

Champ Clark, in a recent speech in Kansas City, thus described Mr. Roosevelt's course this year:

"In Kansas he was an insurgent, in Missouri he was a progressive, in New York a standpatter, and in St. Louis he went up in an airship."

The fact remains, however, that notwithstanding all his inconsistencies, Mr. Roosevelt has not failed anywhere this year, or any other year for that matter, to advocate the election of the straight Republican ticket. At Osawatomie he assumed the leadership of the progressive wing of his party, and denounced the Payne tariff bill. True, however, to his crooked political instincts, he returned to New York and struck a bargain with the reactionary Taft administration, whereby the President assisted him to capture, for his own selfish purposes, the New York Republican machine. In return for the administration support he breathed a benediction on the administration in his Saratoga speech, and connived at the indorsement of the Payne bill by the Saratoga convention.

Mr. Roosevelt pleaded for Beveridge in Indiana as a true blue progressive. Then he went into Massachusetts and declared Henry Cabot Lodge, one of the most hardened Tories in public life, to be a true friend of progress. It is this sort of thing that will absolutely destroy the progressive movement, if Mr. Roosevelt is to remain its acknowledged chieftain.

+

Of Mr. Cummins better things were expected. His course in the Senate has been one of manly defiance of his party organization and administration bossism. He braved party ostracism and endured the loss of patronage in order to maintain his self-respect, and his speech at the Des Moines convention, after Congress had adjourned, was a splendid defiance to the Standpatters and an invitation for war to the bitter end.

For some reason best known to himself, Mr. Cummins has seen fit to change his tactics, to eat out of the hand of the men whom he has hitherto denounced as enemies of the people, and to get back on the old reservation. If his Des Moines speech was that of a patriot, his Chicago speech, delivered less than three months later, was the utterance of a demagogue. That Cummins, of all men, speaking in a State where Joseph G. Cannon is a candidate for office, should advise the election of the straight Republican ticket sent the cold chills down the backs of thousands of his admirers. That he should insultingly notify the rank and file of the Democratic party that their services are not wanted in the progressive struggle, unless they are willing to accept the protective theory and join the Republican party as orthodox members thereof, jarred the confidence and dashed the hopes of thousands of men who have looked to him for better things.

+

Neither Roosevelt nor Cummins is essential to the ultimate triumph of real democracy. Either, however, may retard that triumph temporarily. The effect of their present attitude is to strengthen party ties at a time when, in the interests of better politics, they were being weakened. That attitude, if persisted in, will alienate from the cause to which

they profess devotion the entire independent vote.

Both Roosevelt and Cummins mistake the temper and sentiment of the average intelligent voter. The appeal for "party solidarity"—the time dishonored "yellow dog" political exhortation—has lost its force and power. The man who thinks at all nowadays knows that by listening to such appeals in the past he has helped fasten the grip of special privilege upon the government in its every branch. He is in no mood, therefore, to respond to such an appeal, whether it be made by the shameless Joe Cannon or by the immaculate Albert B. Cummins. The man who makes such an appeal merely discredits himself.

It must be said in fairness, though, that other progressive leaders have not fallen into the errors of Roosevelt and Cummins. La Follette, Bristow, Poin-dexter and their fellows have sounded no "yellow dog" appeals. It is well for the permanency of the movement with which they have identified themselves that they have refrained from such utterances.

+

The case of Mr. Roosevelt, of course, is hopeless. He is utterly and incorrigibly selfish, and never in his life has he cherished a political principle which he was not willing to sacrifice for personal advantage. There are many hopeful indications, however, that he has struck the political toboggan, and the sooner he reaches its bottom the better for real reform in this country.

There is still hope for Mr. Cummins, however, because he instinctively thinks right. If the progressive movement has reached a stage where it is able to discipline its members, the distinguished Iowan ought to be called on the carpet by his colleagues, and warned that pleas for "party solidarity" at the cost of political principle are as reprehensible and as unpatriotic, coming from him, as they were when President Taft fulminated them at Winona.

D. K. L.

+ + +

## POLITICS IN THE ALDRICH PRIVATE-WEALTH.

Lonsdale, Rhode Island, Oct. 26.

It may be of interest to the widely scattered readers of *The Public* to hear something from Rhode Island on the eve of this unusually interesting and important national election.

+

In the Republican party of this State not a breath of insurgency is visible or audible. True, the claim of Progressiveness is heard, but it is merely lip-service. Standpatism is the order of the day.

Not but that there are many Republicans here who sympathize with the Insurgents of the West; they are, however, with scarcely an exception, keeping their own counsel.

At one time it looked as though an Independent Republican, a Progressive in the best sense of that word, would be put into the field for United States Senator. This spirit of revolt was strongest when it was supposed that Senator Aldrich would be a candidate to succeed himself. But when that famous Standpatter withdrew from the race, the spur to In-

dependence lost its force and the attempt to name a Republican opponent to the regulation candidate failed.

The Lincoln men, so-called, who were very active three and four years ago, but have been quiescent for the past two years, appear to have entertained the hope that the death of Boss Brayton might lead to a high class Republican nomination for the United States Senate. Of this happy event there is no present evidence.

Notwithstanding the inactivity of the Independent Republicans, the Democratic convention might have seized the opportunity and put an Insurgent Republican into the field. By so doing, the Opposition would have strengthened itself all along the line.

The convention did, however, select an able and well qualified judge as its candidate for Senator; but, being actively engaged in his duties in the United States court, he can make no canvass, and therefore will not draw votes to the Democratic legislative candidates as an Insurgent Republican would have done.



As in Maine, Connecticut and New Jersey, the Democrats of Rhode Island have nominated for Governor of the State an able and well qualified gentleman, who is likely to get the votes of many Independent Republicans.



The feature of the campaign thus far, and the one which is most likely to influence the result, in so far as individual candidates for the legislature are concerned, is the "heckling" of candidates.

The movement to question by mail the candidates for governor, lieutenant governor, senators and representatives, originated with the Tax Reform Association. Its wish was to have two questions asked, the second one relating to home rule for the cities and towns on the matter of local taxation. After conference with other organizations, however, the final decision was to quiz the candidates upon but a single point, as set forth in the following letter:

**RHODE ISLAND INTERROGATION ASSOCIATION.**  
Campaign Committee.

Hiram Vrooman, Secretary, 16 Bridgham Street.

ITS OBJECT.—The object of this Association is to heckle or question candidates for public office and pledge them to the support of the issues involved in the questions presented.

Providence, R. I., October 10, 1910.

To Candidate for the Rhode Island General Assembly:

Dear Sir—The undersigned committee, representing by appointment, the State Federation of Labor, the Prohibition State Committee, the Tax Reform Association, the Interrogation Association, also representative of the Independent vote of the State, beg to request of you a statement of your attitude upon the following public question, and the position you will take towards legislation thereon, if elected:

Question: Will you, if elected, vote for, and do all in your power to secure the passage of a Constitutional Amendment which shall enable a majority of the voters of the State to make changes in the State Constitution by means of the Initiative and Referendum?

Please answer immediately, inasmuch as early publicity is intended.

Neglect to reply will be considered as a refusal to support the legislation asked for.

A. E. Hohler,  
President of State Branch of American Federation of Labor.

Hiram Vrooman,  
Louis E. Remington,  
Lucius F. C. Garvin,  
Charles H. Lee.

Answer.....

Signature.....

The question had been sent to 321 candidates up to date, October 26th, and 130 answers had been received, all favorable except four.

Most of the affirmative answers are from Democrats, a considerable number from the comparatively few Prohibitionists, and a few only thus far from Republicans.

Several influential labor organizations have sent out the same questions to local candidates for the legislature.

LUCIUS F. C. GARVIN.

---

**INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS**

---

**FINANCIAL DEBILITY.\***

Indianapolis, Ind.

Out from Washington city September 25th, there was sent a news dispatch that began: "It is unlikely that there will be any shortage of money this fall anywhere in the United States. This is not to be construed as the promise of any particular individual but is the large impersonal view of the Treasury Department, whose hand is on the pulse of the nation's financial and business life, and represents the opinions of the officials who constantly watch for symptoms of any stringency."

Then followed half a column of so-called reasons which the Treasury officials are said to have given for "their predictions." Among these reasons are assumptions that have no foundation in fact, or if true, no more to do with the quantity of money available for business than the spots on the sun.

It is assumed that Europe "will owe America money," that it "will be paid in gold that will come across in bars," that "the banks will take these bars to the mints or sub-treasuries to be stored" that "gold certificates will be issued to represent it," etc., etc.

This is the character of pretenses by which it is attempted, on the alleged authority of the Treasury Department, to deceive the people concerning financial conditions.



The opinions of Treasury officials are of no more value than the opinions of intelligent students of the subject outside the Department.

But I do not believe the statements contained in this dispatch had a Treasury Department origin. I have had some experience in getting information from the Department. There has usually been no difficulty in getting facts as they are shown by the Department records, but when questions have been asked that required an expression of an opinion or

\*See preceding articles by Mr. Van Vorhis in The Public, vol. xiii, pp. 798, 920.