

sign authority. We allude, of course, to the fact that the Italian hierarchy of the Roman Catholic church not only stands for Roman Catholicism as a religious faith, but has sometimes assumed world-wide political functions. Of the religious authority of this hierarchy, American citizenship ought to take no more notice than of the religious authority of any other church dignitaries; but American citizenship should be extremely vigilant regarding the affiliations of political candidates with any foreign hierarchy in connection with any effort the latter may make to influence our elections. Foreign entanglements are none the less dangerous for being churchly.

This duty of vigilance, which should apply to candidates regardless of whether or not they are Catholics in religious faith, or Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians or Unitarians, applies with peculiar force to Mr. Taft, though he is not a Roman Catholic in religion; for of Mr. Taft's political coterie there is much gossip indicative of secret understandings with the Roman hierarchy on its political side—understandings of a kind that endanger the freedom of American citizenship. The gossip to that effect is so general, the quarters in which it circulates are so significant of special knowledge, and it has endured so long, that it cannot be lightly ignored. These understandings are said to have grown out of Philippine affairs, and to have played an influential if not a decisive part in behalf of Mr. McKinley in the election of 1900, and in behalf of Mr. Roosevelt in the election of 1904. They are frequently referred to with confidence in the present campaign as not unlikely to be influential now in behalf of Mr. Taft.

Disturbing confirmation of the gossip referred to above may be found in the Westminster Gazette of August 15. It appears in what purports to be a dispatch from Rome, coming from or through some unnamed "Exchange." The dispatch is as follows:

The American Presidency.—Rome, Friday.—The Pope to-day received Cardinal Gibbons in farewell audience, and discussed with him the United States Presidential campaign. His Holiness expressed the hope that all Catholics in America would unite in working for the success of Mr. Taft, who in all questions in which the Catholic church was interested had shown himself favorably disposed towards the Papacy.—Exchange.

Inasmuch as gossip regarding the political understandings between Mr. Taft's coterie and the Roman hierarchy has all along associated the names of Cardinal Gibbons and Mr. Taft, the dispatch quoted above is more than usually signifi-

cant. American Catholics who, like the great Irish Catholic, Daniel O'Connell, take religion but not politics from Rome, would be uninfluenced by any politico-hierarchical understanding that might exist, unless to resent it. But there is a vast throng of naturalized immigrants from the Continent of Europe, whose ignorance of the difference between their religious and their political obligations might make them automatically responsive to the subtle influence of just such understandings. To discourage these Italian influences on political action in this country, presses upon thoughtful American Catholics as a civic duty. To all other Americans the subject is of vastly more importance with reference to Mr. Taft's candidacy than the petty and impertinent objection that he is a Unitarian.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, September 29, 1908.

The Bryan-Roosevelt Controversy.

In replying on the 23d to Mr. Bryan's letter to him of the 22d (p. 608), President Roosevelt evaded the issue over Gov. Haskell which he had made on the strength of Mr. Hearst's charge that Gov. Haskell had once tried, in the interest of the Standard Oil Co., to bribe Attorney-General Mott of Ohio, and for which Mr. Bryan had in his letter asked proof. On this point President Roosevelt's letter of the 23d was as follows:

In my statement I purposely made no specific allusion to the Ohio matter, and shall at this time make none, in spite of its significance, and in spite of the further fact that Gov. Haskell's close relations with the Standard Oil interests while he was in Ohio is a matter of common notoriety.

Having thus disposed of the original question in the controversy, President Roosevelt proceeded to charge Gov. Haskell with other delinquencies, the details of which would necessitate a report too long for these columns.

+

The remainder of President Roosevelt's letter, also long and argumentative, dealt with the general issues of the campaign. In the course of it the President again vouched for Mr. Taft as the representative in the campaign of the policies of the Roosevelt administration.

Before Mr. Bryan replied to President Roosevelt's letter, Gov. Haskell issued a statement from Guthrie by way of reply in his own behalf. It bore date the 23d. On the original issue of alleged attempt at bribing Attorney-General Monett of Ohio, in 1899 in behalf of the Standard Oil Co., Gov. Haskell said:

It is fair for me to assume if my case was to be dignified by an all day cabinet meeting that beyond question Mr. Hearst and his campaign associate, President Roosevelt, left no stone unturned to blacken my character. That being true they certainly raked Ohio fore and aft concerning the Ohio Standard Oil cases of 1899 and finding absolutely nothing reflecting on me the President tried to waive his charge of last Monday aside by saying he will make no allusion to that. He drops this subject because his original statement was untruthful and he must know from what he knows and tried to find in Ohio that I spoke the truth when I said that I never in all my life had any interest in connection with nor service for that company. I say the President knows now that my statement is true, and I regret that he tries to brush it aside without doing me candid justice. Were I to adopt the character of language so commonly used by the President I would spell it in fewer letters than "falsehood."

Then taking up the congeries of accusations which President Roosevelt had added in his letter to Mr. Bryan, Gov. Haskell proceeded to deny some and explain as to others.

Gov. Haskell resigned as treasurer of the Democratic committee on the 25th, his letter to Chairman Mack being as follows:

Since the President and his cabinet have joined forces with Mr. Hearst and three Wall street brokers to make a personal fight against me, notwithstanding the President in his answer to Mr. Bryan abandoned his charge about Ohio Standard Oil cases, yet by all the means at the command of the government and the millions of Hearst and his Wall street allies, they persist in vicious, unwarranted and untruthful attack on me. Personally, I welcome their attack, and shall meet it with all the vigor at my command. I shall treat them all as private citizens and subject to the penalties of the law which they merit. In this I know I shall have the aid of my neighbors at home for all proper purposes, but my time must be free from other demands here. Again, my heart is full of hope for the election of Bryan and Kern. Honest government and rule by the people is at stake. Important beyond any battle at the polls in the last generation is the pending contest. I would not for one moment consider remaining in any way connected with the committee, therefore I hereby tender my resignation as treasurer of the Democratic national committee that not the slightest contest of my own could in any way be used by the President to cloud the sky and shield our opponents from discussing the real issues and laying bare the Republican duplicity to the people.

Mr. Herman Ridder, editor of the New York

Staats Zeitung, has been appointed treasurer in Gov. Haskell's place.

Closely following Gov. Haskell's resignation from the Democratic committee, Mr. Coleman du Pont resigned from the executive committee and as chairman of the speakers' bureau of the Republican national committee. This was because he is reputed to be a member of the powder trust.

Mr. Bryan answered Mr. Roosevelt on the 26th, saying:

Mr. Haskell having voluntarily resigned from the committee that he might be more free to prosecute those who have brought charges against him, I need not discuss the question of his guilt or innocence, further than to say that the public service which he has rendered and the vote of confidence which he has received from the people of his State ought to protect him from condemnation until the charges can be examined in some court where partisanship does not bias, and where campaign exigencies do not compel prejudgment. I would not deem it necessary to address you further, but for the fact that you seize upon the charges and attempt to make political capital out of them. You even charge that my connection with Mr. Haskell's selection as a member of the resolutions committee and as treasurer of the committee raises a question as to my sincerity as an opponent of trusts and monopolies. As an individual and as the candidate of my party, I resent the charge and repel the insinuation. I have been in public life for eighteen years and I have been sufficiently conspicuous to make my conduct a matter of public interest. I have passed through two Presidential campaigns in which party feeling ran high and epithet was exhausted. I have no hesitation in saying that you cannot find an act, a word, or a thought of mine to justify your partisan charge. I had never been informed of any charge that had been made against Mr. Haskell connecting him with the Standard Oil company or with any other trust. I had known him as a leader in the Constitutional convention of Oklahoma and had known him as one of the men principally responsible for the excellent Constitution which has since been adopted—and adopted by a majority of more than 100,000, 70,000 of which was furnished by Republicans. I had known of his election to the Governorship of that great young State by a majority of some 30,000. I had known that the Constitution was adopted, and that Gov. Haskell was elected in spite of the efforts of your administration and in spite of the speeches made in Oklahoma by Mr. Taft. You say that it was a matter of common notoriety that Mr. Haskell was connected with the Standard Oil company. I have a right to assume that if so serious an objection had existed to Mr. Haskell's election and had been a matter of common notoriety in Ohio, as you say, Mr. Taft would have felt it his conscientious duty to warn the people when he spoke in Oklahoma. If he did not have the knowledge, why can it be assumed that I had it? And if he had it, how can you excuse his failure to communicate the

information to the people of Oklahoma? If you feel it your patriotic duty to denounce Mr. Haskell when he is only a member of the national organization, how much more would Mr. Taft have felt it his patriotic duty to denounce Mr. Haskell when he was aspiring to be the chief executive of a great State.

The remainder of Mr. Bryan's letter dealt with Mr. Roosevelt's supplementary accusations and with the general issues of the campaign.

+

In reply Mr. Roosevelt wrote to Mr. Bryan on the 27th a letter devoted chiefly to the general issues of the campaign and to the history of his administration with reference to trusts. Regarding the Haskell controversy this letter reasserted all the accusations against Gov. Haskell, including, though somewhat ambiguously, the charge of attempting to bribe Attorney-General Monett. The reassertion was made in these terms:

You speak highly of the public service which he has rendered and protest against any condemnation of him except such as may come in a court. Out of your own mouth you are condemned. You thereby set up that standard of "law honesty," which has been the bane of this people in endeavoring to get equity and fair dealing—as they should obtain among high-minded men—from great business corporations and from individuals like Mr. Haskell. Apparently you disclaim even asking Mr. Haskell to retire from the position in which you placed him, so that he retires of his own free will, and you utter no word of condemnation of his gross offenses against public decency and honesty. On the contrary you strive to make it appear that his misconduct in reference to the Standard Oil Company is all of which he is accused; whereas, shameless though this particular act of his is, it is no worse than countless others in his career.

The evidence cited by the President in support of this "blanket" accusation is too voluminous to reproduce here. It consists, however, of personal letters and newspaper clippings which do not amount to proof from which any person of judicial mind would infer the validity of President Roosevelt's accusations. On the basis of this evidence, however, President Roosevelt concludes his letter to Mr. Bryan as follows:

Of all corruption the most far-reaching for evil is that which hides itself behind the mask of furious demagoguery, seeking to arouse and to pander to the basest passions of mankind. No better exemplification of this type of corruption could be found than in the case of Mr. Haskell. You have uttered no word of condemnation of Haskellism, as we thus see it. That you consciously sought to bring it about, I do not believe. That it was the natural result of the effort to apply in practice your teachings, I have no question.

+ +

Senator Foraker and Mr. Taft.

President Roosevelt having brought Senator Foraker into disagreeable contrast with Mr. Taft,

in his original attack upon Gov. Haskell, and also in his first letter of reply to Mr. Bryan (p. 609), Senator Foraker published a long and circumstantial personal statement on the 25th with reference to himself which begins as follows:

The President commences his statement connected with the publication of Judge Taft's letter with a bitter arraignment of me because of Mr. Hearst's charges, which he appears to have accepted as fully proved as soon as made. He does not wait for proof or explanation, nor accept the same when offered. Mr. Hearst's charges are not simply that I was in the employment of the Standard Oil Company, and that I was paid for my services, but that I was secretly in that employment for illegitimate purposes, and that the money I received was paid as compensation for improperly influencing legislation by Congress in conflict with and in violation of my official duties. He read a number of letters and made certain comments calculated, if unanswered or unexplained, to create the belief that his charges were true. That I was employed by the company was never concealed or denied. On the contrary, such employment was well known at the time to all concerned. Only a few days ago ex-Attorney General Monett, who was prosecuting the proceedings against the Standard Oil Company at the time, stated, in a public interview, that I told him at the time that I had been retained by the company. If employed and rendering services, presumably I was compensated. In announcing, therefore, the mere fact that I was employed by the company, and that I received payments on that account, no information was imparted by Mr. Hearst and no offense was established, for it remained that such employment and payment might be entirely proper and legitimate. Under all the circumstances an explanation was required, and in former statements I made such explanation by showing that my employment was confined to the affairs of the company in Ohio and its reorganization after the trust was dissolved by order of our Supreme Court, and that my employment had no relation in the slightest degree to anything in which the Federal government was then interested, or with respect to which the Congress was then legislating or at that time proposing to legislate, and that the employment was ended long before the company was made the subject of any special attention in Congress and longer still before it was attacked in the Federal courts or proceeded against in any way by the Federal government; and further, that the employment was not to defend the company against charges of violation of the laws of Ohio or the United States or the orders of any of the courts, but only to assist in executing the orders of the courts and so reorganizing as to conform to all laws, State and national, and to fully comply with all the orders of the courts that had been made against it. If my statements in this behalf are true, they make a complete defense against Mr. Hearst's charges and all deductions therefrom of improper conduct, unless the ethics involved have been radically changed from what they have always heretofore been supposed to be. From the beginning of our government, senators and congressmen who were lawyers have been regarded as free to continue the practice of their profession, if they so