
CONDENSED EDITORIALS

THE INSANE ASSAULT UPON ROOSEVELT.

From William J. Bryan's Indianapolis Speech of October 16, 1912, as Reproduced in The Commoner of October 25.

The suggestion that the assailant was led to make the attack because of newspaper criticism, is a far-fetched one.

I have been a careful reader of the papers since last June, and I am quite sure that the Taft papers have been no more bitter in their assaults upon Mr. Roosevelt than the Roosevelt papers have been in their assaults upon Mr. Taft; and neither side has attacked the other with more virulence than both have attacked the Democrats in campaigns past.

I can show you as bitter things said against me by both the friends of Mr. Taft and the friends of Mr. Roosevelt as the friends of either have said against the other. The papers say many things that they ought not to say, but I know of no party that is guiltless in this matter.

A nation sits anxiously by the ex-President's bedside, hoping that the wound is not a serious one, but Mr. Roosevelt's supporters must not use this attack to protect themselves and their position from just criticism.



PROFESSION VERSUS PERFORMANCE.

By Senator La Follette in La Follette's Weekly of October 26, 1912.

In weighing the course which it was my duty to take when Roosevelt became an open and aggressive candidate, claiming the leadership of the Republican Progressive movement, I reviewed the record of his official life.

He had given utterance to many strong progressive declarations. Taken by themselves, they would persuade the most ardent progressive. At times this side of the man had led me to be hopeful that he might support our movement, and with his prestige as a former President, if he would but hold fast, give us greatly added strength.

But to commit the progressive cause to his control, to stake all on his remaining steadfast, to "follow, follow, follow, wherever he would lead,"—quoting the refrain of those so-called Progressives who did follow him unquestioningly—compelled me, whenever this momentous question came up in a serious way, and before taking the final step, to go back along the course over which this man had come and see whether he had left a straight or a crooked trail.

Important events blazed that trail, which established its general course and direction. More than that—which was the vital thing now—it pointed the way he would certainly go in the future.

There was his record on the coal land bill.

His sponsorship for the Hepburn bill, which was in fact little more than a sham.

His shiftiness on the value of railroad property as a basis for rate regulation.

His aversion to the anti-trust law and his combination and trust policy which, despite his verbal assaults on trusts, steadily strengthened and encouraged the growth of monopoly.

His strong support of the Aldrich-Cannon standpat tariff program.

His confidential relations with Morgan, Perkins, Frick, Harriman, and those associated with them in the interlocking directorates controlling the Big Business of the country.

And his uniform policy of opposition to the progressive movement in Wisconsin and other States.

Each of these, by itself, would shatter, for the time being, confidence in Roosevelt's integrity of purpose.

But it would be followed by such vigorous and apparently sincere denunciation of the evils of Privilege, as again to make one believe in and trust him.

But when reviewed in their relation, one with another, in this great crisis in the life of the progressive movement, I could not conscientiously accept him as a leader of the progressive movement.



LEGISLATURES UNDER HATS.

Woodrow Wilson in a Speech at Hartford, Conn., as Reported in the New York Times of Sept. 26, 1912.

In the great State of Oregon on the Pacific Coast they have the Initiative and the Referendum, and there is a certain gentleman named Mr. U'Ren who is at the center of a group of men who busy themselves in suggesting certain legislative reforms to be carried out upon the Initiative of the people themselves, and these gentlemen, by commending these measures to the general public, have transformed the government of the State of Oregon.

But the point I was about to make was this: When I last visited the State of Oregon I reached the City of Portland in that great State on a morning when there happened to be, in the leading newspaper of the city, an editorial to this effect: That there were two legislatures in Oregon—I think it was said with a sneer—one was at Salem, the capital of the State, and the other went around under Mr. U'Ren's hat.

I digested this statement, and when I came to speak in the evening I ventured upon this remark: "Now, I do not wish anybody to understand me as advocating the concentration of power in any man or in any group of men, but I simply wish to say that if I had my choice between a legislature that went around under the hat of somebody in particular whom I could identify and find, and a legislature that went around under God knows whose hat, I would choose the legislature that goes around under the hat of the recognizable individual. For I know and could tell those people that until very recent months nobody knew who wore the hat of the legislature of New Jersey, and that because the wearer of the hat was not disclosed, was not recognizable, could not be mentioned by name, the people of New Jersey had, for half a generation, been cheated after every election out of every reform upon which they had insisted.