

Goodwin's Weekly.

Theo. Schwaner
23 E 2nd St

VOL. IV.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, APRIL 9, 1904.

No. 22.

C. C. GOODWIN, - - - - - Editor.

J. T. GOODWIN, - - - - - Manager.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE OF GOODWIN'S WEEKLY.

Including postage in the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months. Subscriptions to all foreign countries within the Postal Union, \$3.50 per year.

Single copies, 5 cents.

Payments should be made by Check, Money Order, or Registered Letter, payable to GOODWIN'S WEEKLY.

Address all communications to GOODWIN'S WEEKLY, Entered at the Postoffice at Salt Lake City, Utah, U.S.A. as second-class matter.

P. O. Boxes 1074 and 1020.

Phone 301.

217-219-231 COMMERCIAL CLUB BLDG. SALT LAKE CITY

THE PRESIDENT'S ENEMIES.

We have a Democratic contemporary which is most bitter upon President Roosevelt. It copies from a Washington correspondent of the Boston Herald, an indictment of the President that contains more counts than can be found against George III in that somewhat famous instrument known as the Declaration of Independence. Among these are the following:

- 1.—He is lawless and arbitrary.
- 2.—He is as blind a partisan as Andrew Jackson turned out to be, without Johnson's respect for the Constitution.
- 3.—He uses the advantage of his relations with the Senate oligarchy above the welfare of his country and above the welfare of his party.
- 4.—His disposition is to run riot, etc.
- 5.—He places his party above the country and his will above the party and the law.
- 6.—He shows his lofty conception of his own power by his anger toward Justice Holmes for refusing to join the Roosevelt view of the Merger case.
- 7.—He shows his irresponsible power by his appointments to office, as in the case of Dr. Wood.
- 8.—He is both a trust buster by pretense and a friend of the trusts in reality.
- 9.—He is a spoliator.
- 10.—He is a promoter of war. He lacks personal dignity and he inflicts comic royalty at the White House on the people of the United States. Finally he is the most unpopular President that Washington has ever seen.

That sounds portentous, does it not? "Lawless and arbitrary." What law has he trampled on or defied? He has a will of his own, sure enough, but who has suffered through any arbitrary act of his?

"As blind a partisan as Andrew Johnson." If our memory does not run astray Andrew Johnson was not famous as a partisan, but as one who betrayed his party.

As to the third count, how can such a man have advantages in his relations with the Senate? Is the whole Senate corrupt? Then in what way has he trenched upon the welfare of

either his party or country? Both seem to be in pretty good form.

As to his disposition to run riot, in what way has he shown it?

What proof is there of the truth of the next charge that he holds his party above the country or himself above his party?

What proof is there that he was angry at Justice Holmes? Why should he not be just as angry at the other two Democratic Justices who dissented from the opinion of the majority in the Merger case? And how did any one of the Justices know what the Roosevelt opinion was in that case?

As to the case of Dr. Wood, General Wood received all his earlier promotions from President McKinley. Several of the older officers of the army were retired because of age limit. The President sent in new names to fill the vacancies precisely according to rank, or rather the Secretary of War did, and General Wood's name was included. It was a matter in which President Roosevelt really had nothing to do, except to endorse the papers.

As to trusts, what other President has done aught to restrain them? Then, if the President is a spoliator, why does not this great correspondent name some case in which he has been involved?

As to "promoting war," what special war has he promoted?

The truth in this case can, we think, be reached by a very brief explanation. Away back in 1872 a little bunch of newspapers that had been Republican sloughed off and supported Greeley. They did not like President Grant. Their defeat that year only intensified their bitterness, and they have ever since played "the holier than thou" roll. Among those journals were the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, the Boston Herald and later Harper's Weekly. They have represented the Carl Schurz and Wayne McVeigh class, and certain New England University professors, etc. They have always been the off oxen in politics. They have scrupled at no falsehood, have suppressed no slander, have seemed to have but one motto, and that has been "anything to beat the Republican party." They are lying now about Roosevelt, just as of old they lied about Grant and Blaine and plenty of others.

Now, Mr. Morgan owns Harper's Weekly, and it is a guide for the others. The rich syndicates, headed by Mr. Morgan, want the President defeated, because they cannot use him. Hence they have set their hounds baying on his track. That is the whole secret. It is not a case of the woods being filled with wolves. A few coyotes are making all the clamor.

In the meantime the masses are with the President and he will be nominated by acclamation. That fact shows how unpopular he is, how lawless he must be, how he disregards the laws and likes to make war. His election is just about as certain as is his nomination.

RICH CANDIDATES.

The State Journal considers Presidential candidates from the money standpoint. It does not believe that money honestly obtained is any drawback to a candidate, which is a most sound and logical conclusion, especially when consider-

ing Democratic candidates. In this connection it mentions four possible candidates—Cleveland, Hearst, Towne and Bryan. It thinks no matter how rich Mr. Bryan might become, "he would still be the same unaffected, American citizen, devoted to the interests of the people."

We believe that, too, only if he were to be induced to make a speech, the burden would be how much the people are suffering from the tyranny and heartlessness of the wealthy.

It thinks that the richer Towne might become, he would not change, but would still be "the same cheerful giver, the same generous, open-hearted glorious exponent of the equal rights of men that he now is, which we think is true. It thinks that were Will Hearst to inherit all the wealth of his mother, he would probably establish some more newspapers to advocate "the rights of the many against the aggressions of the few." Inasmuch as it is understood that his mother gave him, long ago, the income from the Homestake mines (\$1,500,000) per annum, it is not probable that Mr. Hearst would suffer any violent change of character, even should he become rich.

It thinks Mr. Cleveland is "quite as much a man of the people as he was during his first term as President, during which he was unquestionably a poor man."

Well, cannot the very same kindly things be said of J. Pierpont Morgan and Mr. Rockefeller, and the others who are held up as enemies of their race? Rockefeller can double discount either Mr. Cleveland or Mr. Bryan at a Sunday school re-union, and the annual charities of Mr. Morgan aggregate one-tenth of his income.

But no matter. We do not care how rich a candidate may be, whether he inherited his wealth, earned it honestly, or obtained wealth by a "streak of luck," but we want to ask the State Journal if Mr. Cleveland's candidacy was not estopped by the decision in the merger case? Were the Democracy to nominate him, could not the party be permanently enjoined on the showing that it had formed a combine "in restraint of trade" unparalleled since 1892?

THAT MERGER DECISION.

The decision in the Merger case is one so far reaching in its effects that it is startling to the legal profession, it is stunning to that class of capitalists whose idea is to combine and control production and transportation that it can at pleasure fleece consumers. The several justices of the Supreme Court were divided in opinion, the casting vote was by Justice Brewer. He held that the Sherman law "did not intend by the act to reach and destroy those minor contracts in partial restraint of trade, which the long course of decisions at common law had affirmed were reasonable and ought to be upheld." In the Merger case he held that the Hill combine was a palpable restraint of trade and hence gave the casting vote which made the decision.

It seems reasonable then that should another case be carried to the Supreme Court and it could be shown that while a combine had been made for economic reasons but that it had not in any manner restricted trade or advanced prices to the consumer it would be held that it did not come within reach or under the censorship of the Sher-