

Franklin Pierce on "Keeping Still"

Franklin Pierce of New York has written to Henry Watterson, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, this interesting letter:

"I have read with interest your talk before the National Press club at Washington yesterday. So sturdy a fighter as you are will surely not take unkindly honest difference of opinion as to the true policies of the democratic party. You say, 'Keep still and profit by the enemies' mistakes.' I say, go at the republican party hell-bent on the question of protective tariffs, imperialism, ship subsidies, extravagant government and costly navy, corruption and all the other abuses which they have been imposing upon this American people. The democratic party has been keeping still altogether too long. Free government can not exist without agitation, and the democratic party ought to be a party of agitation. The alleged safe and sane part of this party naturally belongs to the republican party, and there it will finally bring up. When the leaders of the democratic party are quiet, notwithstanding hundreds of tariff-bred monopolies are selling their products to the American consumer for twice the price which they would exact if the tariff was removed; when these special interests sit at the hearth of the poor, charging them extra prices for coal, extorting from 50 to 250 per cent more for every thread of clothing which they wear than the natural price, and robbing them day and night, year in and year out, by enhanced prices for all the necessaries of life, and we democrats sit around smiling as serenely as two summer mornings, when such a condition of affairs as this exists, I say, away, away with you faithless ones. You are recreant to your trust and are recreant to the memory of the democratic leaders of the past, and from the very heavens their voices condemn you.

"Slavery was the curse of the south before the war, but our modern materialism, our tariff-made monopolies and the rule of corrupt special interests is laying much heavier burdens upon your people than did slavery in those days, and you southern men have bowed your heads to this sin and seem to be returning to your old doctrines that society exists for the benefit of the few instead of the many; that the millions may be enslaved to increase the riches of a few thousand planters and manufacturers. God save you and bring you back to true democratic principles or send you over to the republican party, where you belong if you do not reform.

"Again, you tell us that if the scheme to cause a breach between President Taft and Roosevelt comes to a head, we democrats may get into power. Is not this the cry of weakness? We can get into power because of a breach between our adversaries? Why not get into power because you are entitled to get into power on your willingness to do the right thing to the whole body of the people? I have no great admiration for ex-President Roosevelt. I have spent not a little time examining his usurpations of power, but Theodore Roosevelt at his worst is the superior of President Taft. No president in our country has ever started in the very beginning of his term by making such a

humiliating exhibit of himself as has President Taft. The progressive element in his party ought to desert him, and I trust that they will desert him. Government with President Taft seems to be something of a joke. He seems to be bent upon having a good time at the people's expense. He is hardly serious upon any public question, and is on altogether too good terms with the corrupt elements of this country to please the vigilant and patriotic citizen. His attitude on the tariff and his attack upon the progressive republicans of the west, his swinging around the circle at the cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money, his easy neglect of public duties, his good-natured lack of indignation at wrong, these all may mark him as a good fellow, but not as a faithful and a great president.

"The hope of the democratic party is in getting back to the first principles of justice and government, throwing aside the superficial men who have been directing its councils, and resolving at once to do justice to the consumers of tariff-burdened goods and to those who are bearing the terrible burdens of our extravagant national government. If the democratic party twenty years ago had cleared its decks and fought valiantly for democratic principles, instead of talking about keeping still and profiting by the enemies' mistakes; if it had sought not only to please the people by honeyed words and demagogic cries, but had actually created and championed real reforms affecting all the people's welfare, it would not be sighing for power today. It is out of power because it is unworthy of power; it is out of power because it lacks leaders who believe in the people and who believe in justice toward all the people. It is out of power because hundreds of its leaders are actually in league with the tariff-made trusts and are voting the republican ticket three-fourths of the time and are real republicans and ought to be in the republican party and stay there. These leaders have simply betrayed the people, and among them are your United States senators from the south, who have been steadily taking care of your large land owners and manufacturers, instead of taking care of the great body of your poor people. Our millionaires are expending hundreds of millions of dollars yearly for charities of all kinds. Let us democrats advocate justice, which will make charity almost unnecessary. Let us urge the people to fight for little things when those little things involve a principle of liberty and justice. Our forefathers fought a seven years' war from Lexington to Yorktown for relief from taxation not a millionth part as burdensome as congress has just imposed upon ninety millions of consumers.

"In short, my dear Mr. Watterson, let us believe in liberty and justice and in their final triumph, and hate from our boots up oppression and gird ourselves anew to fight for the old democratic ideals, and then there will be no use of 'keeping still and profiting by the enemies' mistakes.' Sincerely,

"FRANKLIN PIERCE.

"New York."

Income Tax Cheat

There is danger that in the furore of excitement created by the kicking insurgents and Gifford Pinchot out of the republican party, the full significance of Governor Hughes' message to the New York legislature urging the defeat of the income tax amendment will be overlooked. The governor, as the New York Herald aptly puts it, "has furnished to the opponents of the income tax amendment the one thing they have been seeking—a plausible argument from a highly respectable source." The argument is that the amendment infringes on states' rights because it would make it possible for congress to impose a tax on incomes from state and city bonds—if congress should desire to do so.

It is not necessary just now to argue the question, though it is obvious, in the first place, that congress would impose no such tax unless driven by the spur of necessity and supported by public sentiment, and that, in the second place, something that would discourage the tendency to issue immense amounts of bonds which the people must pay might not be wholly an un-mixed evil. And it is interesting to note how

quickly republican leaders grab at "states' rights" as an excuse to defeat the income tax—Massachusetts republicans made the same plea—while at the same time they are preparing to take away from the states the right to regulate the great corporations which control commerce and the necessities of life, and while they look on, with benign complacency, while inferior federal judges annul at their own irresponsible whim and pleasure the carefully framed laws of sovereign states.

We desire, though, to direct attention to a Washington dispatch printed in the Chicago Tribune, a great republican paper, which frankly admits that Governor Hughes' message is only one step in a plot to defeat the income tax, which plot was clearly in the minds of the republican leaders in Washington last summer when they used the proposed amendment to defeat the inclusion of an income tax in the tariff law. The Tribune dispatch says:

"The blow dealt by Governor Hughes of New York to the proposed constitutional amendment authorizing the levying of an income tax has produced undisguised satisfaction among the Aldrich following in congress and equally patent dismay among the progressives. The latter admit that the attempt to obtain the adoption of

an income tax amendment now is an uphill fight, with the result in grave doubt.

"The outcome is believed to be exactly what was foreseen by Senator Aldrich last summer when he executed his flank move and headed off the inclusion of an income tax in the tariff law. Senator Cummins and the insurgent republicans had nineteen votes for the proposition in the senate and were ready to combine with the democrats and tack the provision on to the Aldrich bill.

"Then Aldrich hastened to the White House and offered to concede a corporation tax if the president would call off the insurgents in the senate. The president accepted, the corporation tax was included in the tariff law, and a resolution was adopted submitting to the state legislatures a constitutional amendment to authorize an income tax.

"Now that Governor Hughes has taken action which likely will block the ratification of the amendment in New York the progressives realize the pitfalls of the trap that Senator Aldrich laid for them. Georgia and Connecticut so far have failed to ratify the proposition, and it is believed that the objections raised by Governor Hughes will be voiced elsewhere, with the result of sidetracking the whole amendment."

The republican party makes a business of fooling the people, then breaking faith with them, and then swindling them in the name of the special interests. It does these things brazenly and impudently, because it has found it can escape the penalty when election day rolls round by threatening that it will bring on a panic and make the corn stop growing in the event of a democratic victory.

The process will continue as long as the people are willing—and not any longer.—Omaha World-Herald.

"EDUCATE THE PEOPLE"

Predicting that the prices of meats will go even higher than they now are Harold Swift, member of the Swift Packing Company, says that the remedy is "educate the people to the use of the cheaper cuts of meats." This is some improvement over the other suggestion that the people be educated to do without meat altogether.

"GOOD GOVERNMENT" BY THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

In the making of a tariff law, one would naturally suppose that those least able to bear the burdens of taxation would not be discriminated against in favor of those best able to pay the tax involved in any tariff levy.

But what are the facts? The man who imports \$1,000 worth of diamonds pays a tax of but \$100—10 per cent. If he imported a thousand shirts worth a dollar each he would have to leave at the customs house and tack onto his selling prices \$601.60—60.16 per cent.

If he decided that he would bring in \$1,000 worth of champagne, one of the items upon which there is a large increase, the tax levied by the tariff is \$500. If he brought in \$1,000 worth of blankets he would pay a tariff tax of \$1,645.42.

If he brought in \$1,000 worth of paintings and statuary, all he would have to pay as customs duties would be \$200, but if it were sugar he would pay \$788.70 tax on \$1,000 worth.

If he brought in \$1,000 worth of jewelry he would have to pay \$600 tariff tax, but if he brought in \$1,000 worth of wool dress goods he would pay \$1,050.92 tariff.

If he imported a \$5,000 automobile the tariff takers would relieve him of \$2,250. If it were \$5,000 worth of yarns the tariff tax would be \$6,960.

If the importation were \$5,000 worth of furs the tariff tax would be \$1,650 but if it were \$5,000 worth of clothing that tax would be \$4,330.

If some New York millionaire brings in a \$100,000 ocean-going yacht the tariff would be \$35,000, but if the importation were stockings the tariff collected would be \$87,950. C. Q. D.