
NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before, continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, June 14, 1910.

Gifford Pinchot's Speech at St. Paul.

Before the Roosevelt Club at St. Paul on the 11th Gifford Pinchot (pp. 182, 200, 217) made an address in which he gave to the Insurgent movement a broad national and high moral character. Conservation of natural resources, and abolition of plunder by means of tariffs, were the timely concrete questions he discussed under the general moral issue of equal rights, and in both connections he denounced business in politics.

+

On the subject of conservation of natural resources, here are some of the more significant things Mr. Pinchot is reported in the news dispatches to have said:

The conservation issue is a moral issue, and the heart of it is this: For whose benefit shall our natural resources be conserved—for the benefit of us all, or for the use and profit of the few? This truth is so obvious and the question itself so simple that the attitude toward conservation of any man in public or private life indicates his stand in the fight for public rights.

Efforts to obscure or belittle the issue have only served to make it larger and clearer in the public estimation. The conservation movement cannot be choked by the baseless charge that it will prevent development, or that every man who tells the plain truth is either a muck-raker or a demagogue. It has taken firm hold on our national moral sense, and when an issue does that it has won.

All monopoly rests on the unregulated control of natural resources and natural advantages. . . .

One of Mr. Pinchot's references to the tariff question was equally pointed:

The tariff, under the policy of protection, was originally a means to raise the rate of wages. It has been made a tool to increase the cost of living.

+

The newspaper reports of Mr. Pinchot's discussion of the present political situation with special reference to conservation and the tariff, contain these excerpts from his speech:

All monopoly rests on the unregulated control of natural resources and natural advantages, and such control by the special interests is impossible without

the help of politics. The alliance between business and politics is the most dangerous thing in our political life. It is the snake that we must kill. The special interests must get out of politics, or the American people will put them out of business. There is no third course.

Every man who knows Congress well, knows the names of Senators and members who betray the people they were elected to represent, and knows also the names of the masters whom they obey. A representative of the people who wears the collar of the special interests has touched bottom. He can sink no farther.

The black shadow of party regularity as the supreme test in public affairs has passed away from the public mind. It is a great deliverance. The man in the street no longer asks about a measure or a policy merely whether it is good Republican or good Democratic doctrine. Now he asks whether it is honest and means what it says, whether it will promote the public interest, weaken special privilege, and help to give every man a fair chance. If it will, it is good, no matter who proposed it. If it will not, it is bad, no matter who defends it.

The brand of politics served out to us by the professional politician has long been composed largely of hot meals for the interests and hot air for the people.

The protest against politics for revenue only is as strong in one party as in the other, for the servants of the interests are plentiful in both. In that respect there is little to choose between them. Differences of purpose or belief between political parties today are vastly less than the differences within the parties. The great gulf of division which strikes across our whole people pays little heed to fading party lines, or to any distinction in name only. The vital separation is between the partisans of government by money for profit and the believers in government by men for human welfare.

When political parties come to be badly led, when their leaders lose touch with the people, when their object ceases to be everybody's welfare and becomes somebody's profit, it is time to change the leaders. One of the most significant facts of the time is that the professional politicians appear to be wholly unaware of the great moral change which has come over political thinking in the last decade. They fail to see that the political dogmas, the political slogans, and the political methods of the past generation have lost their power, and that our people have come at last to judge of politics by the eternal rules of right and wrong.

A new life is stirring among the dry bones of formal platforms and artificial issues. Morality has broken into politics. Political leaders, trust bred and trust fed, find it harder and harder to conceal their actual character. The brass bound collar of Privilege has become plain upon their necks for all men to see. They are known for what they are, and their time is short. But when they come to be retired it will be of little use to replace an unfaithful public servant who wears the collar by another public servant with the same collar around his neck. The motto in every primary—in every election—should be this: No watchdogs of the interests need apply.

The people of the United States demand a new deal and a square deal. They have grasped the fact that the special interests are now in control of public affairs. They have decided once more, to take control of their own business. For the last ten years the determination to do so has been swelling like a river. They insist that the special interests shall go out of politics or out of business—one or the other. And the choice will lie with the interests themselves. If they resist, both the interests and the people will suffer. If wisely they accept the inevitable, the adjustment will not be hard. It will do their business no manner of harm to make it conform to the general welfare. But one way or the other, conform it must.

The overshadowing question before the American people today is this: Shall the nation govern itself or shall the interests run this country? The one great political demand underlying all others, giving meaning to all others, is this. The special interests must get out of politics. The old style leaders, seeking to switch public attention away from this one absorbing and overwhelming issue, are pitifully ridiculous and out of date. To try to divert the march of an aroused public conscience from this righteous inevitable conflict by means of obsolete political catchwords is like trying to dam the Mississippi with dead leaves.

To drive the special interests out of politics is a vast undertaking, for in politics lies their strength. If they resist, as doubtless they will, it will call for nerve, endurance, and sacrifice on the part of the people. It will be no child's play, for the power of privilege is great. But the power of our people is still greater, and their steadfastness is equal to the need. The task is a tremendous one, both in the demands it will make and the rewards it will bring. It must be undertaken, soberly, carried out firmly and justly, and relentlessly followed to the very end.

To these ends, many unfaithful public servants must be retired, much wise legislation must be framed and passed, and the struggle will be bitter and long. But it will be well worth all it will cost, for self-government is at stake.

This nation has decided to do away with government by money for profit and return to the government our forefathers died for and gave to us—government by men for human welfare and human progress.

+ +

Garfield's Speech at St. Paul.

Though not so fully reported as Mr. Pinchot's, James A. Garfield's speech, also before the Roosevelt Club at St. Paul and on the same occasion, appears from the news dispatches to have been in similar temper and to the same purpose. He was "no less emphatic" than Mr. Pinchot, as described by the reports, "in his attack on the foes of conservation." Following are reported excerpts:

The chief opposition to conservation comes from men who have been stopped from doing that which was wrong.

And that wrong is stealing coal and timber lands and water power. The man who steals public property should be treated the same as the man who steals private property. The evil done by the men

who steal these things is vastly greater than the crime of the individual against an individual.

The man who pollutes the water course and is the means of permitting typhoid germs in the drinking water supply of a community is equally a murderer with the man who shoots his neighbor.

The man who steals a public franchise is equally a thief with the man who steals a chicken, and we must learn that a corporation manager who steals from the public is only fit for the penitentiary.

Conservation means the wiping out of unjust monopoly. Regulation of the great corporation is necessarily a part of the great conservation idea. We must conserve our political liberties.

I believe I am right in saying that many of these corporations have been a great controlling influence in our political life. They have had a great influence in controlling our public officials.

We have had enough of that cry, "Don't disturb the business interests," and of that policy of "let well enough alone." I take it that the American people are not content to let things drift. We demand constructive conservation legislation, and we demand that our public officers take the lead in securing it.

As a nation we must take up these problems seriously. It does not mean that the States will be compelled to give up their rights. We must recognize that in dealing with water rights all have a voice in deciding what shall be done with them. It is the same with coal. Coal is local to many States, yet it is the entire nation which is dependent on coal for its fuel. We demand that not one acre of coal land shall be sold. We demand that any one shall have the right to mine the coal. We demand that the forests of our public lands shall be cut in the same manner as we would have our coal mined.

We have for four years demanded legislation of Congress which would conserve the coal of Alaska and prevent its being stolen. We have not been heeded, and we have reason to believe there are great interests which do not desire that legislation. It now behooves you people to leave those men at home who do not heed the public will and to send progressive men to Congress who will serve the public interest.

+ +

Insurgents at the Iowa Primaries.

At the primaries in Iowa on the 7th Gov. Carroll was the Standpat Republican candidate for renomination. Warren Garst was the Insurgent candidate. Garst was defeated by about 1,500. Two years ago Carroll defeated him at the primaries by 23,000.

+

In the Congressional districts, C. A. Kennedy, Walter I. Smith and H. M. Towner (Standpat), and Charles Grik, C. E. Pickett, Gilbert N. Haugen, James W. Good, N. E. Kendell, S. F. Prouty, Frank P. Woods and E. H. Hubbard (Insurgents) were nominated. Prouty (Insurgent) defeated Congressman Hull (Standpat). Prouty carried every county in the district, winning by 3,100. The Standpat Republicans claim a Standpat majority of 120 at the State convention, to be held