

THE INDIAN CITIZEN.

Atoka, I. T.
Thursday, July 16, 1903
Vol. 18 No. 10
Norma E. Smiser, Editor

EDITORIAL ON CHOCTAW PROTECTIVE PARTY

"We accept and endorse as our basic law the late supplementary agreement, and insist that same be carried out as adopted in accordance with the letter of the law and as speedily as possible," is the first declaration of the Hugo convention. Just what the writer of the platform was trying to say here is somewhat involved in doubt. Was it the intention of those who adopted the platform to accept the supplementary agreement as law? Must it be assumed that the Choctaw Protective Party meant by this declaration that they have heretofore set themselves out in defiance of the law as outlaws and have just recently come to accept the law? A convention proceeding accepting the law does not amount to much, for it does not affect the law one way or the other. If, on the other hand the Choctaw Protective Party meant to endorse the supplementary agreement, their effort is a startling confession of the false role played by their leaders in the last campaign, for then they said the supplementary agreement was not a good

thing and urged the people to vote against it. The only conclusion that the recent action of the Choctaw Protective Party fully warrants is that they either acted in bad faith with the people in the last campaign when they denounced the supplementary agreement, or they are trying to deceive the people now in endorsing it.

A further evidence, if any were needed, of the rank inconsistency of the so called Choctaw Protective Party and its avowed policy is that found in the last plank of its platform. After assuming to endorse the supplementary agreement as their first principle they turn right around and condemn its operation as their last principle. So, take the Choctaw Protective Party first and last it has no principle at all. They say in their effusive way: "We condemn as unjust, illegal and surreptitious the present action and management of affairs by Green McCurtain." Now, as the supplementary agreement is the law of the country, basic law if you please, under which Green McCurtain, as principal chief, is proceeding in the administration of affairs, the Choctaw Protective Party, by its own declarations, is put in the absurd position of saying: "We endorse the law, but we do not want it administered." In other words, they say the medicine is good but they do not want to take it. The Choctaw Protective Party needs to take some kind of medicine.

How is the Choctaw Protective Party going to explain its shifting policy on the supplementary agreement? Last year they advised the people to vote against the supplementary agreement, saying that it was a bad thing for the Choctaws. This year they endorse it as their basic law. If the agreement is a good thing, as they now say it is, why did they try to get the people to vote against it last year? Or, on the other hand, if the agreement was a bad thing for the Choctaws, as they said it was last year, why are they endorsing it now?

No man or party of men who tries to play to both sides of an important question, as the men of the Choctaw Protective Party have tried to do with respect to the supplementary agreement, is entitled to the respect and confidence of the public.

Vote for the Tuskahoma Party, the party that has a principle and stands by it, for that is the party that stands by the people and their interests.

Go to the polls August 5th and vote for George W. Scott for national treasurer, E. H. Wilson for national secretary, P. J. Hudson for national auditor, and C. S. Vinson for national attorney.

THE INDIAN CITIZEN.

Atoka, I. T.
Thursday, July 16, 1903
Vol. 18 No. 10
Norma E. Smiser, Editor

EDITORIAL ON CHOCTAW PROTECTIVE PARTY

"We accept and endorse as our basic law the late supplementary agreement, and insist that same be carried out as adopted in accordance with the letter of the law and as speedily as possible," is the first declaration of the Hugo convention. Just what the writer of the platform was trying to say here is somewhat involved in doubt. Was it the intention of those who adopted the platform to accept the supplementary agreement as law? Must it be assumed that the Choctaw Protective Party meant by this declaration that they have heretofore set themselves out in defiance of the law as outlaws and have just recently come to accept the law? A convention proceeding accepting the law does not amount to much, for it does not affect the law one way or the other. If, on the other hand the Choctaw Protective Party meant to endorse the supplementary agreement, their effort is a startling confession of the false role played by their leaders in the last campaign, for then they said the supplementary agreement was not a good

thing and urged the people to vote against it. The only conclusion that the recent action of the Choctaw Protective Party fully warrants is that they either acted in bad faith with the people in the last campaign when they denounced the supplementary agreement, or they are trying to deceive the people now in endorsing it.

A further evidence, if any were needed, of the rank inconsistency of the so called Choctaw Protective Party and its avowed policy is that found in the last plank of its platform. After assuming to endorse the supplementary agreement as their first principle they turn right around and condemn its operation as their last principle. So, take the Choctaw Protective Party first and last it has no principle at all. They say in their effusive way: "We condemn as unjust, illegal and surreptitious the present action and management of affairs by Green McCurtain." Now, as the supplementary agreement is the law of the country, basic law if you please, under which Green McCurtain, as principal chief, is proceeding in the administration of affairs, the Choctaw Protective Party, by its own declarations, is put in the absurd position of saying: "We endorse the law, but we do not want it administered." In other words, they say the medicine is good but they do not want to take it. The Choctaw Protective Party needs to take some kind of medicine.

How is the Choctaw Protective Party going to explain its shifting policy on the supplementary agreement? Last year they advised the people to vote against the supplementary agreement, saying that it was a bad thing for the Choctaws. This year they endorse it as their basic law. If the agreement is a good thing, as they now say it is, why did they try to get the people to vote against it last year? Or, on the other hand, if the agreement was a bad thing for the Choctaws, as they said it was last year, why are they endorsing it now?

No man or party of men who tries to play to both sides of an important question, as the men of the Choctaw Protective Party have tried to do with respect to the supplementary agreement, is entitled to the respect and confidence of the public.

Vote for the Tuskahoma Party, the party that has a principle and stands by it, for that is the party that stands by the people and their interests.

Go to the polls August 5th and vote for George W. Scott for national treasurer, E. H. Wilson for national secretary, P. J. Hudson for national auditor, and C. S. Vinson for national attorney.