

ROOSEVELT HITS TAFT SOPHISTRIES

Arguments of the President Turn to Taft's.

TO RULE IS PEOPLE'S RIGHT

Colonel Declares His Confidence in Plain People—Should Have Power to Redress Own Wrongs—Shows Up Inconsistencies of His Opponents.

New York, March 21.—Former President Roosevelt delivered an address last night in Carnegie hall before an enthusiastic and demonstrative audience. He refuted with characteristic vigor and logic the arguments made against his Columbus speech by Theodore Taft and others. He said:

"The great fundamental issue is now before the Republican party and before our people can be stated briefly. It is, Are the American people fit to govern themselves? To rule themselves, to control themselves? I believe they are. My opponents do not. I believe in the right of the people to rule. I believe that the majority of the plain people of the United States will, day in and day out, make fewer mistakes in governing themselves than any smaller class or body of men, no matter what their training, will make in trying to govern them. I believe again that the American people are as a whole capable of self-control and of learning by their mistakes. Our opponents are not. They are not. They show their real beliefs by the way in which they champion every device to make the nominal rule of the people a sham. I have meant patience with this rule of the majority of the majority. Whenever there is the tyranny of the majority, I shall protest against it with all my heart and soul. But we are today suffering from the tyranny of the minority. It is a small minority that is grabbing our coal deposits, our water powers and our harbor fronts. A small minority is fattening on the sale of adulterated foods and drugs. It is a small minority that has behind monopolies and trusts. It is a small minority that stands behind the present law of master and servant, the exchange and the whole of the serial and industrial injustice. It is a small minority that is today using our convention system to the will of the majority of the people in the choice of delegates to the Chicago convention."

Is the People's Right.

"My opponents charge that two-thirds of my program are wrong because they intrude into the sanctuary of the judges and the second the review by the people of judicial decisions on certain constitutional questions. I have said again and again that I do not advocate the recall of judges in all states and in all communities. The integrity of our judges, from Marshall to White and Holmes—and to Cullen and many others in the present history, but I say it soberly—democracy has a right to approach the sanctuary of the courts when a special interest has corruptly found sanctuary there, and this is exactly what has happened in some of the states where the recall of judges is a living issue. Is it not equally plain that the question whether a given judicial policy is for the public good or not of a judicial nature, but should be settled by the legislature, or in the final instance by the people themselves?"

The President of the United States.

"The devoted most of a recent speech to criticism of this proposition. He says that it is 'utterly without merit or utility, and instead of being in the interest of all the people and of the stability of popular government, is sowing the seeds of confusion and anarchy.' (By this he of course means the tyranny of the majority that is the tyranny of the American people as a whole.) He also says that my proposal (which, as he rightly sees, is merely a proposal to give the people a real instead of a nominal share in the government) and amend a state constitution with reasonable rapidity would make such amendment and interpretation 'depend on the feverish, uncertain and unprincipled determination of success by votes on different laws by temporary and changing majorities,' and that 'it lays the axe at the foot of the tree of well ordered freedom and subjects the guarantees of the property and property without remedy to the fiftieth impulse of a temporary majority of an electorate.'"

Is Wholly Unfounded.

"This criticism is really less a criticism of my proposal than a criticism of all popular government. It is wholly unfounded, unless it is founded on the belief that the people are fundamentally untrustworthy. This is a question that I propose to submit to the people. How can the prevailing morality or a preponderance of opinion be better and more exactly ascertained than by a vote of the people? The people must know better than the court what their own morality and their own opinion is. I ask that you, here, you and others like you, you, the people, be given the chance to state your own view on the justice and public morality and not sit meekly and have your views announced for you by well-meaning adherents of outworn philosophies, who

exalt the pendency of formulas above the real needs of human life. Mr. Taft's position is the position that has been held from the beginning of our government, although not always so openly held by a large number of its members. It is the position, who, down at bottom, distrust popular government, and when they must accept it, accept it with reluctance and budge around it with every excuse of expediency and expediency, and so as to make the power of the people as limited and as ineffective as possible. Mr. Taft fairly defines the issue when he says that our government is and should be a government of the people and is and should be a government of the people. This is an excellent and moderate description of an oligarchy. He defines our government as a government of all of the people by a few of the people."

"I am not speaking jokingly now. I mean to be unjust, for I repeat that many honorable and well-meaning men of high character have taken part in the formation of the nation. Essentially this view is that the constitution is a straight-jacket to be used for the control of an unprincipled and unscrupulous majority. This view is not only false, but mischievous, that our constitutions are instruments designed to secure justice by securing the deliberate but effective expression of the majority. The checks and balances are valuable as far and only so far as they accomplish that deliberation, and that it is a warped and unworthy and improper expression of the majority. It is an attempt to use it only as a means of thwarting the popular will and of preventing justice."

The Real Trouble.

"Mr. Taft says that every class should have a voice in the government. That seems to me a very serious misconception of the American political situation. The real trouble with us is that some classes have too much voice. One of the most important of all the lessons to be taught, and to be learned is that a man should vote not as a representative of a class, but merely as a good citizen. Mr. Taft, again and again, in quotations I have given and elsewhere through his speech, expresses his disbelief in the people when they vote at the polls. In one sentence he says that the people are 'too stupid to be trusted with the momentary impulse of a majority of an electorate and prepares the way for the possible exercise of the grossest tyranny.' He speaks of the 'barbaric uncertainty' and 'unstable determination' of the laws by 'temporary and changing majorities,' and again he says that the system I propose 'would result in the grossest political anarchy.' He speaks of 'guarantees according to popular whim,' which would destroy 'all possible consistency' in constitutional interpretation. I should much like to know the exact meaning of the words made between what Mr. Taft calls the 'fitful impulse of a temporary majority,' when applied to a question such as that I raise and any other question. But I do not intend to propose to review a rule of decision by popular vote, amending or constraining to that extent the constitution would certainly take at least two years from the time of its passage by the legislature which passed the Act."

Then Becomes a "Whim."

"In one of Mr. Taft's speeches he speaks of the 'voice of the people as coming next to the voice of God.' He says that the decision of the people about the presidency after four months' deliberation, is to be treated as 'next to the voice of God,' but if after two years the recall of judges is to be decided by the people and children shall be protected in industry, or men protected from excessive hours of labor under unhygienic conditions, or workers compensated when they lose their limbs in the service of others, then their decision forthwith becomes 'whim' and 'feverish' and 'unstable' and an exercise of the 'grossest tyranny' and the 'laying of the axe to the foot of the tree.'"

That is the old, old doctrine which

"That is the old, old doctrine which has been acted upon for thousands of years abroad and which here in America has been acted upon sometimes with the most disastrous results. It is a doctrine by many men in public and private life, and I am sorry to say by many judges; a doctrine which has in fact tended to create a bulwark for privilege, a bulwark unjustly protect the special interests against the rights of the people as a whole. This doctrine to me is a dreadful doctrine for its effect is, and can only be, to make the courts the privileged class, the aristocracy of popular rights. Naturally, every upholder and beneficiary of crooked privilege loudly applauds the doctrine. It is behind the shield of that doctrine that crooked class of wealth and power control legislation."

Remember I am not discussing the recall of judges—although I wish

"I distinctly understand that the recall is not the issue. I am not discussing the place of unwelcome impeachment which Mr. Taft in effect defends, and that if the days of Maynard ever came back again in the state of New York I should be glad to see the people come to it, but our opponents when they object to all efforts to secure real justice from the courts, are strengthening the hands of those who are the enemies of the people. There has been for many years a real recall of judges as regards appointments, promotions, reappointments and re-elections, and this recall was through the policy of the majority of the state at the end of a long-distance road in the hands of great interests. I believe that a just judge would feel far safer in the hands of the people than in the hands of the interests."

"My remedy is not the result of a library study of constitutional law, but of actual and long-continued experience in the use of governmental power to redress social and industrial evils. Again and again I have said to me that the most serious obstacles that they have encountered during the many years that they have been trying to save American women from the hands of the American industry have been the courts. That is the judgment of almost all the social workers I know and of dozens of parish priests and clergymen and of the executive and legislative who has been seriously attempting to use government as an agency for social and industrial betterment. What is the result of this system of judicial nullification? It is accurately stated by the court of appeals of New York in the employees' liability case, where it was calmly and judicially declared that the people under our republican government are less free to correct the evils that oppress them than are the people of the monarchies of Europe. To any man with vision, to any man with broad and real social sympathies, to any man with common sense, it is a disgrace that this great democratic republic of ours, which a condition is intolerable. It is not government by the people, but mere sham government, in which the will of the people is expressed by a minority of the people. It is out of this experience that my remedy has come, and let it be tried in this field. When as the result of his education and debate a majority of the people are so stupid as to vote for a remedy for an evil from which they suffer and have chosen a legislature and executive pledged to embody that remedy in law and the law has been finally passed and I repeat that it is a disgrace that a bench of judges should then say to the people: 'You must begin all over again. First, amend your constitution, which will take four years; second, secure the passage of a new law (which will take two years more); third, carry that new law over the weary course of litigation which will take no human being knows how long; fourth, submit the whole matter over again to the very same judges who have rendered the decision to which you object. Then, if your patience holds out and you shall still be master of the majority of the people may have its way.' Such a system is not popular government, but a mere mockery of popular government. It is a system framed by the interests of the few to oppress the many, and it can be defended only by those who disbelieve in the people."

Now Have Different Meanings.

"The decisions of which we complain are, as a rule, based upon the constitutional provision that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. The terms 'life, liberty and property' have been used in the constitutions of the English speaking people since Magna Charta. 'Until within the last forty years they have meant no fixed specific meanings; 'property' meant tangible property; 'liberty' meant freedom from personal restraint, or, in other words, from imprisonment in its large sense. About 1870 or thereabouts began to attach to these terms new meanings; 'property' has come to mean every right of value which a person could enjoy, and 'liberty' has come to include the right to make contracts. As a result, what a limit the hours for which women may labor. It is told by the courts that this law deprives them of their 'liberty' and then it restrains their suffrage and takes away a movement. It is told that the law deprives the landlord of his 'property.' Now, I do not believe that any people and especially our free American people, will long consent to the term 'liberty' shall be defined for them by a bench of judges. Every people has defined that term for itself in the course of its development. Friends, our task as Americans is to use the social and industrial justice, achieved through the genuine rule of the people. This is our end, our purpose. The methods for achieving the end are merely expedients to be used as they are suggested according to actual experience shows that they work well or ill."

Is But an Instrument.

"The leader for the time being, whoever he may be, is but an instrument to be used, used and broken and then to be cast aside, and if he is worth his salt he will be broken and cast aside before a soldier car when he is sent where his life is forfeit in order that the victory may be won. In the long fight for righteousness the instrument for all of us is the people. It is of little matter whether any one man fails or succeeds, but the cause shall not fail, for it is the cause of mankind. We here in America are the hands of the future of the world, the fate of the coming years, and shame and disgrace will be ours if in our eyes the light of high resolve is dimmed, if we trail in the steps of the despots of men. If on this new continent we merely build another country of great but unjustly divided material prosperity we shall have done nothing, and we shall do so, if we merely set the greed of our country against the greed of our language and thereby destroy the material well-being of all of us. To turn this government into an instrument, by plutocratic government, would be to reduce it to a larger scale of the lamentable failures of the world that is dead. We stand against all tyranny, by the few or by the many. We stand for the rule of the majority of all of us, for the rule of the many in a spirit of courage, of common sense, of high purpose, above all in a spirit of kindly justice toward every man and every woman."

MOSE NOT HARD TO SATISFY
As Far as Prisoner Was Concerned, He Was Willing to Let the Matter Drop.
Brooman Bulger, a baseball writer, says that in his home town, down in Southern Alabama, a negro was brought into court to answer a charge of murder. "Mose Tupper," said the judge, contemplating the prisoner over his spectacles, "you are accused here of one of the most serious crimes known to our laws—towel, the taking of a human life. Are you properly represented by counsel?" "No, suh," said the darky cheerfully. "Well, have you talked to any one about your defense since your arrest?" "I told the sheriff about the shootin' when he come to my cabin to fetch me heah," said the prisoner—"but that's all."

Machine Hard at Work to Over-ride Will of Republican Voters.

DEBAUCHERY IS THE RULE

Disgraceful Tactics Observed in Indiana, Kansas and Other States to Prevent Real Popular Expression.

Washington.—Outrages more flagrant than any that ever disgraced Republican politics have been characterized the fight in behalf of the re-nomination of William Howard Taft to date. The brutal force of organization, backed by the tremendous influence of the money power, has been characterized by the most debauchery and intimidation effects of corporation activities in politics, have produced, in a number of recent instances, results which cannot fail to arouse the general indignation of the voters everywhere.

By the sheer force of organization

methods, the Taft men are seeking to override the will of the people, obviously believing that the people will submit supinely and fail to resist a popular denial of their rights in their own system of government. Some of these instances make plain why the Taft supporters are so anxious to suppress the free expression of the voters and to have the election of delegates by a direct vote of the people.

Amazons as Example.

This is what happened recently in Kansas. Twenty-seven members of the state committee, which is composed of one hundred and five members in all, met and refused to permit a presidential preference primary in that state—obtaining almost unanimously a resolution in favor of the primary—and declared in favor of the re-nomination of Taft. This action was effected in this way: Fifty-one members of the state committee, less than a quorum, met and without any right to transact business of any kind, held this meeting. The state committee is made up of the chairmen of the different counties who are regularly elected in primary. Under the law, no member can give his proxy to another member. He must represent his county in person. In the meeting of the committee held, twenty-four of the members present were elected by proxy from absent committee members.

Playing the "Game."

These proxies were without value. Notwithstanding this, the proxy holders were elected by the Taft organization, until a bare numerical quorum but not a legal quorum was established. They then proceeded to take the action set forth. There was no semblance of legality in the proceedings, yet under the circumstances the public was powerless to prevent the outrage. Its effect is to deprive the voters of Kansas of the right to choose their delegates to the national convention. The Taft organization has secured the selection to the discorded houses of a machine which was supposed to have been wrecked long ago. Debauching Oklahoma. Another illustration is furnished by the third district of Oklahoma. In this district when the convention assembled the Roosevelt delegates numbered 646 and the Taft delegates 170. The Taft delegates were elected by the Taft organization and other officers of the district committee. When the latter found they were outnumbered they withdrew with the other 170 Taft delegates and held a convention of their own. The Roose-

velt men, outnumbering the Taft supporters nearly four to one, proceeded to elect delegates pledged to support Theodore Roosevelt. The bolting minority elected two delegates pledged to Taft. Under no principle of right or justice could the Taft delegates establish the slightest claim to seats in the convention. But under the organization system, merely because the district committee was controlled through federal office holders by the Taft administration, the Taft delegates are heralded to the country as the regular elected delegates and the men chosen by the overwhelming majority of regularly chosen district delegates and directed to support Theodore Roosevelt must appear before the national committee at Chicago as contestants.

Tactics in Indiana.

In the first Indiana district, where former Senator Hemmway directed the Taft forces, the Roosevelt men had fifty-two out of ninety-seven members of the convention. But here again the organization controlled the district chairman and the district committee proceeded to organize the convention in behalf of Taft, seating arbitrarily and without permitting a vote by the convention, a number of contesting Taft delegates. The Roosevelt men could not obtain recognition and could not make themselves effective except by resorting to physical force. Under these conditions they withdrew from the convention and organized out of their own and elected their delegates. Although holding a clear majority of the convention, they were forced to assume the attitude of bolters in order to escape the Taft steam roller and the delegates they have chosen are also classed as contestants. The same methods have been pursued in other districts.

Elected by Corruption.

The plain and obvious result of these outrageous proceedings is that of the total number of delegates claimed for Taft in states where the Republican party has a fighting chance in the election, nearly all of them, if not quite all, have been illegally elected by the exercise of the worst form of corruption, that which deprives the voters themselves of any voice in the selection of men who will assume to represent them in naming a candidate for the presidency of the United States. The continuance of these methods will in a short time displace general political conditions in the United States. More startling and more abhorrent than was ever known before, it is now to become evident that conscienceless men controlled by patronage, by the particular special interests they represent, are engaged in a great conspiracy to steal from the American people their right of self-government. They are pursuing a rule of ruin policy; the effect of which cannot be limited to the disorganization of the party, but will extend to the nation itself, destroying, as nothing else has done, confidence in public men, in the great business institutions of the country, and in the government itself. Nothing can stop this but the aroused conscience of the voters themselves and their determination to prevent these political manipulators, these money and government in league, from setting aside and overriding the real sentiment of the public.

Taft Approves Methods.

Showing how thoroughly in sympathy with these methods are the Taft managers and the president himself, the former recently made public a dispatch from E. L. Morse, one of the Taft managers in Missouri, respecting the action in one congressional district of this state. The dispatch says: "Congressional committee which makes roll of convention is evenly divided, we controlling chairman and secretary, which will enable us to elect two Taft delegates." Here the proposition is so plainly stated that it illuminates the whole situation. The control of the chairman and secretary of the district committee, two men out of several hundred, is relied upon by the Taft forces to give them the two delegates from that district of Missouri. The Taft managers attempt to concealment of the purpose in view. They are simply determined that representative government in the United States so far as the naming of a candidate for president is concerned shall be destroyed.

To a Post.

To learn more "for recreation" is doubtless a means of cultivating a knowledge of literature; but school boys sometimes regard the authors of poems learned as taskmasters and personal enemies. The Taft managers are no exception. In a letter found among the papers of the venerable German poet Goethe. It was written to him by some schoolboy of Lubek, and signed, "Karl Beckmann, 11, Lubek."

After stating that two boys had been forged because they could not learn Herr Goethe's "Hops of Spring," the letter reads that you did not think of such things when you wrote the poem. The Herr Lehrer says it is a very beautiful poem; but there are so many beautiful poems that we must learn to learn them. Therefore we beg and entreat you, esteemed Herr Goethe, make no more beautiful poems. And to make it worse we have to learn the biography of every poet who has lived in the world, and what year he died in. We write to you because you are the only poet still living, and we wish you a very long life. The Sunday Magazine.

TAFT'S RECORD AGAINST TRUSTS

Sherman Law Enforced Without Fear of Favor.

EXCELS HIS PREDECESSORS.

Both in Civil and Criminal Prosecution Taft Administration Breaks All Records—Legal Accomplishments of Five Presidents Compared.

TAFT'S ANTI-TRUST RECORD.

Under the last five administrations prosecutions under the Sherman anti-trust law have been brought as follows:

	Civil suits.	Criminal suits.	Total.
Under Harrison (three years).....	4	3	7
Under Cleveland (four years).....	5	2	7
Under McKinley (four and one-half years).....	Three bills in equity		
Under Roosevelt (seven and one-half years).....	18	25	43
Under Taft (two years and eleven months).....	22	40	62

One property secure.

The ratio of prosecutions, allowing for length of time in office, of the Taft administration as compared with the records of its four immediate predecessors is approximately as follows:

Taft over Harrison.....	9 to 1
Taft over Cleveland.....	12 to 1
Taft over McKinley.....	30 to 1
Taft over Roosevelt.....	4 to 1

President Taft's administration has broken all records by prosecutions brought and won under the Sherman anti-trust law. Without precedent it has brought to the bar of justice corporations and persons engaging in illegal combinations in restraint of trade, the ultimate purpose of each combination being to create a monopoly and to crush its primary on its products two years and eleven months of his administration President Taft has caused to be brought four more civil suits and fifteen more criminal prosecutions than all his predecessors combined the seven and one-half years of his administration.

Until Mr. Taft became the president the administration of Mr. Roosevelt had the record in both particulars. Thus has President Taft, who was Mr. Roosevelt's right arm during his last administration, kept his pledge to the American people to uphold and maintain the policies of his predecessor, and to remove the stains and undesirable element in the big business of the country.

In the Republican national platform of 1904 reference was made to the prosecution of all trusts and monopolies as one of the great accomplishments of the Roosevelt administration, and the platform declared that the Sherman anti-trust law had been a "wholesome instrument for good in the hands of a wise and fearless executive." In his speech of acceptance Mr. Taft pledged himself to the enforcement of this law and has kept his promise.

Problems Confronting Taft.

Stripped of controversy as to the exact meaning of certain language of the Sherman anti-trust act, the questions that had to be determined by those in administrative authority and those who judicially determine their acts were, first, how effective the law was to reach the great aggregations of formerly competitive producers and dealers, individual and corporate, who, through intercorporate stockholding, mergers, combinations and other devices, had secured a control over a particular line of industry as to enable them to dominate it and to exclude or admit competition as they might choose upon their own terms. Second, to determine whether that construction of the law was correct which had been given to it by some of the judges of the circuit court in New York in the tobacco case and in the oil case, and the issue of the law in the supreme court in other cases, the effect that any combination which in any respect operated to restrain in any degree a process of competition in interstate commerce was necessarily continued by law.

In the three years of the Taft administration all of the sixteen cases left pending by the previous administration have been decided by the Taft administration. The cases which have been argued and submitted to the supreme court of the United States and are now awaiting decision. Of the remaining cases the Standard Oil case, the first of the litigation of the present administration, and after an appeal, decided entirely in favor of the government. The same was also true of the tobacco cases, with the ultimate result of the litigation of the Sherman law trust into four separate and distinct corporations. This, it is believed, will effectively prevent a continuance of the monopolistic conditions complained of.

Taft Anti-trust Record.

During the Taft administration up to February, 1912, twenty-two civil suits have been brought and forty criminal indictments found under the Sherman law, making in all fifty-two proceedings. As a result there were fifteen indictments, and eleven of these in-