

FORAKER'S SIN WAS IN BEING FOUND OUT

In July, 1907, Taft Wrote That He Would Not Compromise With Foraker Because of Foraker's Affiliations and in September, 1908, the Two Men "Harmonized Their Differences"—But When the Standard Oil Letters Are Made Public Foraker is Abandoned

In his statement printed in the newspapers of Tuesday, September 22, Mr. Roosevelt presented a letter, which it is alleged Mr. Taft wrote on July 20, 1907. The name of the gentleman to whom this letter was written is not given but Mr. Roosevelt said that it was to one of Mr. Taft's friends in Ohio. In that letter Mr. Taft said: "I don't care for the presidency if it has to come by compromise with Senator Foraker;" also: "It is not on my part a question of personal feeling with respect to Senator Foraker. It is really a question of political principle."

Now that it has been shown to the public that Senator Foraker had dealings with the Standard Oil trust, this July 20, 1907, letter of Mr. Taft's is printed in the hope of persuading the American people that Mr. Taft is thoroughly devoted to the public interests.

LOOK AT THE RECORD

But let us take a look at the record between July 20, 1907—the date upon which it is said Mr. Taft wrote a letter declaring he would not compromise with Foraker—and Tuesday, September 22, 1908, the date upon which Mr. Roosevelt made the Taft letter public.

Just twenty days prior to the Roosevelt statement, Taft and Foraker met at Toledo, Ohio, and it was announced that their differences were at an end. From that moment until the Standard Oil letters to Foraker were made public, republican papers were filled with congratulations upon the fact that harmonious relations had been established between Foraker and Taft.

CONGRATULATIONS ON THE COMPROMISE

Some of the newspaper comments upon the Taft-Foraker compromise at Toledo, will be interesting.

The Baltimore American (rep.) said that the settlement of the Taft-Foraker differences "assures such a sweeping majority" as will "over top most likely even the magnificent plurality which Ohio gave Roosevelt in 1904."

The Pittsburg Chronicle-Telegraph (rep.) said: "The way is now clear for the rolling up of such a majority for Mr. Taft as Ohio rightfully owes to her favorite son."

The Chicago Post, however, an independent republican paper, did not become enthusiastic over the Taft-Foraker settlement. The Post said: "The west will have some difficulty in forgetting that the Ohioan alone of all the republicans in the senate voted against railroad rate legislation. It also will have some trouble in washing from the memory recollections of the fact that pretty nearly everything Mr. Roosevelt suggested in the way of legislation was anathematized by Mr. Foraker."

The Boston Herald, a Taft organ, printed this illuminating editorial:

"The 'reconciliation' between Mr. Taft and Senator Foraker is everywhere commented upon as an incident which will greatly strengthen the republican ticket in Ohio. But 'reconciliation' is hardly the right word. There has been no personal quarrel between these two eminent men, whatever may have been the case with some of their supporters. And there is nothing new in the announcement that Senator Foraker will heartily support the republican ticket. He announced that fact himself months ago when he said that he would abide by whatever decision the Chicago convention might make. He repeated it as soon as the convention had nominated Mr. Taft. One of the first messages of congratulation received by Mr. Taft, immediately after his nomination, was from Senator Foraker. And no one who knows the senator ever supposed that he would give less than his hearty and whole support to his party's nominee for the presidency. Matters remain where they were, with this difference: while Senator Foraker yields nothing in the courageous stand he has so long maintained for independence of thought and action in the upper chamber of congress, and while Mr. Taft, as a candidate for

the presidency, abstains from taking any side on the question of Senator Foraker's re-election, the public has had an outward, visible demonstration that the presidential candidate and the senior senator from Ohio understand each other very well, are on cordial terms, and that any idea there may have been that Mr. Taft would lend himself to the 'elimination' of Senator Foraker is eliminated."

That harmony meeting took place at the Grand Army reunion, in Toledo, Ohio, September 2, 1908.

The Associated Press reports of that day tell the story of how Taft and Foraker met, clasping hands in full sight of the audience and greeting one another like old time friends.

Did that look as though Mr. Taft was NOT willing to compromise with Foraker when Foraker was strong and powerful and had votes to deliver? But let it be remembered that when Taft clasped hands with Foraker at Toledo, THE STANDARD OIL LETTERS TO FORAKER HAD NOT BEEN MADE PUBLIC.

Did Foraker's sin, in the eyes of the republican candidate for president, consist in being found out?

Before these Standard Oil letters to Foraker had been made public several meetings had been arranged for Cincinnati, Ohio, on Tuesday, September 22. It had been arranged that at the evening meeting where Mr. Taft was to be the principal speaker, Senator Foraker was to preside. And republican papers all over the country were filled with articles congratulating the party that TAFT AND FORAKER HAD COMPROMISED THEIR DIFFERENCES.

Did that look as though Mr. Taft was NOT willing to compromise with Foraker when Foraker was strong and powerful and had votes to deliver? But let it be remembered that when Mr. Taft consented that Senator Foraker should preside at his Cincinnati meeting, THE STANDARD OIL LETTERS TO FORAKER HAD NOT BEEN MADE PUBLIC.

But when Taft clasped hands with Foraker at Toledo and consented that Foraker should preside at Taft's big meeting at Cincinnati, was he ignorant of Senator Foraker's trust affiliations? We have it upon the authority of the president of the United States that TAFT WAS NOT IGNORANT. If, on July 20, 1907, Taft really wrote the letter attributed to him, then MORE THAN ONE YEAR BEFORE THE STANDARD OIL LETTERS WERE MADE PUBLIC, TAFT KNEW OF FORAKER'S TRUST AFFILIATIONS. Yet he joined in the Taft-Foraker harmony meet at Toledo, and later consented that Mr. Foraker should be the presiding officer of the Taft meeting at Cincinnati.

But let it be remembered that when Taft clasped hands with Foraker at Toledo and when Taft consented that Foraker should preside at Taft's Cincinnati meeting, THE STANDARD OIL LETTERS TO FORAKER HAD NOT BEEN MADE PUBLIC.

Now that Foraker's relations with the Standard Oil trust have been made so clear that the people may no longer be deceived, the Taft-Foraker harmony is off; Mr. Foraker retires as chairman of Mr. Taft's meeting; and the president of the United States, acting as Mr. Taft's campaign manager, prints a letter which shows—if it shows anything at all—that Mr. Taft knew it all the time; and it shows also, in the light of his subsequent action, that Taft was willing to compromise with Foraker when Foraker was strong and powerful and had the votes to deliver.

FORAKER'S SIN WAS IN BEING FOUND OUT

At the Toledo, Ohio, meeting Mr. Taft, in the opening of his speech, spoke as follows: "It is a great pleasure for me to meet the gentlemen who are here. The chairman of the meet-

ing said I have filled several offices almost without reward, but as Senator Foraker whispered to me, there are some who would accept them on the same terms. It is a great pleasure for me to be here with Senator Foraker, because when governor he gave me what was really my first chance and took a good deal of risk in putting a man of twenty-nine years in the superior court of Cincinnati. We are in a great electoral campaign and it is a pleasure to think in this presence that we are going to stand in the campaign shoulder to shoulder with the full strength of the republican party."

The Independent (New York), a Taft supporter, in its issue of September 10, in referring to the meeting between Messrs. Taft and Foraker, said:

"The meeting and the addresses are regarded as of political importance, showing that there will be no feud in the republican party in Ohio, and that the Taft wing of the party will favor the re-election of Mr. Foraker to the senate, although Mr. Taft has consistently refused to take part in the divisions in the state. After Mr. Taft and Mr. Foraker had spoken Senator Dick made an address strongly supporting the re-election of Mr. Foraker."

The Indianapolis News (Ind. rep.) said: "FORAKER IS REPUDIATED—AFTER HE WAS EXPOSED. COX IS STILL 'IN LINE' FOR TAFT. So we submit that the PRESIDENT'S ARGUMENT DOES NOT REACH—that TAFT'S LETTER of a YEAR AGO DOES NOT MEET the ISSUE. What the people want to know is what his RELATIONS WITH THESE MEN ARE NOW, not what HE THOUGHT OF THEM IN JULY, 1907."

THE INCREASING CONCERN OF THE PRESIDENT

The Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, (ind. dem.) prints an editorial entitled "Increasing concern of the president." That editorial follows:

To fail to elect Mr. Taft would be a calamity to the country.—President Roosevelt to Congressman McKinley.

Calamity, a grievous or widespread misfortune or disaster.—Standard Dictionary.

President Roosevelt thinks it would be a "calamity to the country" were Taft defeated and Bryan elected to the White House. So firm is he in this belief that he writes a letter to the public and addresses it to an Illinois member of congress.

Nothing could be worse logic or poorer reasoning than this medieval plea that the safety of the country depends on the success of either the one candidate or the other. Business interests of every section agree that the election of Mr. Bryan would not mean disaster; regardless of which of the two leading candidates wins at the polls, the country will move on just the same. The Bryan bugaboo was exploded twelve years ago. Then the president might have found listeners to his plea that democratic success meant "calamity;" but today the voter scoffs at such statements and wonders what it is that has so badly scared the occupant of the White House.

A week ago the president, in writing the public through the person of a Montana ranchman, said he had "a peculiar interest in the success" of Mr. Taft, but he said nothing about a threatened "calamity." What occurred during the week to accentuate the importance of the issue in the presidential mind? In his next letter how will the possible defeat of Mr. Taft be characterized? What is the superlative of "calamity?" The president should be more saving of his ammunition, lest it be exhausted before the real battle begins.

What is imperatively required is a revision of the tariff such as will modify the rates, or, better still, place upon the free list all foreign goods that are the subject of domestic monopoly.—Philadelphia Ledger.