

---

---

## THE TARIFF AND THE TRUSTS

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, FEBRUARY 24, 1912. FROM PAMPHLET IN THE LIBRARY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

THE introduction to which I have just listened certainly puts me under a great obligation for the generous judgment which it embodies. But I am very much afraid that it will be very difficult for me to play up to the rôle, and I want to say at the outset, while I appreciate most profoundly all that has been said, that I do not come here as a Wilson man. I think I can say most sincerely that what stirs my blood in the present contest is not that it may affect me, but that there is a great thing to be done, which intelligent men can combine to do successfully and triumphantly; that there is an opportunity now immediately awaiting the Democratic party such as has never awaited it before. I was saying just now to Mr. Douglas that it was an interesting thing to me that there *was one lesson that some men never seemed to learn, and that was that whenever they tried to serve themselves and made it obvious that they were trying to serve themselves, the thing they least succeeded in doing was serving themselves*; that the only way in which you can connect yourself with the forces of success is by connecting yourself with the forces of society, because every man will be as little as himself if his thought is centred upon himself. (Applause).

You know that we are sometimes laughed at by foreigners for boasting of the size of America, and they naturally suggest that we didn't make America, that we didn't make the physical continent we tread upon, and therefore it is hardly to our credit that it is so big.

But it seems to me they do not discriminate. *Men are just as big as the things they dominate*, and we have dominated a continent and therefore have reason to be proud of its size. Our greatness, the elasticity of our institutions, the adaptability of our life, is measured by the scale of a continent. Having covered that continent with happy homes and successful institutions, we have the right to be proud of its size. And so it seems to me with the individual. In proportion as he can cover with his activities and with his imaginations a great plan, so is he himself enlarged, and in proportion as a party can conceive a great opportunity and forget the things that may come to individuals in the struggle, in that proportion is it noble and in that proportion is it in the road to success. No party that centres its view upon itself can ever be serviceable to the United States. The United States can be served only in its own humour, and according to its own facts and circumstances. What moves my imagination is this, that the circumstances are not now what they ever were before in the United States. For example: we all of us agree that the central issue in the next campaign will probably be, as so often before, the question of the tariff. But the tariff is not now the question that it was a generation ago; the tariff is not now the question it was ten or fifteen years ago. Nature, and the development of our enterprises, the change in the circumstances of the world, would have taken charge of the tariff question. Take this single fact, for example—what made it very difficult to answer the old arguments of the advocates of a protective tariff was this. They pointed out what was perfectly obvious, that within the United States, with its great size and infinite variety, there was an unparalleled area of absolute free trade. The Constitution was set up in order that there might be free trade. There would have been no Constitution of the United States if it had not been that the colonies that had become states were determined to pull down the economic barriers between themselves.

That was what led to the Annapolis Convention, and the Philadelphia Convention. They first met to make a commercial arrangement and upon that commercial arrangement built the institutions of the Nation. The Constitution was made in order that there might be free trade between all the states, and that was the object of the power over interstate commerce that was granted to the Congress. And so, because there was domestic competition it was very difficult to answer the arguments of the protectionists, that protection does not directly govern price and therefore was not directly a burden upon the consumer, because the price was kept down by domestic competition upon the vast scale of a continent. All that has been altered in the last decade. In field after field of our economic exchanges competition has ceased to determine price. Monopoly in one form or another has taken the place of competition, and now, without competition, these gentlemen who lie so snugly behind the high wall of protection are determining arbitrarily what the prices of everything, from foodstuffs up, are to be.

It is not the old question. Senator La Follette, for example, in his interesting autobiography, calls attention to this fact, that the old argument so prominent on the lips of McKinley and Blaine, for instance, is absolutely obliterated by change of circumstances. Not only so, but in those old days we did not have such a surplus of manufactured articles as we have now. An interesting fact is, that our exports of grain with which we used to feed the world have been steadily falling off until the grain dealers tell me that we are within sight of the vanishing point, not because we are producing less, or because it is harder to sell our grain, but because we are needing more ourselves. And the proportion of grain to the domestic demand is very much smaller than it used to be. We are, therefore, coming to the point at which we do not export grain and cannot pay our international exchanges except by other products.

At the same time these tremendously stimulated manufacturers of ours have piled up their output to such an extent that they must have an outlet in foreign fields, or else there will be a congestion that will operate calamitously upon the economic conditions of the country.

But what has happened in the meantime? By the most stupendous stupidity on record we have obliterated our merchant marine. We haven't got the ships in which to carry these goods. We are not allowed to have the ships in which to carry these goods upon any terms by which we can afford to own them. So that we are very philanthropically digging a ditch through the Isthmus to the south of us for the use of the ships of all the world except American ships, for there aren't any American ships to go through. And we are told that the railways of the country are so jealous of their carrying trade that they are trying to prevent the loans necessary in order to build up new lines of ships to reach the South. I don't know whether that is true or not, but it would be just like them for stupidity.

The trouble with our time is not so much selfishness as ignorance, inability to see what is going on under the eyes of the world. Now these are the things that are going on, and the nation that has the ships to carry her goods has the hands with which she can reach the foreign markets, and if she hasn't got the ships she has to go there under such disadvantages as the owners of foreign ships, owned by competing nations, choose to impose upon her.

Not only that, but we haven't a banking system which enables us to set up satisfactory exchange with foreign markets. Our National Banks are actually not allowed to deal in accepted bills of lading, so that Canadian bankers come down to New York, San Francisco and other ports and set up branch banking houses which can do this absolutely essential function of international trade. We have been so rooted in our provincialism, so

unaware of the very processes of our own industrial life, that we have cut ourselves off from the means of making ourselves supreme in the world from an economic point of view.

All this has been going on without the leave of the gentlemen who have established and maintained a protective policy. It has been like a great underground body of creeping waters, destroying the very foundation of the citadel which they thought they had built so stout. At the same time what is about to happen? Why all the threads are going to run in other directions; because the minute you cut that canal through the Isthmus then the great arteries of trade are not going to run exclusively East and West as they run now, they are going to sweep around to the South; they are going to fertilize that great valley of the Mississippi as it never was fertilized before with industry and commerce; and all the railroads instead of shipping outward to the ports are going to find their lines running inward. There are going to be more carrying problems than ever before, but not in the same parts of the country as before. No one can stay the change. And these gentlemen want to stand pat, are standing pat, while the tide is rising around them. You can see by their disconcerted manner that it is almost getting to their breathing apparatus. (Applause.)

In other words, what fills me with confidence in the future is this, that the world is not waiting upon the stupidity of Republican politics. The world has an awkward way of taking things into its own hands. The life of the people must in the long run express itself in its politics, and it does not now express itself in this country in the politics we have been accustomed to in the last decade. (Applause.)

These gentlemen may sit tight and hard as long as they please but they will be hoist by powers they cannot control. The whole query of the future is, does the

Democratic party understand the job and does it know how to do it?

We all feel the inflation of pleasure as Democrats that this is a Democratic year, but it isn't going to be a Democratic year if the Democratic party does not understand the job. (Applause.) Democratic enthusiasm isn't going to do it. Democratic confidence of success isn't going to do it. The selection of the right candidate isn't going to do it. People of this country know what they want and what they are after is not the candidate but the goods. If the candidate is suitable for their purposes, and the party puts him upon a platform that expresses those purposes, then they are for him, otherwise they will wait. They would rather bear the ills they have than fly to others that they know not of.

That is the temper of America. There is a great deal of talk in America, but it is, when all is said, one of the most inveterately conservative people in the world. Americans talk much more freely than they act, particularly in the field of politics. And in a country knitted together with the most delicate and intricate fibres of business, the one thing that is most dreaded is ill-considered experiment. America is not afraid. America is not afraid of acting on principle, of moving, of changing, but is afraid of changing by uncalculated courses. It does not want schemes the operation of which it cannot foresee the effect of, and therefore it always wants a bill of particulars, and we are getting ready to present a bill of particulars. For example, round about this core of all questions which lies in the tariff, lie all these other questions, many of which we sum up under the general term of the corporation question, the trust question.

Nobody can fail to see, no matter how clearly you perceive the evils that have come upon the country by the use of them,—nobody can fail to see that modern business is going to be done by corporations. *The old time of individual competition is probably gone by.* It

may come back; I don't know; it will not come back within our time, I dare say. We will do business henceforth when we do it on a great and successful scale, by means of corporations. But what we are afraid of, as we have said in the Sherman Act, is such use of corporations as will be in restraint of trade; that is, such use as will establish monopoly. Very well, we have got to know what particular things do establish monopoly; because if we merely say "this concern is so big that it looks to us like monopoly" that isn't satisfactory. I am not afraid of any corporation, no matter how big. I am afraid of any corporation, however small, that is bad, that is rotten at the core, whose practices and actions are in restraint of trade. So that the thing we are after is not reckoning size in measuring capacity for damage, but measuring and comprehending the exact damage done. Very well, we are getting details. For example, in the Stanley investigation, in the investigation connected with the trial of the meat packers, and in the investigation I hope will be pushed forward in connection with the so-called money trust (great applause) we are going to find out how the thing is done.

For example, take the meat men, I have some friends connected in a subordinate way as employees of that great industry, some college men who are quick to see and intelligent to comprehend, and once or twice when I have made remarks that did not seem complimentary to the meat trust these gentlemen have written to me and asked if I was aware of the fact that the operations were as a matter of fact yielding this concern only a very minute fraction of profit, and there would be no profit in it at all if they didn't command so large a proportion of the product as to make the sum total considerable. And I didn't know what to say until I read the testimony taken in the trial of the meat packers at Chicago, and then I found out that these gentlemen buy cattle on the hoof, as everybody knows, and they charge up all the expenses of all their operations to the meat; and they

sell the hides and the hoofs, and the parts, whatever they may be, that yield very valuable glue, and all the by-products, which in their sum total are extremely profitable, without any charges being entered against them in their books. So that we are paying for meat in order to enable them to sell hides and determine the price of shoes. (Applause.) Now that is a valuable inside piece of information. They can't any longer impose upon us by showing us their books upon fresh meat (or meat that isn't fresh that comes out of cold storage). That is what I call one of the items in the bill of particulars. We know also by their own testimony it isn't necessary for them to combine themselves in a corporation in order to fix prices; it is only necessary to have a gentleman's understanding, and have correspondence through a secretary agreed upon, and that this secretary, once every so often, shall send out a circular suggesting a price for meat, and this suggestion be taken kindly and acted upon. (Laughter.) That suggestion is perfectly arbitrary; they can establish the price of meat upon an absolutely non-competitive basis.

Very well, we know what the meat packers are doing and what the steel men are doing, and what all these other men are doing. We have got now some of the transactions and the form in which they are carried through. It seems to me that now, therefore, we are ready to proceed to business, so far as we see what we are about. We are not going to lay about us in any blind and vague way, but we are going to do something like this, not proposing this as a measure but merely as an illustration. If you want to cure men of joy riding you won't break up their automobiles, but catch the men that do the joy riding and see that these very useful and pleasant vehicles of our modern life are left for legitimate uses. If you want to stop joy riding in corporations—for that is what is being done (laughter and applause)—you will not break up the corporations; we may need to use them; but you will break up the game,



namely, that use of corporations. I dare say the judges and other lawyers present,—if it is true that judges are still lawyers (laughter) will agree with me that this is at any rate feasible; with the necessary legislation, we can say that a corporation, so long as it acts within its charter, or is within the limits of the law, is something we won't look inside of. We will regard it as long as it is within its legitimate uses as a body corporate that has its own separate entity, and into the details of whose organization we won't pry. We will hold it responsible so far only as a body, an unbroken body, but the minute somebody inside begins to use it for purposes he has no right to use it for, then we are going to turn it inside out and see who is inside. And we are going to establish this principle that with regard to breaches of the law we will deal not with corporations but with individuals, that we don't know corporations, that we never heard of them, when we are dealing with breaches of the law. We can oblige every corporation to file with the proper officer of the law a sworn analysis of the way its business is done, which will be conclusive—not merely presumptive evidence—upon any trial, an analysis which it cannot controvert upon trial; which will show that such and such transactions are ordered by the president, such and such transactions are ordered by a committee of its board, certain other transactions are ordered by the board as a whole, others by its first vice-president, and so on down through the analysis. Then when a wrong is committed we will turn to the analysis and find the officer who according to that analysis ordered that particular thing done, and we will indict him *not as an officer of the corporation but as an individual who used that corporation for something that was illegal*. Then you say, we will find out he was a dummy. Very well, go on, push the trial, draw in all the collateral evidence and find whose dummy he was, then amend the indictment and include the gentlemen whose dummy he was, whether it happens to be an official connected with

that corporation or not, because in this process we have nothing to do with corporations, we are finding men. You know the old cynical French maxim, when any man is running an incalculable course "*cherchez la femme*" (find the woman). Now we must establish the maxim "find the man." Anything that is wrong must have originated with some person in particular. When you have found that person and given him a season to think it over in the penitentiary (applause) the thing will be stopped, and business will be relieved of the embarrassment of breaking up its organization in order to stop these practices.

Do you see any other way to avoid interrupting the natural and normal processes of American business? If you will do this then all the prohibitions of your law will work, no man will use corporations in restraint of trade; and item by item we can put in *our statutes what constitutes restraint of trade*, not leaving it to courts for generalizations which may fit some cases and not others. Then we shall have a programme which need disturb no honest man, and will begin to see the map of the thing. I want to see the map of our corporate life. You don't know the highways of it, you don't know any of the intricacies of it. The difficulty in this country is not altogether that we have big corporations, but that these big corporations are combined with one another, not by law, but by the fact that their directorates interlace in every direction and that the same combinations of men control the majority of the stock in corporation after corporation.

No corporation can ever get big enough to make the Government of the United States afraid, but all of them combined might in some sinister and fateful day make the Government of the United States subserve them. So that you have got to disentangle this puzzle; you have got to find where the lines of personal responsibility interlace; you have got to lift these persons up and put them under cross-examination as to what they are doing

with the business of the country, not for the purpose of gibbeting them, not for the purpose of putting them under contempt and mortifications, but for the purpose of saving the country and saving its business.

I am not aware that I cherish in my heart any bitter feelings toward any individual concerned in these matters. Many of these men do not see the consequences of the thing they are doing. They are just as patriotic so far as they have examined their own consciences as either you or I. They don't comprehend. We have got to wake them to the things that are to be feared, and then devise the particular methods by which they are to be corrected. We are not vindictive, but determined men, with open eyes.

For in the meantime what is going on? When I hear gentlemen say that politics ought to let business alone, I feel like inviting them to first consider whether business is letting politics alone. It is a two-sided matter; if you will quit, we will. If you will stop trying to determine elections by campaign contributions; if you will stop encouraging bi-partisan political machinery, so that it is worth your while to contribute to both campaign funds; if you will stop making the control of legislatures a business proposition, then you will find that in the most complete and only effectual way you have disentangled business from politics.

The initial steps are taken in lobbies, they are not taken in the councils of statesmen; they are taken in those secret and whispered conferences that go on in almost every legislative lobby in this country, where men are shown that it is to their material interest—whether directly or indirectly—that they shall vote as interested parties desire them to vote. These great leagues of business, in other words, are not merely leagues to command markets, but they are often also leagues to command legislation.

And so the view widens, does it not? So the country is asking itself, who is represented in our representative

assemblies? In some states the people are represented, thank God, but in some states they are not represented. In some states the legislatures are secretly and privately controlled. Now, are you going to stir the blood of those people in those states by preaching a eulogy on representative institutions? If they have found out election after election that to vote one ticket or the other is to choose between tweedledum and tweedledee; if they know no matter how they vote things don't get better at the State capital, how are you going to stir their patriotism with the tradition of the great representative institutions in this country? They will laugh in your face, they will say: "Are you so young, so unsophisticated as to suppose you know what you are talking about? Show us representative institutions to worship and we will be the first to fall on our knees, but we want to know who are represented."

There are two or three theories of government in this country. Don't deceive yourself by supposing all the people in this country believe in democratic government, because they do not. You have only to listen to the utterances of very distinguished Republican speakers to see that they do not believe and do not pretend to believe in popular government. They will tell you they do not believe the judgment of the people can be trusted. Are you going to take counsel from these gentlemen as to the preservation of our representative institutions when they don't want them to represent the great body, the rank and file of the people? I don't know whether I was born so, or learned so, or what happened to me, but I know this, that the deepest conviction I have, arising out of observation and experience is this, that I would rather take the judgment of the rank and file than the judgment of the men who have become absorbed and successful as the leaders in great undertakings. (Applause.)

I want to ask these gentlemen this query: What sustains business in the United States? What is it that

makes the United States prosperous? Is it that we have great captains of industry? What would they do without the cunning and skill, the muscle and the indomitable aspiring hope of the American people? If these people were to find hope dying out of their hearts, they will be dumb-driven beasts, and your enterprises will fall for lack of the very breath that sustains them. (Applause.)

If you want to find whether a nation is prosperous or not, ask the men who are on the make what they hope and what they fear. Go to the country districts and ask anxious fathers who are looking for openings for their sons where they expect to get them in, where they find doors open and where they find doors shut. Go to the places where men are making earnings and see whether they dread or confidently look forward to the future, and then you will find whether America is waxing or waning, for if these men are confident, full of hope, if they know they are going to have free chances, if they know that the doors of opportunity are open to them, if they know they are going to get fair treatment wherever they go, then America can conquer the world of enterprise by means of their hope. But if you find, what you do find, men everywhere asking themselves whether the doors of opportunity have not been locked in their faces, then you will have to take a new reckoning as to the future of America.

What was it that they proposed to investigate in Congress the other day? Not a money trust in the ordinary sense that anybody is hiding or hoarding money anywhere. Men who have money are not fools enough not to want to use it, because it does not yield them anything if it is not used. What is suspected is this: that nobody can get large loans in this country to start those large enterprises by which alone our industry thrives, unless he will consent to take certain gentlemen in with him who furnish the money; that the privileged circle is closed, and that while you can

get all the little credits you please in your local banks you can't get your big credits where the reserves of the country are kept, except on the terms of the gentlemen who stand guard over these reserves. (Applause.) That is what is charged. And it is not charged without evidence. It is not charged without abundant evidence. Therefore, if only those who are chosen at the top have the right of way in, what is going to happen to America? Did you ever hear of a nation that was renewed from the top? Did you ever hear of a nation that was not made virile, that did not account for its youth by renewal from the bottom? Did you ever hear of a tree that drew its sap from its flowers? Does it now draw it from the dark and silent places of the soil? Does not a nation draw its power of renewal and enterprise, and all its future, from the ranks of the great body of unnamed men? And if you are going to discourage these men; if you are going to put the chill of fear in their hearts, then American captains of industry can whistle for their future, and they will whistle in a wilderness. (Applause.)

I am the friend of American business, because I know where its foundations are laid, and where they are weak; and those foundations are solid only when laid in the confidence of the common people. (Great applause.)

A Democrat? Why a man does not understand history who isn't a Democrat. A man doesn't understand enterprise who isn't a Democrat. And let me tell you this: Democracy is not merely a matter of programmes, it is a matter of sympathy and insight. It depends upon whether your heart is in connection with the great heart of the people or not. It does not depend upon whether you can cunningly devise a platform that looks firm and good or not. You can build a flimsy platform and stand on it successfully, provided its basis is in the right kind of spirit. It is a matter of seeing—not from your eyes out, but from the eyes of other men

in. Getting the vision that is in the back of the other man's head is the thing; getting the hope that is the universal hope; getting that impulse that is the common human impulse, forward. This world has been swept by wave after wave of Democratic impulse. It is being swept by it now. The great waters are rising, rising, and nothing prevents their fertilizing the valleys except that stubborn, stupid stand-pat dam. (Great applause.)

What fills my imagination, therefore, gentlemen, is this, that we are at the threshold of a great enterprise, the enterprise of retranslating the liberties of America into the terms of our lives as we now actually live them. The party that can do that first is the party that will rule this country for the next generation, and the party that misses it, that doesn't do it, won't rule it now and will never rule it. There are competitors. We aren't the only candidates in the field, we Democrats. Illumination has penetrated the Republican ranks. You don't describe a Republican by merely calling him a Republican. There are various kinds of Republicans; some of them are so attenuated in their doctrines that you can hardly recognize them as such, but all of them still stubbornly cling to that old name, for this reason—I believe in my heart this is the real reason—these men don't come over and call themselves Democrats because they believe the Republican party is the only party that has shown practical genius in understanding and administering the affairs of the Nation; that is the reason they claim the title. They say, yes, we agree with the Democrats but the Democrats don't know how to do it. Yes, our programmes are the same, but do you suppose they know how to carry them out? That is the basis of it, and the deuce of it is that so much of the country agrees with them in it. They agree that they haven't yet sufficient evidence that the Democrats know how to carry that programme out, or clearly know what the programme is.

When I sit down and compare my views with those of a Progressive Republican I can't see what the difference is, except that he has a sort of pious feeling about the doctrine of protection, which I have never felt. (Applause and laughter.) He will always insist, "Oh yes, I am a protectionist, but the tariff needs revision." Now, I don't say anything about protection. I don't care anything about protection. The only thing I want to know is which duty and how much of a duty is serviceable to the country? That is all I want to know. I don't care a rap about the doctrine of protection. It isn't a scientific doctrine; neither is the doctrine of free trade. But the administration of the government of a nation is a very practical thing, and we intend to do, without any feeling of regret or piety of any kind, that which is necessary to do for the promotion of the prosperity of the United States. That is all. (Applause.)

Now they think that is profane. They say: "Just suppose I should vote the Democratic ticket, what would the old man say?" I don't like to say anything unparliamentary about the old man, but I would let the old man take care of himself and vote the way the country seemed to demand in the year 1912 without reference to what may have been thought to have been demanded in the year 1846, for example; for I don't happen to have shared any of the responsibilities of the year 1846, but I do happen to share some of the responsibility for the year 1912, and, therefore, it is that year, and that year alone, which at present interests me.

Very well, then, we have got to show the Progressive Republican that he can come over without being ashamed of it and without being uneasy about the consequences. He is ready to come over if you will only give him polite language and the right sort of encouragement and a hospitable reception. But try to push him over the line and he balks; he balks at the label. If you ask him why, he says, "The Democratic Party hasn't in the past stood for the things I believe in." He



will assert, foolishly I think, but nevertheless he will assert it, that it has not been a sufficiently practical party. That is what he will tell you. That is why I am so intensely interested in having the country understand that we know what we are about, and mean to do those things we have specified. That will remove some obstacles, some questions.

Mr. Louis Pettigrew, of Charleston, S. C., a very commanding figure of a past generation, was a man of humour, as well as force of character. He lost a case one day in court and his client followed him out of the court house and abused him for everything that was vile, called him a thief and a liar, but the old man didn't pay any attention to him until he called him a Federalist; then he knocked him down. Somebody asked him why he did that, and pointed out that that was the least offensive thing he had said. "Yes, damn him," he said, "but it was the only true thing he said." (Laughter.)

Now I went quietly on my way with smiles from many quarters, until on a certain day, in the city of Harrisburg, I happened to let it slip that I knew there was a corner in credit. I said that the most serious trust of all was the money trust. And I know that was so, because it drew blood. They hadn't winced until then, and ever since then they have said, this man ought to be put out of business, and I dare say from their point of view he ought. I quite agree with them. Because if those things are true they must be stopped, but nobody need fear anything who is not implicated and engaged in them. Therefore, let every man who doesn't want them touched stand up and get counted. It will shorten the process of identification later on.

When you get your specific programme, these gentlemen are going to balk. They are going to say you will destroy business. You are not going to destroy business, you are only going to break up monopoly of enterprise, you will be letting in new men, new light, new

energy and new prospects of achievement. I am interested in nothing so much as releasing the energy of the country. That, to my mind, is the whole task of politics, to release the honest energy of the country.

When I think over what we are engaged in doing in the field of politics, I conceive it this way, men who are behind any interest always unite in organization, and the danger in every country is that these special interests will be the only things organized, and that the common interest will be unorganized against them. *The business of government is to organize the common interest against the special interests.* (Applause.) That is the reason it is worth while going around and trying to expound—no matter how imperfectly—what the situation is, so that you may draw these threads of common thought into one pattern, so that you may organize the general mind for the comprehension of the situation. As soon as the common mind is organized then no special interest can hold its own against it.

This is the thing to which we must challenge ourselves; this is the enterprise of the so-called radicalism of our time. If I am informed correctly as to the meaning of the word radical, it has something to do with roots. Now the false radical pulls up roots to see if the thing is growing; the true radical goes down to the roots to see that the soil is wholesome (applause) and that the tap-root is getting the pure nutriment that ought to come from the soil. That is the kind of radicalism I believe in, recultivation, thence reformation of the whole process.

In the presence of such things, gentlemen, what ought we to do? Why we ought, above all things else, to get together. (Great applause.) This is a national conception, a national enterprise, a national opportunity and a national hope. Will any man dare thrust his individual ambition in the way? Will any man dare, because he would be the leader, say that unless he is the leader he will not coöperate? Will any set of men say that

unless they can have their way in doing the thing they will not coöperate? Ah, gentlemen, the stake is too big, the condemnation for failure is too overwhelming. We shall be judged for a generation as we act in 1912. If we allow ourselves to fall apart by reason of any jealousies, if we put any obstacle in the way of the universal movement towards this happy goal, then all the rest of our lives we shall know that we made it impossible for Democracy to have a fresh fruitage in America.

And what would that mean? It would mean the old vision gone. It would mean that those old days were forever gone when men forgot their own fortunes in order to promote the common interest; those days gone by when America lifted her head so blithely and so bravely among the nations, and drew the gaze of mankind to her own fair countenance; that this countenance now wears the mask of self-interest; that men find covert behind it, and dare not display their passion for self-interest; and that America has taken the common road of the nations that go down because they have forgotten the destiny of man. (Great applause and ovation.)