William M. Cross.
Treasurer—James Menefee.
Auditor—M. E. Trapp.
Clerk of Supreme Court—W. H. L. Campbell.

State Examiner—Charles Taylor.
Superintendent Public Instruction—E. D. Cameron.

Mine Inspector—Peter Hanraty.
Commissioner of Charities—Miss Kate Barnard.

Labor Commissioner—Charles Daugherty.
Insurance Commissioner—T. J. McComb.
Corporation Commissioners—J. J. McAlester, A. P. Watson, J. E. Love.

This ticket was selected by primaries and is representative of the will of the majority. It makes direct appeal to every good interest in the new state, and its election will mean that the provisions of the new constitution will be put into practical operation, and that Oklahoma will enter upon her statehood career with every interest of the people safeguarded, and the rights of every citizen guaranteed.



REASSURED

The Wall Street Journal says: "Wall Street should not forget that Taft is really the president's candidate for the presidential succession, and that he is the inheritor of the president's policy. Nevertheless Taft is Taft, and not Roosevelt, and his treatment of the Roosevelt policies will be Taft-wise, and not Roosevelt-wise. That is the only difference."

A few days later Wall Street read in the New York World's report of an interview with John D. Rockefeller the following: "Mr. Rockefeller was unstinting in his praise of Secretary Taft and Charles E. Hughes, governor of New York. 'Both of them,' he said, 'are deliberate men, safe men.' Secretary Taft, Mr. Rockefeller said he believed to be a man who would do as his conscience dictated, and that he would not be guided by the beliefs and policies of a predecessor."

Since Mr. Taft delivered his "revise-the-tariff-after-election speech" Wall Street does not appear to be greatly distressed by the Taft boom.



ANOTHER QUESTION

The New York World says: "Never was a democratic party more needed in the country than today. But what is democratic policy? Who are the democratic leaders? What is a democrat?"

But long ago the World failed to solve that problem—at least to the World's satisfaction. The more timely question is "what is the New York World?"—and many careful readers of the World's editorial page are unable to give the answer.



THE FIRST ECHO

The first echo of the president's speech in favor of "national incorporation" comes from President Stickney of the Chicago Great Western. He is interviewed in Europe and says he is a firm believer in federal supervision and adds, "It will be by federal control that we will be able to escape the pettifogging methods of the pot-house politician who now is attracting considerable attention to himself in the various states."

President Stickney's comment shows that the object of national incorporation is to help

the railroads—not the people. The state legislators who passed the two-cent rate laws are the "pot-house politicians" referred to and the railroads are very anxious to get rid of these troublesome creatures. A United States senate filled with railroad attorneys and trust representatives would suit the railroads much better—the control would be mild and gentle.

But what do the people think of a scheme which the railroads endorse so heartily? The more national incorporation is considered the more objectionable it will be found.



ONLY LASHES OF LOVE

An interesting discussion is going on between the Omaha World-Herald and Mr. Henry Watterson. It is well known that Mr. Watterson has found much fault in Mr. Bryan, and out of the goodness of his heart he has been kind enough to mention these evidences of weakness—in the hope, of course, that good may come to the country even though improvement be not noticeable in Mr. Bryan.

Mr. Watterson has frequently complained that Mr. Bryan has expressed himself too freely and openly on living questions. But the Courier-Journal of August 13 printed one editorial that did not find fault with Mr. Bryan—perhaps that was because it did not relate to Mr. Bryan. In that editorial Mr. Watterson criticised those republicans who insisted that Mr. Taft should not define his position on the tariff. In that editorial Mr. Watterson said that these republicans were afraid that Mr. Taft would "be so unwise as to dwell upon the expediency of a tariff reduction." Mr. Watterson said that in the view of these republicans: "This would be terrible. It would hurt the party and weaken Taft as a political chief." The World Herald directed attention to this editorial and particularly to the following extracts:

"Secretary Taft is one of those strong-minded men who, being for a thing, do not hesitate to say so; therefore, being a tariff revisionist, the chances are that he is not apt to make any effort to conceal the fact. It may weaken him with the party managers, who like to see the campaign funds roll in, but the people—the independent voters who know something about the evils of that tariff—are likely to be pleased.

"It is a great trick of politicians nowadays to do what is technically known as 'playing both ends against the middle.' Now, if Mr. Taft could or would resort to the trick he might get the lofty and honorable fame of being a brilliant, cunning and successful politician. To hear some folks talk, nothing could be more splendid than to be a smooth politician, no matter what sort of public official such a politician may be.

"The trouble with Mr. Taft, however, is that he seems to be one of those peculiar persons who dare to prefer to be honest rather than shrewd—who would rather be a statesman than a politician."

The World-Herald asked whether the Henry Watterson who wrote this editorial approving Mr. Taft is the same Henry Watterson who has been "querulously scolding" Mr. Bryan.

In another column The Commoner reproduces another editorial from the World-Herald which editorial deals with Mr. Watterson's effort to explain.

It is, indeed, a very interesting discussion but the World-Herald must not be too hard on the great Kentucky editor. Mr. Bryan is not the only democrat with whom Henry Watterson has habitually found fault even though the criticism was more painful to Henry Watterson than to the one condemned. Like others who have bared their backs to the Wattersonian lashes of love Mr. Bryan will "bear it calmly, though a ponderous woe, and still adore the hand that gives the blow," and well we know—for he himself has intimated as much—that, in paraphrase of the poet of old:

"Henry is not always angry when he strikes, But most chastises those whom most he likes."



DO YOU BELIEVE IT?

With Aldrich and Foraker opposing tariff revision in the senate, "Uncle Joe" Cannon with his ways and means committee opposing tariff revision in the house, and with the tariff beneficiaries providing the campaign fund for the republican party does anyone imagine that the tariff will be revised "after the presidential election" in the event the republican party wins?