

The Outlook

APRIL 16, 1910

LYMAN ABBOTT, Editor-in-Chief. HAMILTON W. MABIE, Associate Editor

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Contributing Editor



MR. ROOSEVELT AND
THE VATICAN INCIDENT

"I wish I could make every member of a Christian church feel that just in so far as he spends his time in quarreling with other Christians of other churches he is helping to discredit Christianity in the eyes of the world." These words were used by Mr. Roosevelt in the address before the American Mission at Khartum, which is printed in full in this issue of The Outlook. It is precisely this feeling that prompted Mr. Roosevelt to write his message to the American people through The Outlook, the keynote of which was, to quote one sentence, "the avoidance of harsh and bitter comment between and among good men." This deprecation of any rancor or acrimonious feeling has been generally understood and respected, and the warning has been accepted by men of all creeds. But an exception, grossly ill advised and lamentable, is found in the expressions put forth in Rome by Mr. Tipple, the pastor of the Methodist Church there. In this manifesto violent attacks were made on the Roman hierarchy, and such phrases were used as these: "To be anathematized by the Roman hierarchy is to be named a friend. It is to be noted that Mr. Roosevelt does not indorse the accusations made by the Vatican against the Methodists of Rome." As a consequence of this utterance, Mr. Roosevelt issued the following statement, as cabled by Mr. John Callan O'Laughlin, former Assistant Secretary of State, and now correspondent for the New York "Times":

I had made no arrangements to speak at any church or clerical organization in Rome. I have received a number of gentlemen of all religious faiths who have called at my rooms or at the American Embassy.

Under the circumstances I have requested the American Ambassador not to hold the reception which he had intended to hold Wednesday afternoon.

As regards all efforts, by whomsoever made, to bring about and inflame religious animosities because of what has occurred in connection with the Vatican and myself, I can do no more than to refer to the emphatic statements contained in my open letter to Dr. Lyman Abbott, already published.

All that I there said I desire to reiterate with my whole power.

We are glad to be able to add a message, cabled directly to The Outlook by Mr. Lawrence F. Abbott, of its staff, that the "obnoxious statement made by one individual is repudiated by higher Methodist ecclesiastical authorities." The censure deserved thus belongs to an individual rather than to the body of Methodists in Rome. The statement of Mr. Tipple, when one considers the time and the special circumstances, was nothing less than offensive and inflammatory. Nothing is more certain than that Mr. Roosevelt's plans for his visit to Rome were framed especially to avoid friction or dissension, and if the matter had been left to his own judgment and prevision, the incident would not have occurred. But no man in his situation could with self-respect give, on demand, pledges for his future conduct. As the London "Times" says, "Suppose the Vatican had made up its mind to trust to the good sense and right feeling of this great American. Is it imaginable that this trust would have been reposed in him in vain? The whole temperament of the man is proof that it would not." The more that Cardinal Merry del Val and his supporters explain their position, the more evident it is that neither etiquette nor dignity required the Vatican to attempt to extract a promise in advance as to Mr. Roosevelt's conduct. Else-

where in this number of The Outlook we print some of the echoes from the press in comment on the incident. While a wide difference of opinion exists as regards the relations between the Methodists in Rome and the Vatican, there is almost unanimity in the feeling that Mr. Roosevelt acted with perfect dignity and correctness, and that he did the utmost possible in urging that the matter should not be regarded as a subject of controversy.



**SENATOR BEVERIDGE
AND THE
INDIANA REPUBLICANS**

Last week the Republican State Convention of Indiana met at Indianapolis.

Its duties were to select a State ticket, with the exception of nominees for Governor and Lieutenant-Governor, and to adopt a platform stating the opinion of Indiana Republicans on State and National issues. On State issues the platform is disappointing, as it entirely omits mention of the dominant issue—local option. On National issues the platform is of far more than State importance. The adoption of this platform was prefaced by an address by the Chairman of the Convention, the Hon. Albert J. Beveridge, senior United States Senator from Indiana. The substance of Mr. Beveridge's speech was a defense of his vote against the Payne Tariff Bill, passed last August. In ringing tones he sent such staccato sentences as these through the hall:

Like President Taft, I wanted on the free list many raw materials that needed no protection. Yet only one was so treated. I could not stand for the duties on these articles, and I cannot stand for them now.

Like President Taft, I wanted free iron ore, of which we have the greatest deposits on earth, and which the Steel Trust chiefly controls. I could not stand for the duty that was passed, and I cannot stand for it now.

Like President Taft, I wanted the ancient woolen schedule reduced. It gives to the woolen trust unfair control. It raises the price and reduces the weight of the people's clothing. I stood against this schedule when the bill was passed, and I stand against it now.

I could not stand for the duty on lumber when the tariff bill was passed, and I cannot stand for it now.

I could not stand for the obsolete and infamous sugar schedule, which no man in Indiana can read and understand, but which the Sugar Trust can read and understand;

yet efforts to change that schedule were opposed by Democratic votes.

Mr. Beveridge declined to vote for the bill. Together with other Insurgents, he made a gallant fight for the lower tariffs. The Outlook applauded the fight, but, when it was closed and the roll called, regretted that the Insurgents could not see their way to voting for the Payne Bill. That measure did not redeem Republican pledges, it is true. But it did something toward redeeming them; it was better to have half or a quarter or even an eighth of a loaf than no bread. For this reason, the President signed the bill. He felt that it was a step, even if a very short, halting, and disappointing step, in the right direction. The President then and since has defended the bill as being all that could be accomplished at the late session of Congress; unfortunately, he has not as often added the statement of his belief that it is but an earnest of a more intelligent and acceptable revision. That revision should follow the principle laid down in the capital tariff plank of the Indiana platform:

We believe in a protective tariff, measured by the difference between the cost of production here and abroad. Less than this is unjust to American laborers; more is unjust to American consumers. That difference should be ascertained with the utmost speed, and the present law modified accordingly.

The language follows that of the similar plank in the National Republican party platform adopted at Chicago last June. But it significantly omits the phrase "together with a reasonable profit to American industries." This is just. If the difference in cost of production is adequately covered, what other protection is needed? In their desire for revision Mr. Beveridge and Mr. Taft are not as far apart as may be supposed; they are bound by a common sympathy. In particular, both have strenuously favored the tariff-reform method embodied in another plank in the Indiana platform, the non-partisan tariff commission plank. On that we comment elsewhere.



**MR. ROOT ON THE
RAILWAY BILL**

The speech which Senator Root delivered in the Senate in installments on March 30, 31, and April 1 was a great example of parliamentary