

inating a candidate against whom there is so much aggressive opposition.

Prominent representatives of the party there are who believe the first reason assigned for desiring to prevent the nomination of Mr. Taft is sufficient. Many persons believe too little attention has been paid to the use of federal power in obtaining Taft delegates. It is common knowledge among persons who have followed the events of last year that the entire federal machine, with the president of the United States at the throttle, has been used in making sure of the election of delegates who would support the administration's candidate. In the south, where the federal office-holders could not control without running roughshod over the opposition, roughshod methods were resorted to.

Practically every delegate from the south who is here asking for admission to the convention as a Taft man was chosen by a convention of officeholders. When it became necessary for the administration to resort to extreme measures Frank H. Hitchcock was taken from the office of first assistant postmaster general and placed in charge of the work of obtaining delegates in the south. Why? Because, as first assistant postmaster general, he had appointed the postmasters down there and was the one man who could successfully assemble them in conventions for the purpose of electing delegates that would come here ready to carry out the administration's bidding. More than a year ago the federal administration deliberately started out to gather in the 244 delegates from the eleven southern states for Mr. Taft—states that do not contribute one electoral vote to the election of a republican president, and yet have within one vote of 25 per cent of the votes in the national convention. The federal administration's activity in the south makes the contests from down there doubly interesting. If the national committee should stand by Mr. Hitchcock's word—if it shall say that it was right and proper for the office-holders to dictate the election of delegates—Mr. Taft's chance for obtaining the nomination will be greatly enhanced.

Unless all signs fail delegates from the progressive republican states of the west will want to know all about the Taft alliance with Wall Street before casting their votes in the convention. It is inevitable that there must be some explanations. Why is the Standard Oil company, the steel trust, every trust, good and bad, now for Mr. Taft? It will, in the opinion of good judges, take a lot of explaining to convince the western delegates that a deal of some sort was not made. In New York it is common talk that it was the president's promise to "take the teeth out of the Sherman anti-trust law" that brought some of the big ones over.

The administration failed to persuade congress to extract the said teeth, but from all accounts Mr. Roosevelt is determined that the national convention shall, in its platform, promise to have congress do the extracting at the next session. Somebody carried the word to the "undesirable citizens" in New York that if Mr. Taft should be nominated and elected they (the undesirable citizens) would not be molested during the next four years. There is no doubt about this. And yet, about 300 delegates were instructed to vote for Mr. Taft because he was the one man who could be depended on to carry out the Roosevelt policies. It seems worth while to remark again that some one is being fooled. Is it the "interests" in Wall Street or the progressive republicans of the central west and the far west?



THE FOURTH OF JULY

A correspondent has asked, first, what can be done to promote a movement for a more sane celebration of the Fourth of July and to correct a somewhat perverted patriotic sentiment. Second, what can be done to prepare the children and youth for the high duties of Christian citizenship. As the day approaches for the annual celebration of the Fourth of July it is well that preparation should be made for celebrations in harmony with the national sentiment that led our forefathers to set apart this day as a public holiday. Our failure to celebrate this day is not a good sign and even where it is celebrated, the fact that the celebration turns to amusements rather than to the serious contemplation of the subjects suggested by the day, this fact is likewise significant of a lack of respect for the day.

The Fourth of July is a national holiday because on that day the nation's independence was declared and it is considered as the birthday of the republic. Patriotism would suggest an appropriate celebration in every community—

a celebration at which the people would gather to bestow merited praise upon our forefathers; to discuss the fundamental principles of methods of government; to review the achievements of the past; to consider the dangers that menace the future; and to lay plans for the perpetuity of a government of the people, by the people and for the people. Amusements can be introduced in the program but the amusements ought to be incidental and not the main feature of the day. Is it not possible for the people to lay aside for at least one day out of the year their interest in material prosperity and consider the questions vitally concerning our national life and our national destiny?

When the parents commemorate the Fourth or July as they should, it will be easy to prepare the children for the duties of citizenship. We are all imitators to a greater or less extent and the children are quite sure to be impressed by the actions and conversations of their elders. The best way to prepare our children for the discharge of the high duties of citizenship is to be scrupulously careful ourselves about the discharge of the duties of citizenship. If parents are indifferent to the observance of the Fourth of July, their children are apt to be. If the parents prefer amusements on that day, the children are apt to prefer amusements, too. It is not necessary that there should be an elaborate address by a distinguished speaker, although an impressive address by one who enjoys the confidence of the people is entirely fitting. The Declaration of Independence should be read, national airs ought to be sung and those who are leaders of thought in their community ought to give expression to their views. It ought to be a day for the free exchange of sentiment and for the stimulation of thought about public questions and interest in public affairs.

The indifference with which some now speak of the vital principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence ought to lead to more zeal on the part of those who defend the Declaration of Independence. Colonialism would not have been accepted so complacently by so many had there been the interest there ought to have been in the constant discussion of the principles of free government. Imperialism would not have found the reception that it did had the Fourth of July been observed as it ought to have been observed, and the advocates of imperialism and colonialism will grow less in proportion as the people take an active interest in the perpetuation of the ideals of government that led the patriots of 1776 to promulgate the Declaration of Independence and pledge to its support their lives, their property and their sacred honor.



A PREJUDICED VIEW

Referring to Mr. Bryan's statement at the governors' meeting recently held at the White House that "Not all, but most of the contentions over the line between nation and state are traceable to predatory corporations which are trying to shield themselves from deserved punishment, or endeavoring to prevent needed restraining legislation."

Wouldn't it have been a fairer statement and more true, to have said, "Not all, but most of the contentions over the line between nation and state are traceable to the enactment of not needed, uncalled for, unfair, unjust and unconstitutional laws by incompetent and prejudiced state legislatures, under the influence of the prevalent demagoguery of office seeking leaders, and the attempt to enforce, to the extreme, part of such laws by incompetent, vote seeking state commissions, thereby compelling the owners of corporate property thus discriminated against, to appeal to the broader justice of the federal courts for their rights under the supreme law of the land."

Is it patriotism, or an appeal to the unthinking for support that impels a public man to condemn the federal courts for their protection of the rights of citizens of this republic, under its supreme law as against the enactment and attempted enforcement of laws as above referred to? (Signed) READER.

The above communication has been received at The Commoner office. The writer affixes his name to the letter, but for publication signs the name "Reader." The Commoner is glad to give "Reader" space for the expression of his opinion, not only as a matter of courtesy to him but as a matter of information to the public. He is an assistant in the office of a railroad president and represents the extreme railroad view. The language employed by him

is sufficient to convict him in any court of being so warped in his views that he holds the public in contempt and considers the public and their representatives as conspirators against the railroads.

His position is identical with that taken by many of the railroad officials in the past; they sent their lobbyists to the national and state capitols; they praised every man as a statesman whose ear was trained to catch the pulsations of a pocketbook and denounced every man as a demagogue who was against wholesale exploitation of the masses. There is evidence, however, that some of the railroad managers have seen the error of this position and now recognize the right of the people to be consulted in matters affecting the railroads. The railroad is a quasi-public corporation and it owes certain duties to its patrons. These patrons can only speak through legislation and their right to speak is no longer denied.

The men who are engaged in legitimate railroading understand that we are entering upon a new era and they have no sympathy with the opinion expressed in the above communication. Instead of characterizing the people as "unthinking;" instead of denouncing legislatures as a mob; instead of slandering state governments and state courts the fair minded man admits the iniquity of the pass, the rebate and the discrimination between people and places and proposes to meet the public in a spirit of candor and discuss the questions at issue in an open and honorable way.

Let us hope that the number of such railroad men may increase and that their influence may secure harmonious co-operation between the railroads and their patrons. The railroads are necessary to the country, but the country is no less necessary to the railroads. The railroads have helped to settle up the waste places but the settling up of the waste places has been of great advantage to the railroads.

The honest railroad managers ought to separate themselves from the exploiters and take their place on the side of the public. Anyone who holds the opinions expressed by the "Reader" above or who looks at the subject from his viewpoint can not hope to meet legislators in the spirit that is necessary for an amicable adjustment of differences.

No reformer, however violent his remedies; no agitator, however unfair his arguments has ever gone to greater length in abusing the railroads than the railroad employe signing himself "Reader" has gone in abusing the public. It is fortunate for the railroads as well as for the public that "Reader" represents the past rather than the present, the departing rather than the coming day. The wise railroad official can not fail to recognize that there has been a basis for past complaints and that the public sense of justice, which when offended has cried out for reforms, will when satisfied protect patron and stockholder alike from injustice.



MAKE THE CONSUMER PAY

The New York Herald is a republican paper likewise the Chicago Tribune. Neither the editor of the Tribune nor the editor of the Herald loses any sleep because of the exorbitant tariff. Rather than revision they have a method whereby newspaper publishers will not feel the exactions of the paper trust. Following is an editorial from the New York Herald:

"There is a deal of common sense in the advice that is given to the unhappy publishers of one-cent newspapers by Mr. Robert W. Patterson, the editor of the Chicago Tribune. Here it is, as conveyed in the Herald's special cables today from London, where the editor of our esteemed contemporary is sojourning at present, but is ready to give this kindly and helping hand to his 'one-cent' journalistic brothers in their hour of trouble: There is one remedy for publishers of one-cent newspapers who are demanding that congress should remove the duty from wood pulp and white paper. That is to raise the price of their newspapers. What could more resemble that admirable mental commodity, 'horse sense,' than this sound advice of Mr. Patterson? It indicates a direct cut across lots out of financial difficulty."



WHY?

The motto of the "National Prosperity Association" is: "Give us a rest and sunshine." It might better have used the petition of the old colored gentleman who was caught in the woods after night in a terrific thunderstorm. As the thunders rolled he begged: "Please give us less noise and more light."