

The party had not divided over a great issue, and the leaders had not been in open alliance with the enemy. No one in considering the career of Arnold would overlook the change that took place in the sentiment toward him after he became an employe of the English government, and so no rational man can review the record of those who deserted the party in 1896 without taking into consideration the change which their conduct wrought in the sentiment toward them. Whether they were honest or not is not the question. If a democrat becomes a republican he becomes unavailable for a democratic office or for the management of the party so long as he remains a republican, no matter how honest or conscientious he may be in making the change. If he returns he must give evidence of a change of heart before he will be trusted again.

Even the election of 1894, disastrous as it was, was only a feeble illustration of what may be expected if the party comes again under the leadership of those who were recreant in recent campaigns. In 1894 the party had to carry the gross iniquities of Mr. Cleveland's administration, but the men who led the party had not at that time entirely alienated the confidence of the masses by desertion. Even men who were faithful to the principles of the party went down to defeat because of the apathy aroused by Mr. Cleveland's subserviency to Wall street influences. What will be the result if the men who were loyal in 1896 and 1900 are asked to rally under the standard of those whom they distrust, and are required to surrender their deep convictions and condemn their own votes. If the party (although it polled a million more votes than ever before) could not win when 10 per cent of the members of the party were dissatisfied, how can it hope to win when 90 per cent of the members are dissatisfied? Harmony on the terms proposed, and no better terms will be proposed, means not only the abandonment of principle for the promise of success, but it means a failure to secure success—the trading of a birthright for a mess of pottage without getting the pottage. The "anything-to-win" policy is an insult to those who have convictions and it ought to be offensive even to those who have no convictions if they have political judgment.

### Why Permit This Favoritism?

In its issue of May 18th, the Chicago Tribune, republican, had an unusually interesting editorial entitled "The arrogance of wealth." The Tribune was considerably disturbed because Andrew Carnegie had offered to pay \$20,000,000 for the Philippine islands provided only that he was permitted to assure the Filipinos that they would be given their independence.

Although heretofore the Tribune has not indicated that it has lost patience with Mr. Carnegie, that paper now says that the steel magnate "has tried the patience of his friends severely in some of his late bids for notoriety." The Tribune thinks that Mr. Carnegie is constantly posing. It says he has "scattered libraries broadly through the country, all of which are to be called for him, and everyone of them is 'a contribution to the conscience fund.'" Then the Tribune explains,

Mr. Carnegie made his money in a magnificent way, but he should never forget that HE MADE IT THROUGH THE UNDUER FAVORITISM of the government of the United States. OWING TO THE DISCRIMINATION PRACTICED IN HIS FAVOR BY THE TARIFF, he was enabled to amass a fortune of two hundred millions of dollars or more, MOST OF WHICH CAME OUT OF THE POCKETS OF HIS COUNTRYMEN THROUGH THE OPERATION OF UNEQUAL LAWS. Much has been said of the benefit arising to the workmen from the establishment of the Carnegie works. The beneficent tariff system permitted the works to survive and flourish, but there are some people who have not forgotten the Homestead strike, nor

the outrageous manner in which the workmen were treated at that time by employers whose brutality has seldom been exceeded in the history of labor agitations.

It is significant that republican papers did not remind Mr. Carnegie of the source of his great fortune until that gentleman undertook to condemn an important policy of the republican party. But we think this republican paper is to be given credit for its candor, when it says that Mr. Carnegie "should never forget that he made it (his fortune) through the undue favoritism of the government of the United States."

"Undue favoritism" is good. If the Tribune's criticism of this point is true, why does not the Tribune direct its shafts at the party that gave "undue favoritism" rather than at the man who took advantage of the opportunity of enjoying the extraordinary privileges?

"Owing to the discrimination practiced in his favor by the tariff," says the Tribune, "he was enabled to amass a fortune of two hundred million dollars or more, most of which came out of the pockets of his countrymen through the operation of unequal laws."

This is exactly what the democratic party has claimed and exactly what the republican papers have denied; but why does not this republican paper direct its criticism against the republican party that practiced this discrimination and enabled a man to "amass a fortune of two hundred millions of dollars or more, most of which came out of the pockets of his countrymen through the operations of unequal laws?"

How does it happen that the Tribune continues day after day to insist that the party that provided this "undue favoritism," that practiced this "discrimination" in favor of Andrew Carnegie and other men, is the party of honesty, of patriotism, of progress?

The "undue favoritism" and the "discrimination" by which Andrew Carnegie was enabled to build up his immense fortune is being practiced today under the authority of the republican party. Why does not the Chicago Tribune condemn this undue favoritism and this discrimination? Why does it not array itself against a policy which takes millions of dollars out of the pockets of the people through the operation of unequal laws, and places these fortunes in the pockets of a few individuals who contribute liberally to the republican campaign fund?

### Roosevelt Arraigns Roosevelt

Mr. Roosevelt delivered an interesting address at the commencement exercises of Harvard university. He had much to say concerning the criticism of a number of his appointees. The substance of Mr. Roosevelt's remarks in this respect are well stated in a telegram to the Chicago Record-Herald by William E. Curtis.

Mr. Curtis reports Mr. Roosevelt as saying substantially that "it was the custom in England to reward men who did great work with titles and lands, while in this country a hero is rewarded by malignant attacks and is fortunate if he is permitted to take up the threads of business life left in a tangled condition when he responded to the call of his country."

This is the most remarkable of the many remarkable utterances made by President Roosevelt.

No attempt has been made to deprive the men to whose defense Mr. Roosevelt rushes of the credit which properly belongs to them. For certain things they have been criticised and no serious attempt has been made by the administration or the friends of these men to provide intelligent defense.

The charge against Secretary Root of keeping the people in the dark concerning the conduct of affairs in the Philippines has been amply confirmed, if confirmation were necessary, by the republican press.

General Wood was charged with using public

money for the purpose of aiding a lobby engaged in an effort to pass a certain measure through congress. Instead of denying the charge, General Wood has frankly admitted it to be true.

But what an arraignment President Roosevelt made of his own administration when he complained of the practice of "rewarding" heroes by malignant attacks.

Mr. Roosevelt would have done well to have looked at the notches on the handle of his own bright blade before he delivered this utterance.

Dewey, Miles and Schley did not receive titles, for this government had no titles to bestow; they did not receive lands, for this government had no lands to give; they did receive, and they yet retain, the love and the gratitude of the American people for their distinguished services. But what about the president who complained of the manner in which American heroes were treated? What manner of treatment did these heroes receive at the hands of Theodore Roosevelt?

Every one of these heroes has been the target for the most persistent attacks by this administration and its representatives. Dewey has been repeatedly snubbed; Miles has been repeatedly insulted and humiliated, while Schley, the man to whom the American people have given the title of "Hero of Santiago Bay," has been branded, even by Theodore Roosevelt himself, as a man who "weighed too nicely" the dangers of a great battle—a great battle, too, in which Schley was the active leader and in which he established his courage and his leadership to the satisfaction of the American people.

It requires considerable courage on the part of Mr. Roosevelt to complain, in the presence of an intelligent audience, of the manner in which heroes are treated in this country.

Wood and Taft and Root are the "heroes" to whose defense Mr. Roosevelt rushes. Whatever heroism these gentlemen may have displayed was largely shown in civil office; and while it is true that heroism may be displayed in civil office as well as upon the battle field, it seems strange, indeed, that Mr. Roosevelt is so ready to rush to the defense of the men whom he regards as heroes of civil life while he has had nothing but criticism and harsh words to apply to Dewey, Miles, and Schley, whose breasts have been bared in battle in the service of their country and whose works have been so faithful that the American people, with practically one voice, accord to them the honors to which they are entitled.

No democratic orator could have framed a more severe arraignment of Mr. Roosevelt than Mr. Roosevelt provided for himself in his speech delivered at Cambridge, Mass.

### A Campaign Expedient.

As soon as President Roosevelt returned home from his sojourn in Pittsburg the papers announced with a great flourish of trumpets that he had decided to make a vigorous attack upon the trusts.

Now?

No, after the election.

It will occur to the student of political history that it is much easier for the republican party to attack the trusts after a while than it is to attack them now. The president has been in office about nine months, and during that time congress has been in session for about six months. During all this time the trusts have flourished. They have grown, spread, declared dividends and fattened off of the people. Everybody knows of their existence—except the president and his attorney general. The steel trust has stalked abroad, suppressing competition, preying upon industry and accumulating millions by extortion, while the president hob-nobbed with its stockholders and directors, his attorney general having been the private attorney of those who exercise the largest influence in the management of the steel trust.

If the present law is sufficient to destroy the