

may enable many well meaning men to correct themselves, it will be the part of democrats and republicans who do see clearly, to lead their brethren out of the dark.

One may find republicans everywhere who denounce Aldrich in the senate, Cannon in the house, Ballinger in the cabinet, yet insist that they are the faithful followers of Mr. Taft. Even some of the insurgents have protested that they are devoted to the "Taft policies" and that their fight is not against the Taft administration. Why can not these people see, as many ordinary citizens do, that Mr. Taft is the faithful political associate of Senator Aldrich? Have they not co-operated in the formation of national policies and was it not Mr. Taft who, in his speech at Boston, described the Rhode Island senator as a faithful servant of the people upon whose counsels they could confidently rely? Is he not the political associate of Speaker Cannon? Did he not assist in preventing a stampede from Cannon in the re-election of Cannon as speaker and in the maintenance of Cannonism in the rules of the house? Has he not, in his special messages, advocated those policies which the trust magnates and the railway leaders favor, particularly the policy of concentrating control over the railroads through the central court at Washington and the policy of destroying the states' authority over corporations through centralization by way of national incorporation? Has he not upheld the hands of Ballinger, decorating him with one of the highest honors the president has to bestow, exerting his efforts to prevent any investigation of Ballinger's official conduct and discharging Glavis and Pinchot, who were exerting their efforts to protect the people from the evils which the Ballinger policies would bring upon them?

If one-half of what republican papers like the North American have charged against Aldrich and Cannon and Ballinger be true then Mr. Taft should have been able to recognize some of the wrong doing.

If he is really so blind that he could not see, surely there should be among the several members of his cabinet, at least one man who could tell him the truth.

But whether it be a case of a blind man in the White House leading a cabinet full of blind men, or a president and cabinet members who prefer not to see, choosing the cause of men who stand for special interests and seeking to put the brand of infamy upon men who stand for public interests—whether it be woeful ignorance or deliberate wickedness, the time for revolt among patriotic men in the republican party is at hand.

#### WHY NOT HIGHER UP?

Four employes of the sugar trust have been sent to jail. The sentence of each of these men was for one year. The sugar scandals showed that frauds on a large scale had been carried on to the great financial advantage of the sugar trust. Surely the employes who helped to carry out these frauds did not devise the plans for robbery from pure anxiety to see their employers flourish. Surely the already rich men who grew richer through these bad practices had something to do with the frauds; yet they are to escape while four employes go to prison.

It was so in the insurance frauds. The investigation of those frauds brought fame to Lawyer Hughes and made him governor of New York. Although enormous frauds were uncovered the rich and influential insurance magnates went scot free while an obscure clerk received a prison sentence.

Will the American people ever have such an administration of public affairs that they will not be treated to a lot of buncombe as an excuse for the non-enforcement of criminal law?

Does it not seem reasonable to believe that they will never have such an enforcement of the law so long as they surrender the reins of government to a political party that is financed by the monopolists?

#### DROP PRETENSE

The following is taken from a statement issued by the house insurgents:

"In the effort to beloud the real issue, an unfair and malicious attempt is being made to represent us as opposed to President Taft's administration and policies. There is not even a semblance of truth in this accusation. Without exception we are firm supporters of republican doctrines and President's Taft's administration."

It would seem that the time for self-deception

is past. If these insurgents are to be of service to their constituents they must recognize that many of Mr. Taft's policies are pure and simple Aldrichism and must be opposed by men who stand for the public interests.

The excitement over the Pinchot dismissal was so intense that some republicans failed to attach to the recommendations in the president's special message, the importance they deserved; they failed to recognize the revolution in our system which these recommendations carried into effect would bring about.

Have they not already learned that these recommendations have the approval of the trust magnates and the railroad presidents of the country? Do they not see that in the senate Stephen B. Elkins, recognized as one of the foremost spokesmen for the railroad trust, is likewise the president's spokesman so far as concerns his proposed amendments to the interstate commerce law?

Every republican insurgent and every democratic democrat in America must, sooner or later, drop polite pretense and fight Aldrichism and Cannonism in the White House just as vigorously as they fight those evils in the capitol building. And they must fight Aldrichism and Cannonism in their party—in both of the great parties—for the foul blight of those mighty evils has fallen upon some who claim to be democrats as well as upon some who claim to be republicans.

#### NOT MR. BRYAN

The New York Herald quotes the New Orleans Times-Democrat as saying:

"The plan of national incorporation, like many another of the reforms or regulatory measures urged by the Roosevelt administration, was proposed some years ago by Mr. Bryan. Its value depends almost entirely, of course, upon the terms of the law which is to give it effect. With the measure rigged in the monopolistic interest, it might easily prove dangerous. But there is reason to believe that the adequate and effective regulation of the great corporations will at last be secured by a system of national incorporation, though it may not follow the exact lines sketched by the president."

National incorporation did not originate with Mr. Bryan or with any other democrat. The Times-Democrat has national incorporation confused with the federal license proposition as advocated by Mr. Bryan. National incorporation would destroy the state's power over corporations doing business within the state's borders. Federal license would simply mean that a federal remedy would be added to, not substituted for, state remedies.

#### HUMAN NATURE A FACTOR

The Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, in attempting to defend the policy of taxing raw material is guilty of an amusing misjudgment of human nature, as well as of an inexcusable misrepresentation of Mr. Bryan's position. It says:

"It is absolutely true that free raw materials under a protective system would strengthen the hold of that system, add to the advantage given the manufacturers and lift not one particle of the burden from the shoulders of the consumers. It is true also that if the south should voluntarily give up the few duties that protect its products this surrender would strengthen the hold on protection of products that the South buys."

"To illustrate our view, let us suppose the case of two men. One owns timber and has a saw-mill, and the other owns sheep and clips wool. The sheep owner is in favor of a tariff on wool, but he thinks a tariff on lumber an outrage. So long as a high duty is kept on lumber he has a prospect of becoming an opponent of the protective system, because it hurts him as well as helps him. Repeal the tax on lumber, and does he reciprocate by proposing a repeal of the tariff on wool? Not a bit of it. The tariff has ceased to hurt him, and he regards it now as a beneficent system. He will stick to protection through thick and thin, for it helps him, and does not hurt him. When the tariff on lumber is repealed all hope of securing the assistance of this man in the fight on protection is given up."

In the first place it ignores the fact that the platform proposed by Mr. Bryan calls for a greater reduction in the tariff on manufactured products than it does in the tariff on raw material. There is no thought of giving the manufacturer MORE benefit; free raw material is for the benefit of the consumer as the Times-Union would see if it read the platform which

Mr. Bryan has presented for the consideration of democratic candidates for congress.

But misrepresentation is not unusual and it remains to be seen whether the Times-Union will retract its misrepresentations or prove by persisting in them that the misrepresentation was intended. The more interesting part of the Times-Union's editorial, however, is its misunderstanding of human nature. It argues that it is wrong to take the tariff off of lumber for fear the sheep raiser will then lose his interest in tariff reform. That is sophistry. In the first place there are comparatively few sheep owners while all the people use lumber and it is not fair to tax the people who use lumber merely to coerce a few sheep-raisers.

But the fact is you can not coerce wool growers in that way. While they can collect 40 per cent on wool they will consent to a tax on lumber. Who ever heard of a wool growers association demanding a reduction of the tax on anything? The protected industries stand together. A few get a tariff on wool, a few get a tariff on lumber and the few who enjoy special benefits combine against the many who bear the burden. When we remove the tariff on wool the sheep growers will become interested in tariff reform—and not before. So when we remove the tariff on lumber the lumber men will help to reduce the tariff on other things.

Any one who understands human nature knows that you can not increase the number of tariff reformers by spreading the benefits of protection among a larger number.

#### HOW LONG?

Away back in 1902 David B. Henderson, then speaker of the house of representatives, wrote a letter to Mr. Birge, a prominent republican and merchant of Keokuk, Ia., saying:

"There is a storm brewing in the mind of the average American as to existing conditions, and the congressman who fails to realize this will find himself in the near future relegated to the shade of home life. I find many intelligent republicans who feel as I do, that the time has come when it is the business of the republican party to look the whole question squarely in the face and to lower the protective tariff to its legitimate ends, that it shall be no longer prohibitory."

Later Mr. Henderson declined to be a candidate for re-election and in his letter of declination he said that he found many republicans in his district in favor of putting trust-made articles on the free list as a remedy for private monopolies. Being opposed to that remedy he said he preferred to retire to private life rather than strike such a blow at the system of protection.

It will be seen that away back in 1902 even Mr. Henderson, who retired from public life rather than strike a blow at the system of protection, realized that the time had come when the republican party must "lower the protective tariff to its legitimate ends that it shall be no longer prohibitory." Since then there have been two presidential campaigns. In the first one the republican party escaped without being required seriously to face its tariff record, in the next one, however, public sentiment was so strong that the republican leaders found it necessary to promise tariff revision. Again the republican party won and it "redeemed" its promise by enacting a tariff law that in its net results is an increase over the tariff law against which even Mr. Henderson protested and from which the republican party, in 1908, promised to give the people relief.

Is it possible that in the light of history intelligent republicans, having no axes to grind, can look to the republican party for relief from tariff exactions?

#### PRIVILEGE WITHOUT RESPONSIBILITY

Judge Munger in suspending the Nebraska guarantee of deposits law presents two reasons for holding the law unconstitutional; first, because it requires banks to contribute to each other's losses; second, because it forbids individuals from doing a banking business. The judge holds that enforced participation in losses is a taking of property without due process of law. While we must await the decision of the United States supreme court before we know whether this is to be regarded as law or merely as a valueless personal opinion it is not out of place to suggest that the requirement appeared reasonable to a large number of persons—in fact, to a majority of the voters of the state of Nebraska—and The Commoner submits that the reasons upon which the people based their opin-