

will, and of that sort of overlordship and insolent discrimination of the weaker from the stronger, which, from the American White House, found so preposterous an illustration in the President's dismissal of the two colored companies at Brownsville. Most significant, however, of all Mr. Shepard's incisive utterances is this on the Roosevelt policies, for it points to probable facts that ought to be definitely explained by Mr. Taft and widely understood:

Mr. Taft explicitly warns us that if he be elected, he will promote and continue all the policies of Mr. Roosevelt. I know well that here at the Northeast the greater number of men rich or well-to-do, and nearly all great pecuniary interests, are supporting Mr. Taft upon the quiet but widespread and seemingly explicit understanding that, if successful, he is not to keep his word, that he is to do the reverse of all this. After the votes are safely and irrevocably counted he is, we are confidently assured, to disappoint those whose votes were cast for him as a President who would continue all of the Roosevelt program which has at the last turned out to be so disastrous and dangerous. This support imputes to Mr. Taft an insincerity of which I do not believe him guilty. If he had been out of sympathy with the Roosevelt program, which is abhorrent today to ninety-nine out of every hundred Cleveland Democrats, we should long ago, I am sure, have heard from him some outspoken and courageous words. He would not have remained as he has, during all these years of his Cabinet service, a supporter either openly or tacitly of all the items and every item of Mr. Roosevelt's program; nor, beyond a doubt, would he today ask for the Presidency on the promise that his Administration would continue them all.

+

Summing up the facts of the present situation, and speaking as a Cleveland Democrat to Cleveland Democrats, Mr. Shepard makes this argument, to which it would seem that those among them who, like himself, are democratic as distinguished from plutocratic Cleveland Democrats, can hardly fail to respond, and to which no reasonable democratic Democrat of any other affiliation ought to object:

What if we think the problems of monopoly can find no solution, even partial, in some of the devices approved by Mr. Bryan? Which, indeed, of these devices does Mr. Taft or his party condemn? Which of them, indeed, does not have the highest Republican approval? The only device of that kind approved by Mr. Bryan which Mr. Taft finds himself able articulately to condemn is the abatement of the evils of the protective tariff—a device which truly is no device at all, but a statesmanlike policy practically sufficient for the result to be accomplished. And what if we dislike the guarantee of bank deposits? Is there anything momentous in that suggestion? Can we not trust so much to the wisdom of the next Congress. . . . The wonderful love which Mr. Bryan has inspired among the masses of Americans is not stupid. He feels indeed human rights more

intensely than most men; but we cannot infer that, when vested with official power, he will not have the sobriety which, under Republican administration, has been sadly lacking at the White House. Quite the contrary. If Mr. Bryan comes there, we know, in his unquestioned patriotism, that he will, so far as he can, reverse the three great policies for which Mr. Taft stands, and that, on lesser matters, he will act with wise caution and after a reasonable and deferential consideration of the sentiments of the great body of citizens who, while they opposed him in 1896, (and most of them in 1900,) give him today their earnest and I trust their decisive support.

+ +

Mr. Taft on Protection.

The letter of Edward M. Shepard on Mr. Taft's three distinctive policies—protection, imperialism and administrative lawlessness—was fully confirmed by Mr. Taft himself when he spoke at Milwaukee. He had been asked by Mr. Bryan whether it would be his policy if elected to "revise" the tariff up or down. Mr. Taft has frequently spoken, as his platform does, of "revising the tariff." But he has been very cautious not to say whether the revision is to be in the direction of a greater or a less tariff burden upon consumers. Like Mr. Roosevelt, he does not propose doing it in any particular way, but in a "just" way. As to what would be just—well, elect Mr. Taft and see! He was equally indefinite in going through the motions at Milwaukee of answering Mr. Bryan's question. As soon as inaugurated he declared he would call Congress together and "recommend a genuine and honest revision of the tariff in accordance with the principle of protection laid down in the party platform." In this revision, the protected manufacturers will ("as they ought," said he), try to get all the tariff plunder from consumers they can. And the consumers—well, "there is," said Mr. Taft, "a large element in the Republican party representing the consumer, through whom the demand for a revision of the tariff on conservative protective lines to reduce excessive rates has crystallized into the definite pledge to revise the tariff." That is an interesting bit of political intelligence, to be sure; but we fail to find in it anything more about Mr. Taft's purpose than that he will allow the consumers to fight it out with the protected manufacturers "who ought," etc., while he himself sits as placidly as possible in what he describes as the chair with upturned tacks on the seat. On the question of the direction in which Mr. Taft will try to have the tariff revised, whether up or down, for the unprivileged consumer or for the Interests, he is as dumb as an oyster. And on this question President Roosevelt does not rush in to help him out.

Mr. Taft and "the Facts."

"Let us examine the facts," said Mr. Taft in his address to the Norwood voters, near Cincinnati, last week. What facts? The political conditions of Hamilton county? The fact that he proclaimed with so much emphasis at Akron in 1905 that "the whole government of both city and county is absolutely under Cox's control and every Republican political convention nominates men whom he dictates"? No; not those facts. "I have selected for a subject for discussion," he said, "one very near my heart, and that is the Philippine Islands." And so, Hamilton county voters were enlightened for the coming election by a recital of the situation in the Philippines. And how much of the facts in that situation did Mr. Taft tell them? Is it right for us to inquire whether that perpetual franchise for the railroad he spoke of was of any pecuniary benefit to any official representative of the American Government? Were any officials interested in the Benguet land boom that resulted from the improvements made by the United States Government during his administration there? Another fact he referred to very partially was the Filipino desire for national independence. "There is evidently a difference of opinion," he admitted, "among the Independistas" on that subject; but he did not mention the important fact that in June of this year the Philippine Assembly voted on this question, and declared for national independence by 54 in favor, to only 18 against. Another fact he referred to was "our educational work" there in fitting the Filipinos for self-government. But was it not under his administration in the Philippines that a law was enforced which made it treason for the natives to hold public meetings in favor of national independence? Or to speak in favor of independence even in private conversation? Or so much as to circulate the American Declaration of Independence? He referred in general terms approvingly to "our treatment of the Philippines." Then why has the full report of that treatment, as made by Gen. Miles after his visit there, never been allowed to be published? What was published of his report showed that our treatment of them had been ruthless, bloody and horribly savage. If Mr. Taft claims credit for his treatment of the Philippines, why has he suppressed the larger part of Gen. Miles's report? By implication he denies the charge that he departed from the principles of the Declaration of Independence. Why not tell, then, about Mabini, whom he exiled to Guam and to death because he refused to swear allegiance to the United States government? That brave man (too feeble,

as a chronic invalid, to offer any physical resistance to the alien invasion of his country) told Mr. Taft he had no right to swear allegiance to our government; for the principle was a true one, he said, as expressed in our Declaration of Independence, that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Was the report false that Mr. Taft told Mabini he was not there to discuss abstract principles and that he had no more to do with the Declaration of Independence than the Czar of Russia had? Was it for loyalty to that doctrine of the Declaration that Mr. Taft "educated" that Filipino patriot by sending him back to prison and afterward to Guam? Let Mr. Taft tell all the facts, at least the important ones, if he is going to turn our thoughts away from the terrible economic situation we have at our own door.

* * *

Journalistic Ethics.

There was a time when the grocer sanded his sugar and thought he had to. The present is a time when newspaper publishers sand their news and think they have to. But the one is as bad policy as the other, to say nothing of the morals of either. Grocers have found out the bad policy of sanding sugar and quit it. But publishers have not yet found out the bad policy of sanding news, though they will. Some papers, however, stand out against the present prevailing policy on the ground of its immorality. One of these is the Sacramento Bee. This paper has a set of "shop rules" which are so unique and significant that we reproduce them in full, in the hope that they may fall here and there in good soil and bring up fruit a thousandfold. We take them from the Coast Seamen's Journal, which first gave them publicity outside the sanctum of the Bee:

The Bee demands from all its writers accuracy before anything else. Better lose an item than make a splurge one day and correct it next.

Equally with that, it demands absolute fairness in the treatment of news. Reports must not be colored to please a friend or wrong an enemy.

Don't editorialize in the news columns. An accurate report is its own best editorial.

Don't exaggerate. Every exaggeration hurts immeasurably the cause it pretends to help.

If a mistake is made, it must be corrected. It is as much the duty of a Bee writer to work to the rectification of a wrong done by an error in an item, as it is first to use every precaution not to allow that error to creep in.

Be extremely careful of the name and reputation of women. Even when dealing with an unfortunate, remember that so long as she commits no crime other than her own sin against chastity, she is entitled at least to pity.