

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 10, NO. 4

Lincoln, Nebraska, February 4, 1910

Whole Number 472

"Good" of Course

The Philadelphia North American, republican, in one of its fearfully and wonderfully made editorials, says that Mr. Taft is a puzzle. Referring to some of the recommendations in his special message, the North American says:

"Such recommendations coming from an Aldrich or a Cannon would be pronounced deliberately and villainously wrong. The honesty of Taft saves him from any such unjust interpretation of his desires or utterances. But they are of such character that only the abiding faith in his goodness of intent frees him from such censure."

If the editor of the North American would call in some of his bright reporters, say the young cub on the police run, he might learn something to his advantage. He might learn that Mr. Taft is a puzzle only to those who, through blind devotion to the republican party, have had their eyes so habitually sealed that they could not gaze through a stone with a big hole in it.

Sooner or later republican editors and other republican leaders, who desire to save their reputation for intelligence, and who are not hopelessly bound to the special interests, will have to recognize the fact now patent to many of the plainest sort of people: The fact that however honest Mr. Taft may be and however extensive one's "abiding faith in his goodness" may be, he is the friend of Aldrich and of Cannon as he is the friend of Ballinger; he is the advocate of Aldrichism and Cannonism and is now, within full sight of the American people, undertaking to deliver to the contributors to republican campaign funds, dominion over the corporation and financial affairs of the American government.

We may well understand why the North American hesitates to "censure" the gentleman whom it recently supported for the presidency. The American might, at least, get its own eyes open to the simple truth.

THEY LIKE THE "IF"

In his speech at Dallas, introducing Governor Harmon, Hon. J. E. Cockwell called attention to a very nice distinction. He said:

"We have troubles here, too. The promised land looks so far away to some of our people that in their hunger they are tempted by the flesh pots of Egypt and leave the line of march, forgetting the final goal—the absolute destruction of the protective tariff—and seek to satisfy their greed by demanding protection on the articles in which they are immediately concerned. They thus yield the principle. Our people are taught by some that if we must pay a protective tariff on the manufactured products of lumber, hides or wool, for example, then lumber, hides and wool must also be protected.

FOUR YEARS MORE OF THE FULL DINNER PAIL

"Revolutions have been started by less than the American people are suffering now," says Senator Joseph L. Bristow of Kansas. "Meat foots up to a quarter of the average household expenses, and it ought to be cheaper today instead of dearer than it was twenty-five years ago, because of the greater economy in its preparation and sale. When I was a boy 25 per cent of the carcass went to waste. Now nothing goes to waste—not even the blood."

Senator Bristow's words crystalize the sentiment of protest in all parts of the country against the higher cost of living. Thus far the movement, which first took form in an actual boycott at Cleveland, has met with most success in the west. The east has been slower to follow, influenced perhaps by a widespread feeling among small dealers and in the labor unions, that a universal boycott, though effective as a protest, would actually play into the hands of the packers, who, with their control of cold storage houses and refrigerator lines could carry their product through a prolonged boycott, though a thirty day's cessation of trade would put the small independents out of business.—Denver News.

Those who thus say "if" we must pay on these manufactured articles know full well there is no "if" about it; under present conditions it is a case of "must," and the true statement of their argument is: "Because" we must pay a protective tariff on the manufactured products of lumber, hides and wool, therefore it is right to pay a second protective tariff on the raw products also. But I digress. These matters will be settled by the constituted authorities and the issue will be properly presented in the platform. Who shall carry the banner?"

The point which Mr. Cockwell makes is worthy of consideration. He is right in saying that those who preface their defense of protection on local products by saying, "If we must pay a tariff on something else," etc, really mean "because," and there is a great difference between the two words. "Because" implies resignation, while "if" does not. The people who say they want a tariff on what they produce "if" they must pay a tariff on what they buy, really mean that they are ready to accept the protective tariff as a settled policy, and will make no further effort to overthrow it. Mr. Cockwell has rendered the cause of honest tariff reform a service by pointing out the paralyzing influence of that word "if," when used by protectionist democrats. They have used the word until they like it, and they have gradually transformed it from a threat into an excuse.

MR. CANNON KNEW

In December, 1905, the New York Tribune printed an interview with Speaker Cannon in which the speaker said that tariff revision was impossible, adding:

"If some fellow did introduce a tariff bill, and it was argued and argued, and at the end of twelve months its advocates could gather together enough votes to pass it, the country being held up by the tail in the meantime, I think you'd find that the new law would have just as many outrageous things in it as are found in the Dingley tariff act."

Mr. Cannon certainly knew what he was talking about. The truth is that the new law has even more "outrageous things in it than are found in the Dingley tariff act."

But why did not the rank and file of republicans know?

Is It "Obsolete"

In an editorial entitled "An Obsolete Principle," the St. Louis Censor, a weekly publication, says:

"There has been a 'fool' theory in this country for a long time, that the object of its government may be summed up in the statement—'The greatest good to the greatest number.' However, such a principle may have been applied by the pioneers of the republic, it is dead—er now than the character cast for the 'lead' at a wake. Carthage, Missouri, has just had a fine illustration of the working of the new system of laws handed down from time to time by various federal judges. Carthage, a city of fifteen thousand people, has had its water supply cut off in a day, herself placed at the mercy of fire and pestilence, her mains and sewers left without water, her mills and factories stopped, her buildings heated by steam rendered uninhabitable, and the cancellation of her fire insurance policies threatened, for the good and sufficient reason that the water corporation, backed by a federal court, had concluded to quit. Carthage had a corporation supplying it with water, that several years ago it attempted to regulate. This was a very wrong thing for the people of Carthage to do, for what right have the people to interfere with the divine right of monopolies? The monopoly entered into agreement with the people, but with the same mental reservations Charles I always applied to parliament, it did not keep them, but what of that? Then the water monopoly applied to Phillips, of Kansas City, federal judge, and the result of Phillips' decision is that the welfare, even the lives of fifteen thousand people, have no rights where interests or rights of one corporation are involved."

It is worthy of serious consideration on the part of all men who are interested in government—and all men are interested in government although they do not always display that interest—whether this St. Louis newspaper is correct in the statement that "the greatest good to the greatest number" is an obsolete principle. May it not be that those who either from special interest or environment lean toward the privilege have been encouraged by the apparent indifference of the masses of the American people? May it not be that righteous principles continue to live even when their importance is not recognized by the very people most dependent upon them? May it not be that the very insolence that has been displayed by the representatives of special interests, the very emphasis they have given to their power to impose upon a patient people will be the very means of demonstrating to those who now doubt and to those who never knew that "the scaffold sways the future" and "behind the dim unknown" the light of truth is shining?

If heavy imposition will arouse the American people to the importance of the warning "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" then the victory over indifference will be worth all it shall have cost.

"THE TALK OF THE TOWN"

The New York Tribune, republican, prints this touching poem:

The cost of living's gone so high
We can not live and so must die.
And say,

We've got to do it right away,
Because unless we're p. d. q.
In what's it's up to us to do,
The undertaker's will combine
Along the whole darn funeral line
And make that cost prohibitive
As now we find it is to live.
Thus we can neither live nor die,
No matter by what means we try,
And this condition being true,
Say, what in thunder shall we do?

Is the answer "vote the republican ticket and get 'four years more of the full dinner pail'?"

CONTENTS

"GOOD" OF COURSE
IS IT "OBSOLETE?"

MR. CANNON KNEW

EDUCATIONAL SERIES—A COMEDY IN
THREE ACTS—BY A REPUBLICAN
EDITOR

PRACTICAL TARIFF TALKS
WHERE THE OLD SHIP IS LEAKING
DEMOCRACY AND INSURGENCY
PUT THE COMMONER INTO HANDS OF
MILLION VOTERS

CURRENT TOPICS
WHETHER COMMON OR NOT
HOME DEPARTMENT
NEWS OF THE WEEK
WASHINGTON NEWS