

# THE BOISE CITIZEN

VOL. XI

BOISE, IDAHO, JUNE 17, 1910

NO. 29.

## Theodore Roosevelt

Most of the laity among progressive Republicans imagine that Mr. Roosevelt will place himself at their head and lead the charge against the reactionaries. After that, they think, "it will be all over but the shouting"; that the reactionaries will take to the woods, and that progress will be enthroned in the Republican organization. It is doubtful if their leaders at Washington share their hope as to Mr. Roosevelt's future course, or agree with them that his identification with insurgency is essential to that movement's success, but there is no question as to the hope and confidence of the rank and file.

A close study of Mr. Roosevelt's career will fail to disclose any thing in it upon which to base the hope that he will become an insurgent.

In his later years he has been chief among the apostles of party regularity, and Insurgency is essentially irregular. Mr. Roosevelt has never done or said anything to show that he sympathizes with Insurgency's aims or purposes. In fact, many people who acclaim most loudly their belief in the "Roosevelt policies" have no clear conception of what those policies are, nor of the character of the man for whom they are named. They have judged Mr. Roosevelt by his words and not by his deeds, and the result is an amazing popular misconception of the real Roosevelt.

Mr. Roosevelt's strength, in fact, has come largely through his ability to convince the people of his devotion to the public welfare, while in an emergency he has never failed to enlist in behalf of himself or his cause the support of "the malefactors of great wealth." Certainly his policies have never included any extension of democratic government, which, after all, is the inspiring principle of this insurgent movement.

If Mr. Roosevelt's future is to be judged by his past, he will be found allied with the standpat element of his party, although he will probably avoid committing himself publicly to the standpat faction. He is the most adroit politician of his time, and he wants to be president again. He has no hope that he can attain that place against the combined opposition of the wealth of the country—a wealth which, despite his pretense to the contrary, he has always cultivated and courted. At the same time he will avoid, if possible, doing aught that will alienate to any serious degree the support of the rank and file.

Mr. Roosevelt's failure to identify himself with insurgency will not injure that movement nearly so much as some of its devotees imagine. It may cost the movement some immediate victories, and involve the desertion of some men who identified themselves with it in the belief that it was the band wagon; but in the long run it will result in the strengthening of this great movement which, breaking out in the Republican party, has extended into all parties and awaits merely the psychological moment to crystallize into an irresistible political force.

It is essential to the success of any new movement in politics that it be not launched inauspiciously, nor discredited in advance by false leadership; and the spectacle of Theodore Roosevelt leading a great battle for democracy would, to those who judge him by his deeds and not by his words, be an incongruous one indeed.

Mr. Roosevelt is disqualified for leadership of the new idea in politics by reason of his utter lack of sympathy with or belief in democratic principles. Early in life he was inoculated with the virus of Alexander Hamilton's philosophy, and all through his public career he has clung tenaciously to the belief that the first duty of government is to protect the people from themselves.

He has succeeded, most of the time in concealing this belief, it is true; but it breathed in every line of his public speeches and writings, and may there be found by those who are willing to go beneath the surface. It may be granted that he resents the plundering of many by the privileged few; but when called upon to suggest a remedy he has never in his life proposed an extension of the power lodged in the people to control and direct their own affairs. Invariably he has demanded an extension of the powers of the central government, and further removal of that government from popular control. He would eradicate privilege through the agency of a powerful bureaucratic system, responsible not to the people, but to the appointing authority.

Point out any evil to Mr. Roosevelt, from child labor to the woolly aphis pest, and he will suggest as a remedy the creation of a commission of experts to be appointed by the President.

Instances of Mr. Roosevelt's abhorrence of real democracy are so many that it is difficult to select from the wealth of the material at hand. His present round of calls upon the crowned heads of Europe, and his refusal to visit the only democratic government in the old world—Switzerland—is an excellent example of it. It has been demonstrated in his almost brutal defense of exploitation and tyranny in the Philippines, in his championship of British misrule in India and Egypt, and by his attitude toward democratic issues in this country. He sent Taft into Oklahoma to oppose the adoption of the initiative and referendum; and Cummins and LaFollette, in their desperate struggles to redeem their States from reactionary control, had to combat constantly the influence of Federal patronage peddled by Roosevelt to the corporation machines of those States.

The Insurgents are Democrats in a real sense, though not in a party sense. They believe in bringing government close to the people. They are for the initiative and referendum, for the recall, and for the direct election of Senators. Mr. Roosevelt does not pretend to believe in a single one of these things. His ideas of a centralized government are almost identical with the ideas of centralization and autocracy which Alexander Hamilton preached more than a century ago.

It is idle to hope that a man holding these notions can be counted upon to render efficient service to insurgency.

Mr. Roosevelt's lack of democratic feeling is displayed in his ardent military spirit and in his almost fanatical devotion to the exploded doctrine that a nation should spend vast sums of money on heavy armaments and huge military forces. It shows his lust for blood and his passion for slaughter—in the imperialistic customs and forms with which he surrounded the ordinary routine matters of the White House while he was the tenant of that edifice.

Even in delivering a peace oration at Christiana he could not refrain from eulogizing bloody war as a necessity which at times was bound to sweep every other consideration aside.

Insurgency owes much of its present force and militancy to resentment at the passage of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law. It must be evident to clear-minded political thinkers that the battleships of protection are to be the next point of assault against entrenched privilege in this country. Upon this issue Mr. Roosevelt is certain to disappoint those who are counting on his leadership. If he has any convictions on the tariff question, he concealed them carefully during his seven years in the Presidential office.

At a time when Albert B. Cummins was proclaiming that the Dingley law was costing the American people more money every day than the total stealings from the life insurance companies in New York, Mr. Roosevelt was arranging with Messrs. Aldrich and Cannon that the question of tariff revision should go over until he was safely out of office.

Mr. Roosevelt is supposed to have left college a free trader, but one may doubt if he ever had any real convictions on the subject. Here is what he says in his life of Thomas H. Benton on the question of protection:

"Now whether a protective tariff is right or wrong may be open to question; but, if it exists at all, it should work as simply as possible. If its interpretation varies, or if it is continually meddled with by Congress, great damage ensues. It is in reality of far less importance that a law should be ideally right than that it should be certain and steady in its workings."

Nobody will deny that the Dingley and Payne-Aldrich bills have been "certain and steady in their workings." But it goes without saying that the man who wrote that passage had no knowledge or the tariff question, either from a protectionist or from a free-trade standpoint.—That he has no conception of the economic phase of the question, and that the possibility of a moral principle being involved in it has never entered his head. Lacking both knowledge and conviction, he would be a totally unfit leader for a movement which aims to wipe out or at least mitigate tariff abuses.

Another reason why Mr. Roosevelt will be careful to avoid identification with the Insurgent movement lies in the fact that never in his life has he publicly acknowledged himself guilty of a mistake. To become an Insurgent he must confess to the whole American people that he was guilty of a gross blunder in forcing the nomination of Mr. Taft and vouching for his fidelity to the principles with which Mr. Roosevelt himself was identified in the public mind. Such an acknowledgement Mr. Roosevelt will never make.

Mr. Roosevelt would be an unsafe leader of the insurgent cause, even could he be induced to assume its leadership. Those who trace back his career will discover that he has been the most agile trimmer and compromiser with the powers of darkness in modern times. With him the result of the immediate contest in which he is engaged, excludes every other consideration. He is never willing to pursue with unwavering fidelity a given principle to the bitter end, regardless of its effect on his personal fortunes or ambitions. If by an artful and timely compromise he can boast of the shadow of victory, he willingly surrenders the substance. The most glaring example of that trait in his character was afforded by his capitulation to Aldrich, Spooner and Allison in the struggle over the Hepburn rate bill.

There has never been a time in Mr. Roosevelt's career when he was not willing to deal and dicker privately with those whom he was publicly denouncing as enemies of mankind. Once or twice he has been caught and exposed at it, notably in the case when he was President of the United States, he wrote a personal letter to E. H. Harriman, soliciting campaign funds.

He is not of the stuff of which martyrs and crusaders are made—content to wait for time to vindicate his course and force the adoption of his ideas. He is not patient enough to sow the seed and await the due coming of the harvest time. What he demands always is immediate results, which shall redound to the public glorification of Theodore Roosevelt. Too often he has surrendered what he has paraded as his undying principles in order to achieve his immediate ends.

If ever in the world there was a movement that demanded a militant, uncompromising leader, who would not abate a jot or tittle of principle, but would pursue an undeviating course to the last, it is the Insurgent movement. In the hands of a compromiser or trimmer, a man who is willing to bargain in a back room with its enemies, it is bound to be wrecked.

Senator Cummins evidently understands this. Not long ago, when Aldrich sent for him and asked him for terms of compromise on the railroad bill pending in Congress, Mr. Cummins declined to name any terms, or to discuss the matter with the reactionary leader. That was the stand of a man who is as good a politician as Roosevelt and infinitely more faithfully to principle.

Instead of needing the leadership of Mr. Roosevelt, the progressive Republicans are fortunate indeed that they will probably escape it.—D. K. L. in The Public.

## Reforming Legal Procedure

Two important committees have lately been appointed to help forward the good work of reforming our judicial procedure. One of them was appointed by the American Bar Association, the other by the National Civic Federation. Both are composed of first-rate men and their recommendations will command attention. A statement of their joint purpose by Everett P. Wheeler emphasizes the point that they seek no modification of the law itself, but only of its administration. The trial of equity suits in the Federal courts is instanced as an excellent subject for reform. In these the procedure is as antiquated as it can be and everything is contrived apparently for the sake of delay and expense. The whole machinery is so cumbersome that it can hardly be made to work at all. Then, in ordinary lawsuits, there are the costs and delays arising from technicalities, the errors of lawyers, the meticulousness of judges. Legislation is sought to improve the administration of the law in all these departments.

There ought not to be any opposition to this progressive legislation, but it is too much to expect that everybody will favor it. Mr. Wheeler's remark that "it is to everybody's interest to have lawsuits quickly and cheaply disposed of" must be taken with a grain or two of salt. The lawyers who draw fees from dilatory proceedings may desire to have their opportunities curtailed, and they may not. Certainly, so far as their financial interest is concerned, the law's delays are a source of rich income to them. We ought not to hope that they will be unselfish enough to work against their own pockets. Few men are capable of such disinterestedness. If the law's procedure is ever reformed it will be done against the wishes and the more or less active opposition of a large fraction of the legal profession. What would become of the masters in chancery and their pickings, for example, if Federal equity suits were tried in a sensible way? The same question applies to a host of other parasites.—Oregonian.

## A Bribery Lesson

"Maybe I took the money because I saw every one else doing the same thing," groans the father, and the daughter cries out, "To spend years of toil in building a name and then to destroy it at one blow!"

There are times when the standard of morals sink dangerously low, and men barter their honor for a price; but there can never be a time when such actions will not be followed by the cry of the daughter and the mute suffering of the wife. If the man who enters the hall of temptation could be made to realize that, if he could be made to hear that cry and see that face before he has sold his birthright for a mess of pottage, he would come through unscathed.

May it not be possible for these loved ones who know of the sin only when the penalty is to be paid to do something to fortify the tempted? Do all wives and daughters, however loving and faithful, appreciate the position of the husband and father who enters the fierce commercial struggle? Do they give him sufficient assurance that they appreciate his character as a man, regardless of his ability as a money getter? Honor is not yet such a lusty plant that it will flourish amid weeds in a sterile soil without care and cultivation.

If this wife and this daughter had only known the snares that were to be set for the feet of the husband and father, if they had put their arms about him as he set out for the legislature, and said, "We are proud of you. We are glad our neighbors have recognized your worth and chosen you to represent them. We hope to see you rise to still higher positions. But whether you do or not we shall love you, not because you are a law-maker of a great State, but because you are an upright man; not because our neighbors have faith in you, but because we know you never did a mean thing, or betrayed a trust." Had they done this, would he have fallen?

But let no one grow pessimistic over the graft disclosures. The standard of public morals is rising, not falling; the world is growing better, not worse. It is because the public conscience has become so acute that graft is now exposed that formerly lay hidden; nay, the very things themselves are now rated as graft that were formerly passed as innocent.

If one doubts this, let him consider the one item of graft, the pass. How many years has it been since members of the government in every branch, legislative, executive and judicial, considered the railway pass a legitimate perquisite? Yet where is the judge or the Congressman who will openly confess to the use of the pass?

During the great Pullman strike a high Washington official—and a man noted for his honesty—came to Chicago to investigate the trouble, and he traveled on a Pullman pass. That act did excite public criticism, for we were then making the transition from the old to the new standard.

Yes, the tendency is upward, not downward. And though we must condemn the wrong-doer, let us not forget the right-doer. And you, Mr. Editor, forget not your opportunity. One word of appreciation of the honest man may be worth a column of abuse for the fallen.

## Flying Squadron in State Politics

Campaign time is usually the season of "flying squadron" politics, that empties state houses, court houses and other seats of the public offices during the electoral canvass, leaving all salaries to run on for a service that is not rendered, leading to a serious neglect and accumulation of public business, and often costing the public in private penalties more than the great sums appropriated to cover the service that is not performed, says the Lewiston Tribune. The press of the state of Iowa makes caustic mention of the fact that Senator Cummins is one of the worst of offenders in this respect. During his long career as governor he was in close relations with officialism throughout the State, which has been increased by his later distributions of federal patronage. It is related that all these have been organized into a "flying squadron," which was dispatched in detail throughout the state to influence the voters in the political actions. Notwithstanding the fact that these men were paid heavy salaries by the state to perform their official duties they left their posts and devoted their energies to working up caucuses and conventions, to making speeches and to efforts to influence primaries. Probably the same thing has been, and is, occurring in this state and in all other state and the large sums appropriated not simply for salaries but for traveling expenses and various incidentals are mainly used as campaign funds to further the reelection of the incumbents or of their higher benefactor. In this state, where low and crude politics prevails, where men of the shabbiest character can be elected to the highest offices by affiliation with the "reform forces," nothing better is to be expected, but Iowa has emerged from the swaddling clothes era, has sent the "reformers" back home to their private duties and otherwise surmounted the dark days of its career. Senator Cummins is a leader for something better in federal affairs than what has been had; he stands for something worse in his own state.

Of course, the salaries paid to men who thus quit the service for which they are elected or appointed and paid run up until the citizen of average intelligence would be astonished over the aggregate of revenue which is thus pulled out of the pockets of the people without any better return than the neglect of important public duty and, in many instances, unscrupulous and successful efforts to deceive and mislead those who are paying and supporting them. But the actual outlay thus misused, large as it is, may only amount to a drop in the bucket beside the incidental and indirect losses to the people. The immigration office, for instance, might render vast benefit to the state by expending its energies and appropriations in useful service, instead of employing both merely as campaign agencies. The land department would double the value of the state's resources in that respect if its employees were not usually engaged in political work instead of state land business. The same can be said, to a greater or less extent, all the way through. When the meaning and the evils of it are clearly understood the people are sure to look back with astonishment, upon the records of those men, highly favored of their party and of the public, who have ever dared to betake themselves to it.

At Twin Falls, recently, Hon. M. Alexander suggested that it would be a splendid scheme for the state to invest its idle funds in county warrants drawing seven per cent. Does it not strike you that this would be a good business proposition? Would it not increase the income of the state, without any possibility of loss. Such propositions as these come from a business man who would look after the business of the state as if it were his own, not on the plan of so many men of exploiting the state's business for their own private interest.