

# Hughes Would Have Recognized Huerta

"When the administration (Wilson's) came into power, Huerta was exercising authority as provisional president of Mexico. He was certainly in fact the head of the government of Mexico. . . . We make no defense of Huerta. But the administration had nothing to do with the moral character of Huerta if in fact he represented the GOVERNMENT of Mexico. We shall never worthily prosecute our unselfish aims or serve humanity by wrong-headedness."

Thus, in the language quoted above, does Candidate Hughes assail President Wilson for refusing to recognize Huerta. According to Mr. Hughes, Huerta represented the GOVERNMENT of Mexico and therefore he must be recognized regardless of his moral character or the methods employed to secure the place. Here is an issue which the people can easily understand, and when they understand it they will support the President.

Huerta was the head of the army under President Madero. Felix Diaz wanted to overthrow Madero and install himself as president. He met Huerta by appointment at the American embassy, THEN IN CHARGE OF ONE OF THOSE "EXPERIENCED" REPUBLICAN DIPLOMATS OF WHOSE REMOVAL MR. HUGHES COMPLAINS. There a program was arranged whereby Huerta was to SEIZE AND IMPRISON PRESIDENT MADERO (assassination followed) and become provisional president and Diaz was to be permitted to be a candidate at the following election.

The conspiracy was carried out by an act of high treason on the part of Huerta, and then he either caused or permitted the assassination of Madero and the vice-president, so that the way was open for his capture of the presidency. He wired President Taft, "I have overthrown this government." He then proceeded to coerce the congress into going through the farce of selecting him provisional president, and later deposed congress and assumed and exercised as complete a despotism as was ever set up. Afterwards he went through the form of conducting an election and electing himself.

THIS IS THE RED-HANDED TYRANT WHOM MR. HUGHES WOULD HAVE RECOGNIZED AS THE HEAD OF A NEIGHBOR REPUBLIC. Huerta represented the "GOVERNMENT," but not THE PEOPLE, just as a horse thief may represent a stolen horse, but not right or justice. And who desired the recognition of Huerta? The EXPLOITERS, MEXICAN AND FOREIGN. They were as indifferent as Mr. Hughes to the bloody and traitorous methods employed, and as indifferent to the interests and wishes of the people whom both Huerta and the exploiters ignored.

The American people will prefer the so-called "wrong-headedness" of the President to complacency of a candidate who would overlook both morals and the principles of representative government in order to give the exploiters a "strong" man to kill off all who protested against the rape of their government and the spoliation of their country.

W. J. BRYAN.

## "FORCE ACCOMPLISHES NOTHING PERMANENT"

"Force accomplishes nothing permanent," says the President, and the Chicago Tribune goes into editorial convulsions. By the way, the Tribune might tell its readers what effect the intervention which it advocates would have on sisal in Yucatan, and what interest the Tribune has in the Harvester trust and binding twine.

THOMAS. M. PATTERSON

In the death of Hon. Thomas M. Patterson of Colorado the nation loses one of its ablest and most courageous public men, the democratic party one of its wisest and most trusted advisers, the west one of its most devoted friends and champions, and Mr. Bryan one of his most esteemed personal and political friends. The passing of beloved co-laborers is the darkest shadow that clouds political life. The Commoner extends its condolence to the bereaved family of the deceased.

W. J. BRYAN.

## HUERTA'S TELEGRAM TO TAFT

Mexico City, February 18, 1913.  
(Via Galveston.)

His Excellency, the President of the United States, Wm. H. Taft, Washington, D. C.

I have the honor to inform you that I have overthrown this government. The forces are with me and from now on peace and prosperity will reign.

Your obedient servant,  
VICTORIANO HUERTA,  
Commander-in-chief.

## DIPLOMATS NOT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. Hughes charges this administration with appointing "inexperienced" democrats in the place of "experienced" republicans, and promises that he will never, no never, be guilty of such reprehensible conduct. Let it be remembered: 1st. That AMBASSADORS AND MINISTERS ARE NOT UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE. Their resignations are constructively in the hands of the President. 2nd. These positions can not be put under the civil service without an indefensible aping of the monarchical system. No civil service examination will disclose whether a man has the discretion necessary for such a position, and training as secretary does not necessarily develop it.

3d. The diplomatic official is the personal representative of the President in his dealing with foreign countries, and it is much more important that he shall be loyal to the administration and in sympathy with its policy than he shall be experienced in court customs. He can soon learn the social customs of the court to which he goes, but he can not soon acquire loyalty to a president of the opposite party, or sympathy with his policy.

If Mr. Hughes is elected it will not take him long to accept the resignation of democrats and appoint republicans in sympathy with the new president and his dollar diplomacy.

It must be remembered that after sixteen years of republican rule President Wilson found diplomatic service full of republicans, appointed for political service rendered. Neither reason nor precedent required him to make these unsympathetic men his personal representatives to carry out his policies.

If it ever occurs to Mr. Hughes to be fair he might give a list of the republicans holding prominent diplomatic positions and the reason for their appointment, together with a record of their diplomatic experience before appointment. Why was Mr. Reid appointed to London, Mr. Leishman to Berlin, Mr. Herrick to Paris, Mr. Kerens to Vienna and Mr. Guild to St. Petersburg? W. J. BRYAN.

The national publicity bureau of the republican party says that if it is possible to secure an adjournment of congress before the passage of the proposition involving government ownership of certain lines of business "the American people will see to it that business men are placed in charge and that government activities are confined to proper functions of government." Which, we assert, is a rather bald declaration that if the republicans are again given the reins the old ideas of Mark Hanna will again be in effect. How do the plain folks like that arrangement?

If one were to place entire faith in the interviews with those manufacturers who insist that a restoration of the old Payne-Aldrich tariffs is necessary, he would feel that their entire concern was about the poor factory workers; but if he heard what they say to their congressmen on the subject they would gain the impression that it was their business that was going to rack and ruin because the government has stopped subsidizing them.

Copies of The Commoner may be secured by individuals or campaign committees where desired for free distribution as campaign literature at the special rate of 2 1/2 c per copy, and will be mailed in bulk to one address or to separate addresses.

# The Income Tax Amendment

The taxation of incomes is possible because of an amendment to the federal constitution, adopted in 1913, specifically authorizing such a tax, and the democratic party deserves a large part of the credit for securing the adoption of this amendment. The revenue law of 1894, passed by the democratic congress, contained an income tax provision, a flat rate of two per cent being assessed against all incomes in excess of \$4,000.00.

This law was declared unconstitutional by a divided court—5 to 4—one judge changing his decision between the two hearings of the case. In 1896 the democratic platform declared in favor of an income tax and the demand was repeated in 1900 and 1908. The platform of 1908 demanded an amendment to the constitution specifically authorizing an income tax. The republican platforms during those campaigns were silent on the subject and in the campaign of 1908 the republican candidate announced his opposition to an amendment, giving as his reason that IT WAS NOT NECESSARY. He contended that an income tax, if needed, could be collected by a statute properly drawn. The republican candidate was elected and then followed a peculiar situation which illustrates the influence of unexpected circumstances. The democrats in the senate took the president at his word and prepared an income tax amendment to the Aldrich bill and secured the support of enough progressives to insure its adoption. To defeat a STATUTORY income tax, Senator Aldrich prevailed upon President Taft to recommend the VERY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT WHICH HE HAD DECLARED UNNECESSARY, and the democrats, already committed to an amendment, accepted this solution of the situation and the amendment was submitted.

The republican leaders did not expect the amendment to be ratified. President Taft made no effort to secure ratification, and the PRESENT REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE, MR. HUGHES, THEN GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK, SENT A MESSAGE TO THE LEGISLATURE PROTESTING AGAINST RATIFICATION. But, to the surprise of republican leaders, the states ratified the amendment and it is now a part of the constitution, its validity being attested by a unanimous decision of the supreme court. Here is a great reform which has made it possible to transfer a large per cent of federal taxation from consumption to incomes—from the overburdened masses to those who have been escaping their fair share of the expense of government.

The democratic party, having labored to secure the amendment, has been prompt to take the advantage of the opportunity it offers to do justice to the common people in the matter of taxation. Surely the democratic party deserves the gratitude of the public for its sturdy defense of their rights and interests. PRESIDENT WILSON, THEN GOVERNOR OF NEW JERSEY, WAS ONE OF THE STATE EXECUTIVES WHO OFFICIALLY URGED THE RATIFICATION OF THE INCOME TAX AMENDMENT.

W. J. BRYAN.

Big business is always sensitive to profits, and they say that big business is against Wilson. Big Business is now enjoying larger profits than it has ever had before. Any larger profits will necessarily come from the consuming classes. If big business isn't satisfied with its present profits, what protection will the consumer have if it elects its candidate for president this fall?

Those republican editors who were so very sure that the President was bent upon thrusting war upon Carranza because he believed that such a step would be necessary to insure his reelection are now writing crisp editorials to express their opinion that Mr. Wilson's peaceful solution of the Mexican problem is traceable to the President's belief that he could not be re-elected if he plunged the nation into war.

A progressive newspaper man in the market for a plant with 4,000 daily circulation, doing over \$50,000 business annually, only democratic paper in a fine county, beautiful county seat town of 8,000 population, might find just what he wants by addressing No. 144, The Commoner.