

ment. Corruption has been brought into city politics by the attempt to effectively regulate franchised holding corporations, and city governments have been driven, as a matter of self preservation, to the ownership of the franchises. The Roosevelt policy of admitting private monopolies to exist permanently, subject to regulation, would simply end, after futile attempts at regulation, in a demand for government ownership. The socialist believes in monopoly in industry, the monopoly to be owned and operated by the government in the interests of the people. Mr. Roosevelt believes in monopoly to be owned and operated by monopolists in their own interest, but under government regulation. Mr. Taft believes in maintaining competition but is not in favor of the passage of any laws that would be effective for the purpose. Mr. Wilson believes in the absolute prevention of monopoly by laws that will make it impossible for a monopoly to exist. The democratic position, as stated and defended by Mr. Wilson, ought to commend itself to those who believe in a government of the people, administered by the people in their own interests.

PATRIOT NO. 1

Mr. Perkins, known as Patriot No. 1, says he was a patriot in 1896 when he opposed the restoration of bimetalism, and when, later, he opposed Mr. Bryan's anti-trust policies. Well, that is a matter of opinion. About six and a half millions of democrats will differ from him. But when he attempts to state as a fact that Mr. Taft carried out the democratic policy when he dissolved the oil and tobacco trusts in such a way as to LEAVE THE OWNERSHIP UNCHANGED, he showed either lack of intelligence or lack of honesty. A dissolution which leaves the same ownership is not a dissolution—it is a farce. The parts do not compete after such a dissolution—it is as much a monopoly as ever. Mr. Perkins is very stupid if he thinks this is the democratic position. The democrats say that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable—let Mr. Perkins and Mr. Roosevelt meet that proposition.

73½ PER CENT IMPURE

The testimony given before the investigating committee last week by Mr. Sheldon, treasurer of the republican national committee will put a quietus on Mr. Roosevelt's discussion of the campaign contributions collected by his committee in 1904. Mr. Sheldon testified that there were four (4) subscriptions of \$100,000.00 each from Archbold of the Standard Oil company, Morgan, Frick and Gould. These were in addition to the \$250,000 raised by Harriman. After telling of these enormous contributions Mr. Sheldon adds that 73½ per cent of Mr. Roosevelt's campaign funds came from corporations. When it is remembered that such contributions are now prohibited by a criminal law it will be seen that nearly three-fourths of all of Mr. Roosevelt's campaign funds came from sources that are at this time, legally blacklisted. No wonder that Mr. Roosevelt has not helped to secure publicity.

WILSON IN NEBRASKA

The democrats of Nebraska were delighted with Governor Wilson's speeches and he was pleased with the reception accorded him. Honors are easy.

THE BANKERS' CONFESSION

T. L. Mathews of Fremont, Neb., president of a building and loan association, and at one time United States marshal for Nebraska, delivered an address before the Nebraska Bankers' association. Mr. Mathews is a republican and in his address he said:

"J. P. Morgan has a controlling influence in financial and industrial institutions whose capitalization amounts to \$12,000,000,000. The wealth of the United States is computed at \$108,000,000,000, so you see, Mr. Morgan controls an amount equal to one-tenth of the wealth of all.

"The Wall Street Journal defines banking power as being measured by sum of capital, surplus, deposits and circulation. The 7,000 national banks have a combined banking power of \$6,000,000,000. Mr. Morgan's ownership and control of wealth, which I placed at \$12,000,000,000, therefore, just doubles the sum of the banking power of all the national banks of the United States.

"While Mr. Morgan's ownership and control is stupendous and monumental, he stands not alone as one to whom the distribution of wealth has given prominence and undue dangerous

power. Mr. Cargenie's fortune is estimated at \$500,000,000, the larger part of it made out of watered stock sold to the people; rotten armor plate sold to the government, as was proved by a congressional investigation; the protection of an uncalled for high tariff and the abuse of the men, women and children in the employ of the steel trust.

"The personal fortune of Mr. Rockefeller is estimated at \$1,000,000,000, made by stifling competition, bribery, secret rebates, violation of the laws of humanity and the laws of God. The stench of kerosene has polluted the lobby room of every legislature from Maine to Manila, and no Rockefeller foundation will ever in time or eternity atone, or compensate the debauchery of public virtue and morality and false standards it has set up.

"The offenses of the sugar trust against public morals and the laws of the land smell to heaven. Within the past few years, trusts have been found guilty and paid a penalty of \$170,000 for rebating. They have paid the government \$2,000,000 for false weights, secured by bribery, and ex-Secretary Shaw says that during his incumbency of office he estimates that they defrauded the government of \$10,000,000 annually. They have confessed to a conspiracy in offering \$750,000 to stop a suit at law. Six of its seven directors were indicted for conspiracy and the statute of limitations was all that saved them from the penitentiary.

"I would not want to say anything offensive or inject politics into this address, but I am constrained to say that a man whose coffers are filled with the spoils of the steel trust, the harvester trust and others too numerous to mention, several of which were under indictment for high crimes and misdemeanors, that man is not an ideal character to stand as godfather to a reform party whose shibboleth is, 'Thou shalt not steal.'"

USED ROOSEVELT TO BEAT LA FOLLETTE

In an article entitled, "The Presidential Candidates," Rudolph Spreckles, writing in La Follette's Magazine, says: The voters throughout the nation are facing a most trying situation and the coming presidential campaign is likely to cause much confusion in the minds of the people. A serious crisis is at hand and there is danger of the people losing much of the ground they have gained in their fight for equal justice and equal opportunity.

Men from Wall street who had gained their wealth by organizing and managing some of the most oppressive trusts turned to Colonel Roosevelt, knowing that if he could be induced to become a candidate for president at the same time as La Follette a split in the progressive republican ranks would surely follow. I make the positive assertion that Colonel Roosevelt knew as early as September, 1911, that Wall street interests would be agreeable to his candidacy, and I believe it was that knowledge more than any other single consideration that induced Roosevelt to become a candidate, for he knew better than any one else that a big campaign fund is needed to win a national election, and big business men when interested in a candidate always contribute the money needed.

From what has occurred since September, 1911, it must now be admitted that the desertion of La Follette for Roosevelt was deliberately planned by men known to be Roosevelt lieutenants. That the statements published by these men in their attempt to justify their desertion on the ground that La Follette was not physically able to continue to make the presidential campaign were accepted by so many honest progressives as true and led them to support Roosevelt is to be regretted.

Roosevelt became the progressive candidate in opposition to La Follette, the true progressive. Roosevelt obtained almost unlimited financial aid from men known to be interested in the big trusts and the press of the country gave him—the ex-president—as much or more notice than they gave Taft, the president.

By the lavish expenditure of trust-earned money, and with the publicity he secured throughout the land, a stampede from La Follette to Roosevelt was soon organized. Many prominent progressive republicans were very cunningly suggested as Roosevelt's choice for vice president. Otherwise strong men fell victims to either personal ambition or to the desire for victory at any cost. The attitude of these men resulted in dividing the progressive republican ranks and special privileged interests gained another victory over the people.

Compare the attitude of Roosevelt with that of William J. Bryan. Bryan finding the reactionaries in control of the Baltimore convention,

made the people's fight, thus putting aside any possible chance he might otherwise have had of obtaining for himself the democratic nomination for president. It was inspiring to see a man like Bryan, who has been so long a leader in his party, rise above mere personal ambition and make the fight he did for principles alone.

RADICAL OR REACTIONARY, WHICH?

Editorial in Portland Oregonian: While Roosevelt is proclaiming himself the ideal progressive and glories in his radicalism, Bryan turns upon him with a blunt denial that he is aught but a reactionary, who has taken up some of the time-worn doctrines of the veterans of progress only when they are on the eve of being put in practice. Does Roosevelt thunder forth demands for popular election of senators, income tax, regulation of railroads, publicity of campaign funds? Bryan sneeringly says:

"These things are practically secured, and the democrats have done much more than Mr. Roosevelt to secure them."

Does Roosevelt echo in louder tones Bryan's slogan of 1908: "Let the people rule?" Bryan dismisses the subject with the words:

"Mr. Roosevelt is in favor of the initiative and referendum, but no more than the democrats are, and they are state issues anyhow."

Had he desired, Bryan might have added that in his clamor for presidential primaries Roosevelt is merely indorsing the democratic platform.

As though this denial of Roosevelt's claim to pre-eminence as a radical were not cruel thrust enough, Bryan continues:

"On questions now before the national government such as tariff, trusts, national incorporation, imperialism and the third term, Mr. Roosevelt is wrong. On these subjects he is reactionary and can not secure a following among democrats—he can hardly hope to hold progressive republicans."

Bryan not only brands Roosevelt as a reactionary, but adduces strong arguments to prove the charge. He affirms that of the two ideas of government, Roosevelt holds to the "old and dying idea that a government is an organization entirely independent of the people and resting on force," and not to "our theory that governments are organizations framed by the people for themselves and derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Roosevelt, says the commoner, "would put our nation at the rear of the monarchical procession and make it a defender of the policy of force and hypocrisy." In his adherence to the policy of protection, Bryan says, the colonel stands for the doctrine of "the taxation of the many for the benefit of a few." His ideas of centralization and of expansion of the federal executive power, mean despotism with himself as the man on horseback. His desire to discard constitutional limitations is interpreted to mean:

"Away with the constitution and let us decide what the people need and then do it for them!"

A GOOD STORY ANYWAY

Kansas City Star: After William Jennings Bryan had courted the beautiful Mary Baird for what he considered a sufficient length of time, the commoner, then a struggling young lawyer, concluded to put the vital question to the father of the future Mrs. Bryan. William, after downing the lump in his throat, sought refuge in the scriptures.

"Mr. Baird, I have been reading Proverbs a good deal lately," said Mr. Bryan, "and I find that Solomon says: 'Whoso findeth a wife, findeth a good thing and obtaineth favor of the Lord.'"

Father Baird, being somewhat of a Bible scholar himself, replied: "Yes, I believe Solomon did say that, but Paul suggests that while he that marrieth doeth well, he that marrieth not doeth better."

Bryan, who never has been at loss for an answer in his spectacular life, quickly replied: "Solomon would be the best authority upon this point, because Paul was never married, while Solomon had a number of wives."

Whereupon Father Baird capitulated.

NOW THEY CAN UNDERSTAND

When the voters learn that Frick, representing the steel trust, Archbold, the oil trust, Gould the railroads, and Morgan both the railroads and the trusts, gave \$450,000 to elect Mr. Roosevelt in 1904—more than 6,500,000 democrats contributed to the democratic fund in either 1896 or 1900—they can understand why the predatory interests have been able to bleed the country so successfully.