

CURRENT TOPICS

JOSEPH BENSON FORAKER, former United States senator from Ohio, has been guilty of "treason." The story as told in a Cleveland, Ohio, dispatch carried by the Associated Press follows: "Declining to accede to an alleged request of the republican state executive committee to modify his speech, Former Senator Joseph Benson Foraker has withdrawn from participation in the Ohio state campaign, and has cancelled all his speaking engagements. The senator in his address last week made plain his opposition to the 'new nationalism' described by Theodore Roosevelt, describing it as 'treason.' This brought on heated replies from the stump, and the controversy had taken first place in the state campaign so far as newspaper attention was concerned. In a telephone message to Chairman Charles Craig of the Erie county central committee, Mr. Foraker announced that the state committee had requested him to modify his speeches; that he would make them as he chose or not speak at all, and that therefore he would cancel his Sandusky, O., address, scheduled for tomorrow, as well as all his other speaking dates."

A COLUMBUS, Ohio, dispatch says: "After receiving a telegram from Senator Foraker, cancelling his Sandusky speech, Chairman Craig sought by telephone to induce the former senator to change his mind, but he refused. Chairman Laylan of the state executive committee said the committee had 'cancelled none of Foraker's engagements.' It was learned, however, that the state committee had been deluged with protests from republicans against Foraker's participation in the campaign as a result of his speech at Marysville."

IN ONE OF Senator Foraker's objectionable speeches he said: "The republican party is not only fighting for victory, but it is fighting for life. It is beset by foes both within and without. No issue can be made on the ten commandments, no matter how strenuously or how officiously they may be laid down as governing principles. We have lately had a new declaration of political principles. They are politically baptised as the doctrine of a new nationalism. They are set forth in the nature of a platform for a new party. Possibly they are intended for that use only in the event that the distinguished author be nominated for the presidency by either of the old parties. Such a preachment is not nationalism, either new or old, but imperialism, pure and simple. It is, in spirit at least, as treasonable as secession itself. No wonder W. J. Bryan cries out in amazement against it. In his wildest flights he has never suggested anything approximating such a program. The people now better understand the author and know better how to judge what he proposes. There is ground for hope now that what he proposes will not be accepted as a matter of course, but only if found to be safe and sound. This will be better for him and better for us. It will lessen his multitudinous duties and stop the work of driving into retirement, as reactionary, every great leader who does not subscribe on sight to his fantastic vagaries."

SENATOR LAFOLLETTE pays to the late Senator Dolliver the following tribute: "In mid-career, his star of destiny still in the ascendant, Senator Jonathan P. Dolliver was called by death. It came in the hour of his country's need; at a time when the cause of the people calls for the best leadership, the largest minds, the truest hearts. In Dolliver this cause had a powerful champion. His matchless abilities were consecrated to the common good. The shadow of his loss rests upon every home in the land. Dolliver was cast in a rare mold. He had the attributes of greatness. Few men have possessed his commanding intellect, his brilliant eloquence, his genial satire, his sensitive conscience, his wholesome morality. A prodigious worker, a masterful debater, a courageous fighter, he was a host in himself in the

present struggle for political justice. Intellectually honest and instinctively democratic, he rebelled against the dishonest, undemocratic exploitation of the people in the name of republicanism. When he hurled his protests into the very stronghold of the system, he made the nation listen; and hearing him was to be convinced. His unerring penetration of the disguises thrown around big business statesmanship made the old leaders tremble. Yet Dolliver held no grudges. He harbored no animosities. His political course was steered by principle; not by personalities. He was deeply respected by his opponents; he was loved, as men are seldom loved, by his associates and friends. A great leader, a splendid statesman, is gone. But the impress he has left upon the thought and aspirations of mankind is indelible. Dolliver is dead. But the soul of him lives in people's hearts wherever men are striving for freedom. Dolliver's voice is stilled. But the spirit that spoke through it is the spirit of brotherhood and righteousness, and is enduring."

CHAMP CLARK has a son who is a chip off the old block. A Montgomery City, Mo., dispatch to the New York World says: "Bennet Clark, the young and brilliant son of Champ Clark, democratic minority leader, is attracting attention in this Ninth congressional district because of the fact that he has taken the stump and has been debating political questions with Judge Reuben E. Roy, who is Champ Clark's republican opponent for congress. It is stated that Bennett is making forcible arguments in favor of his father's return to congress, and his friends think that he is certain to be heard from, not only because of the fact that he is a Champ Clark chip, but for the reason that he is educated, polished and a well posted young man, who has taken advantage of the opportunities which the official life of his father has given him during the early manhood. Here is the way Mr. Clark and his son size up the political questions of the day from a democratic standpoint. They believe the democratic party should and will, if given the chance, make this country and its government models for the world."

ASSUMING THAT Theodore Roosevelt really has the 1912 bee in his bonnet, the Sioux City (Ia.) Journal, a standpat republican paper asks, "What effect will the result of the present New York campaign have upon that future?" The Journal says that all practical politicians believe that Mr. Roosevelt has the bee and adds: "No practical politician will deny that a Roosevelt victory in New York this fall—for that is what a republican victory would be—must supply the Roosevelt headgear with a large feather that might offer a cosy resting place for the bee during the next two years. Before the colonel took charge of the republican party in New York a democratic victory was looked upon as practically certain. The colonel, making a rather late start, seized control of the state convention, nominated the ticket, secured a harmony platform and took unto himself the party organization. Presently he will be in the thick of the campaign, directing the fighting. Should victory crown his efforts it will be a triumph for the Roosevelt leadership in the great state of New York, and a guaranty that Roosevelt can do what he pleases with his state in 1912. This certainly would offer encouragement to Roosevelt supporters elsewhere to argue that Roosevelt is the man to do for the republican party in the nation in 1912 what he did for the party in his own state in 1910, namely, strengthen and harmonize it on progressive lines and bring victory within its reach. But suppose republican defeat instead of victory shall follow the Roosevelt activity in New York this fall—what then? Will the absence of a conspicuous feather in the Roosevelt cap deprive the bee of any possible resting place? Colonel Roosevelt's bitterest opponents in the Empire state seem to be proceeding on the theory that a good licking administered to the Roosevelt ticket this fall will put the colonel down and out. They

will be prepared to contend that the outcome is an object lesson that New York will not follow the Roosevelt leadership, and a warning to the country that similar disaster may be expected in the nation at large, if the party is so foolish as to put all its eggs in the Roosevelt basket. Colonel Roosevelt will be urged to accept the logic of his first defeat and retire to a comfortable couch near a window of the Down and Out club. Will the colonel accept the situation as thus outlined and the advice so tendered? It is feared the old guard is over-optimistic in concluding that the colonel can be so easily disposed of. If the bee is now nestling somewhere in the crease of that familiar stetson, there is, as a matter of fact, no reason why it should not continue to nestle there regardless of the lack of opportunity to take a conspicuous perch on a tail feather. If the Roosevelt ticket shall be defeated on November 8 next is it to be supposed that the colonel will cheerfully accept responsibility for the failure? It is not possible to imagine him in so humble a role. It is, however, possible to imagine him charging the old guard with responsibility for the defeat, and taking a solemn vow to lick the old guard to a frazzle at the very first opportunity, which will come, of course, in 1912."

THE BIG TRUST cases in the United States supreme court are not to be decided before election day. An Associated Press dispatch from Washington says: "Because of the failure to have a full bench in the supreme court of the United States, general readjustment of important cases set last spring for consideration in the autumn was made today by the court. The Standard Oil and the tobacco corporation suits under the Sherman anti-trust law were postponed for rehearing from November 14 to January 3. The corporation tax cases were assigned for argument on January 3. So were the cases involving the question of the separate penalty to be imposed on violators of the twenty-eight hour law, regulating the shipment of live stock and the interpretation of the national pure food and drug act. It is expected that successors to Chief Justice Fuller and Justice Moody will have taken their places by that time. The importance of the questions involved also led the court to postpone until January a number of cases set for argument today. The boycott and contempt appeals, arising out of the injunction proceedings in the District of Columbia brought against the American Federation of Labor by the Bucks Stove and Range company of St. Louis, were reassigned for January 16. Samuel Gompers, president of the federation; Frank Morrison and John Mitchell, also officials of the organization, all under sentences to jail for contempt, were in court. The Kissel case, involving the question as to whether or not the American Sugar Refining company and others conspired to prevent the Pennsylvania Sugar Refining company from doing business, was postponed until November 10, on account of illness of counsel. The cases involving the constitutionality of the employers' liability law were resumed for argument on November 28. Attempts to postpone consideration of the cases involving the peonage prosecutions from Florida and the Missouri two-cent fare law was unsuccessful. The argument of the former was begun today. The latter will be heard probably this week."

INFORMATION WANTED

A. S. Tubbs, Lemmon, S. D.—Can you tell me who is the author of the following lines:

"I'm tired of sailing my little boat
Far inside the harbor bar,
I want to be out where the big ships float,
Out on the deep where the great ones are.
And if my frail craft prove too slight,
Better go down in the stirring fight
Than drowse to death on the sheltered shore."

An answer through your columns, or direct, will be satisfactory if you have the information at hand.