



3 1822 00029 4892

THE COMMONS

CONDENSED

William J. Bryan

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO



3 1822 00029 4892



JK
271
.87

493920





Yours truly
W. J. Bryan

The  
Commoner
Condensed

BY
WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

THE
Abbey Press

PUBLISHERS
114
FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

London

Montreal

Copyright, 1902,
by
THE
Hbby Press.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

The Commoner, Condensed, is, as its name implies—a condensation of matter which has appeared in *THE COMMONER* during the first year of its existence. The first eighteen chapters contain editorials dealing with subjects of a permanent nature. These are reproduced without elimination or elaboration, and cover the important political, social and economic questions, which have come before the country during the year.

Following the principal editorials which have appeared in the paper under the titles given, is Chapter XIX., containing a selection of shorter editorials taken from what is commonly called the side-head page, the description having reference to the position of the head-lines. The next chapter contains selected editorial paragraphs which have appeared from time to time on the paragraph page. The first five pages of *THE COMMONER* are devoted to editorials—the first, second and third to those varying in length from one-fourth of a column to several columns, the fourth to paragraphs, and the fifth to side-heads. As the paragraphs and side-heads usually deal with more transient themes, only a small proportion of them will be found in this volume.

Chapter XXI. contains selected matter from Mr. Will M. Maupin's department entitled, "Whether Common or Not." Mr. Maupin's contributions consist of poems, fables, dialogues, squibs and bits of philosophy. In his entertaining style he discusses matters political, matters social and matters sentimental. The extracts selected give a general idea of his style of writing.

Chapter XXII. contains a few poems which, because of their special merit, have survived the year in which they were written. The first, the "Ode to a Waterfowl," appeared in the initial

number of *THE COMMONER*. It is my favorite poem, and was brought to my attention by my father. The author of the poem, William Cullen Bryant, has clothed a familiar theme in beautiful language and so embalmed a noble sentiment that it will live and give inspiration for generations to come. Poems dedicated to Jefferson and Jackson are reproduced for the benefit of those who desire something appropriate for occasions on which the faithful do honor to the memory of the "Sage of Monticello" and the "Hero of New Orleans." The author of these poems, Dr. Howard S. Taylor, of Chicago, has been called Democracy's Poet-Laureate because he has shown so much genius in the poetic presentation of democratic principles and in the eulogy of the party's founders and defenders.

"The Penalty," by Mr. J. A. Edgerton, formerly of Lincoln, Nebraska, now of Denver, is a strong and stately application of moral truth to national life. It condenses all history, sacred and profane, into a few brief and impressive sentences.

"Ben Bolt" and "Little Boy Blue" represent the class to which most of the poems reproduced by *THE COMMONER* belong, while "Nearer Home" and "Amen" are samples of the poems of a religious nature which have appeared occasionally. It is my aim to exclude from the columns of *THE COMMONER* everything objectionable, and, as far as space will permit, include all that is helpful and wholesome. I have received frequent assurance that the poems have been appreciated.

In the Appendix will be found a few articles and letters written for other publications but reprinted in *THE COMMONER*.

The index is quite complete and the reader will be able to find with ease any editorial reproduced, any subject discussed or any person mentioned.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIALS.

	PAGE
The Commoner	1
A Living Fountain	3
How the Tariff Aids the Trusts	3
The Vice-Presidency	4
Militarism against Pensions	5
Christianity versus War	6
Trade-Unionism	7
The Boers—God Bless Them	7
The Party Organization	8
Secret Influence	10
Another Endless Chain	11
Trial by Jury Denied	13
Tolstoi on Imperialism	14
The Presidential Term	14
The Wages of Sin.....	16
Subsidized Instruction	17
Towne's Great Speech	19
The Cuban Constitution	20
Popular Election of Senators	21
Liberty a Supreme Good	23
Mistaken Identity	24
Militarism	25
A Worthy Ambition	26
Abraham Lincoln	27
Chinese Atrocities	29
Gambling	30
An Expert Opinion	31
Let the Legislatures Act	32
A Prosperous Trust	32
Delightful Uncertainty	33
A Partial Remedy	34
By What Authority?.....	35
The Influence of the Press	37
The Cost of Militarism	38
Senatorial Wit	39
"Warnings of a Parting Friend"	39
But What is the Remedy?.....	44
The Root of All Evil.....	46

	PAGE
The Monopoly Must Be Prevented.....	47
Chinese Immigration	48
Schley and Sampson	51
The President an Emperor	51
Is This Aristocracy?.....	53
Where Title Rests	55
The Fifty-sixth Congress	58
Applied Christianity	59
Should be above Suspicion.....	60
Prof. Shaler's Opinion	62
Exploiters on the Ground	63
A Sample of Harmony	66
Benjamin Harrison	69
An Impotent Remedy	70
\$6 Reward	71
A Good Amendment	74
The Canal Treaty	74
Commissioner Gray's Protest	75
Amendment by Convention	77
The President's Growing Powers	78
Politics in Mexico	79
On Dangerous Ground	80
Harrison's Last Word	83
Justice to the Populists	84
Jackson vs. Imperialism.....	86
"Conquest," said the President	88
The Future of Cuba	90
The Capture of Aguinaldo	91
Thomas Jefferson	92
Two Oaths of Allegiance	96
Denmark's Good Example	98
Lincoln and the Silver Republicans	98
The Young Man's Chances	100
A Disastrous Victory	101
An Unfortunate Comparison	104
A Sample of Whitewashing	105
The Rice Deportation	107
Watterson on Destiny	109
The Money Question	113
A Bit Personal	116
Politics in Business	117
The Representative's Duty	119
A Lesson to Rulers	120
Plagiarism	121
Senator McLaurin's Bolt	122
Tolstoi's Noble Appeal	123
An Executive Duty	124
Gambling, Great and Small	126

Contents.

ix

	PAGE
When Harmony is Possible	128
Bravo! Judge Thompson	133
Roosevelt on Duty	134
Watterson's Definition	135
Virginia's Temptation	138
The Pass in Court	140
Criminal Speculation	141
Corporations Enter Parliament	142
Motion, not Progress	143
The Ratification of the Treaty.....	144
Plutocracy in Education	147
The Effect of Diet	148
Lincoln's Gettysburg Speech	149
Mr. Watterson's Cartoon	150
"What about Next Week?".....	153
Blacklisting	154
Before and After	157
The Richmond Times' Mistake	158
Emperor McKinley	161
"Perhaps"	168
Declaration of Independence	171
The South Carolina Situation	171
Constitutional Liberty	174
Herron Attacks Marriage System	178
The Doctrine of Thrones	180
"The Best Form of Giving"	180
Who Wrote It?	182
"Large Concessions"	183
Unsafe Banking	187
Eternal Vigilance	187
Aguinaldo's Offer	188
The Sulu Treaty	189
The Ohio Platform	191
The South not Excluded	194
A False Charge	196
The Steel Strike	198
Not a New Convert	199
Admiral Schley	200
No Middle Ground	201
Equality in Taxation.....	202
Democratic Remedy for Trusts	203
A Criticism Answered	207
A Word to the Disappointed	209
Fake Interviews	210
A Minister's Lament	211
Opening a Reservation.....	216
Fusion, Open and Secret	217
The Silver Republicans	218

	PAGE
Why not to Kruger?	219
Why Ostracize the Best?	221
Inexcusable Misrepresentation	222
Senator Vest's Interview	223
Children not Burdensome	227
Emasculating Democracy	229
Money Problem in Philippines.....	232
Mr. Knox and His Secrets	233
Trickery of Words.....	235
Mr. Littlefield's Address	236
Judicial Tyranny	238
Mr. Bryan's Plans	239
The Nation Mourns	240
Labor Day	242
The Star's Inconsistency	244
Making and Receiving Apologies	247
Will They Remember?	248
"God's Will, not Ours, be Done".....	249
Husband and Wife	250
The Cure for Anarchy	251
Contemptible Politics	253
Dooley Discusses Candidates	254
President Roosevelt	255
High Tariff Doomed.....	255
Freedom of Speech	257
The Turning Point	258
Another Problem	260
Dolliver on Anarchy	261
Nebraska Democrats Firm	263
Roosevelt on Trusts	263
An Example of Partisanship	264
No Time for Despair	265
Facts are Stubborn Things	266
The Assassin Sentenced	270
Kind but Surprising	270
The Farm	272
The Pan-American Conference	273
"Unconscious Anarchy"	274
Christian Advocate on Trusts	277
Mr. Cummins' Error	278
An Inquiry Answered	279
A Lover of Liberty	281
"A World Power"	281
The Producer's Share	282
Tariff Concessions to Cuba	283
The Elections at Hand	284
One Eye Open	286
The Negro Question	288

Contents.

xi

	PAGE
The Money Question Again	294
Hoar is Consistent	296
Death without Hope	297
An Interesting Letter	298
The Elections of 1901	299
Organize Debating Societies	301
Severe on Bolters	302
Ex-Governor Taylor's Case	303
Suspicious Rejoicing	305
"The People Sovereign"	306
Our Duty to the Boers	308
Workingmen at the Polls	311
The Gold Stronghold Captured	312
Democratic Leadership	313
A Prophecy that Failed	315
A Democratic Duty	317
The Yellow Peril	321
Exit, Jones of Nevada	324
Can It Be?.....	326
A Stable Dollar	327
Let Our Ideas Conquer	329
Anti-Anarchy Bills	330
The President's Message	334
Markham's Poetry	340
The Prince of Peace	341
A Word as to Gifts	342
The Meaning of Bimetallism	344
Questions for Debate.....	347
Too Great an Advantage	350
Admiral Schley	350
New Year's Day Resolutions	351
The Philippine Tariff	352
Secretary Gage's Report	353
The Export Tax Decision	354
Branch Banks	355
As Others See Us	356
Getting Down Rapidly	357
Republicans Prevent Discussion	358
Unjust Discrimination	359
An Instance of Tax Dodging.....	362
Monopoly Defined	364
Financial Legislation	365
Steadfastness	366
Hill's Tempting Offer	369
Responsibility for Anarchy	371
Is a Storm Brewing?.....	375
Lafayette's Epitaph	376
Perry Belmont's Defeat	377

	PAGE
A Change of Base	378
The Nicaraguan Canal	379
That Populist Influence.....	381
Why not State of Jefferson?	382
Manifest Destiny	383
Trusts Retard Progress	385
A Remarkable Document	386
Shorter Editorials	389
Editorial Paragraphs	395

WHETHER COMMON OR NOT.

I Ain't the Littlest Girl no More.....	402
Two Seats	403
Writing to Santa Claus	403
A Boyish Nightmare	404
Man, Poor Man	405
If Ol' Hick'ry Wus Alive	406
The Household Physician	406
A Little Fable	407
The Twentieth Century Education	408
Brain Leaks	409
Papa Goose Rhymes	410

POEMS.

To a Waterfowl	412
The Light of Jefferson	413
Jackson's Day	415
Ben Bolt	417
The Penalty	418
Little Boy Blue	419
Amen	420
Nearer Home	421
The Creed of the Flag	422
The Man with the Hoe	424

APPENDIX.

The Hill Coinage Bill	426
The Man with the Hoe	429
Ratify the Treaty. Declare the Nation's Policy.....	434
Industrial Combinations	439
British Rule in India	445
Address at McKinley Memorial.....	454
Moral Courage	456
Imperialism	459
Index.....	461







THE COMMONER CONDENSED.

I.

THE COMMONER.

Webster defines a commoner as "one of the common people." The name has been selected for this paper because **THE COMMONER** will endeavor to aid the common people in the protection of their rights, the advancement of their interests and the realization of their aspirations.

It is not necessary to apologize for the use of a term which distinguishes the great body of the population from the comparatively few, who, for one reason or another, withdraw themselves from sympathetic connection with their fellows. Among the Greeks "Hoi polloi" was used to describe the many, while among the Romans the word "plebs" was employed for the same purpose. These appellations, like "the common people," have been assumed with pride by those to whom they were applied, while they have been used as terms of reproach by those who counted themselves among the aristocratic classes. Within recent years there has been a growing tendency in some quarters to denounce as demagogic any reference to, or praise of, the common people.

One editor in a late issue of his paper takes exception to the phrase and says:

This expression is an ill-chosen one and should have no lodgment in the vocabulary of an American patriot and statesman. If we sought its origin, we would look for it in that specious demagoguery which has evolved the professional politician, arrayed country against town—the farmer and his sons and daughters against the business and professional men and their sons and daughters—capital against labor, and built up against neighbors the impregnable barriers of prejudice and hate.

were produced in the United States 7,418,475 kegs of wire nails. These cost the consumer \$1.31 per keg. There were exported during the same year 307,194 kegs, at about \$1.55 per keg, the foreigner paying a higher price than the home customer. These same nails sold at \$1.11 per keg on an average during 1894.

During the last year there were manufactured 7,599,522 kegs, at an average price of \$2.57 to the domestic buyers. In the meantime, 752,871 kegs were exported, at about \$1.40 per keg. The American customers of the steel wire nail makers paid about \$17,596,124.37 for the balance of the manufactured nails (about 6,846,741 kegs). Had the American consumers been privileged to buy at the quotations granted the foreign buyers, the Americans would have saved about \$8,010,686.97 on their purchase.

More than eight millions of dollars! This measures the extortion practiced upon the hardware merchant, but this must be increased by the merchant's profit, if his profit is estimated upon a percentage basis, before it measures the extortion practiced upon the consumer.

And yet some are so devoted to a protective tariff as not to protest against import duties which enable trusts to sell at home at a high price while they sell abroad at a low price.

THE VICE-PRESIDENCY.

It has been intimated that Vice-President-Elect Roosevelt is desirous of receiving more consideration at the hands of the President than has, as a rule, been given to those occupying his position. Whether or not the report is true is not material, but the ambition, if he does entertain it, is an entirely worthy one.

Why has the Vice-President been so generally ignored by the Chief Executive in the past? It is said that Mr. Breckenridge was only consulted once by President Buchanan, and then only in regard to the phraseology of a Thanksgiving Proclamation. This incident was related to a later Vice-President who was noted for his skill at repartee, and he replied, with a twinkle in his eye: "Well, there is one more Thanksgiving Day before my term expires."

According to the constitution the Vice-President succeeds to the office in case the President dies, resigns, is removed, or becomes unable to discharge the duties of the office. The public good re-

quires that he should be thoroughly informed as to the details of the administration and ready to take up the work of the Executive at a moment's notice. The Vice-President ought to be ex-officio a member of the President's cabinet; he ought to sit next to the President in the council chamber. Receiving his nomination from a national convention and his commission from the people, he is able to furnish the highest possible proof that he enjoys public respect and confidence, and the President should avail himself of the wisdom and discretion of such an adviser. While the responsibility for action rests upon the occupant of the White House he is entitled to, and of course desires, all the light possible before deciding on any question.

Congress can by law impose upon the Vice-President the duty of giving such assistance to his chief, or the President can of his own volition establish the precedent, and it would, in all probability, be observed by his successors.

Many public men have avoided the second place on the ticket for fear it would relegate them to obscurity; some of Colonel Roosevelt's friends objected to his nomination on that ground. A cabinet position has generally been considered more desirable than the Vice-Presidency, but the latter in dignity and importance is, in fact, only second to the presidency, and the occupant deserves the prominence and prestige which would come from more intimate official association with the Executive.

MILITARISM AGAINST PENSIONS.

The following press dispatch from Berlin will be read with interest by pensioners:

To-day's debate in the Reichstag upon a resolution submitted by Herr Nissler, conservative, to amend the pension laws, so that every veteran of the wars of 1864, 1866 and 1870-1871 who is an invalid and unable to support himself would receive 120 marks annually, developed into a terrible arraignment of the government. Speakers of all parties, conservatives, national, liberals, centrists and even socialists, declared their willingness to vote for adequate pensions and censured the government for constantly ignoring this debt of honor, unworthy, as one speaker said, of a country which had embarked on a world policy.

Other speakers declared that the attitude of the Bundesrath in steadily refusing to provide pensions was inexplicable.

As the burdens of militarism increase a government which rests upon force finds it necessary to choose between the army of the present and the soldiers of the past. It can better afford to do injustice to those whose fighting days are over than to alienate those upon whom it must rely for future assistance.

Liberal pensions are possible with a small military establishment, but hardly probable when the resources of a country are drained to support a large body of professional soldiers.

CHRISTIANITY VERSUS WAR.

Erasmus, whose words have echoed through three centuries, has this to say of the antagonism between Christianity and War:

Let us imagine we hear a soldier among these fighting Christians saying the Lord's Prayer just before battle. Our Father! says he. O, hardened wretch! Can you call God Father, when you are just going out to cut your brother's throat?—Hallowed be Thy name. How can the name of God be more impiously unhallowed than by mutual bloody murder among his sons?—Thy kingdom come. Do you pray for the coming of His kingdom while you are endeavoring to establish an earthly despotism by spilling the blood of God's sons and subjects?—Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven. His will in Heaven is for peace; but you are now meditating war.—Give us this day our daily bread. How dare you say this to your Father in Heaven at the moment that you are going to burn your brother's corn fields and would rather lose the benefit of them yourself than suffer him to enjoy them unmolested?—Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. With what face can you pray thus, when, so far from forgiving your brother, you are going with all the haste you can, to murder him in cold blood for an alleged trespass which, after all, is but imaginary?—Lead us not into temptation. And do you presume to deprecate temptation or danger—you who are not only rushing into it yourself, but doing all you can to force your brother into it?—Deliver us from evil. You pray to be delivered from evil, that is, from the evil being, Satan, to whose impulses you are now submitting yourself, and by whose spirit you are guided in contriving the greatest possible evil to your brother?

These sentiments, set forth and commented upon in the Peace Manual, are respectfully commended to those followers of the

Nazarene who preach a strenuous gospel of bloodshed, and who imagine that they see God's hand directing a war waged for conquest and the extension of trade.

TRADE-UNIONISM.

Mr. Wise, a member of the Australian Parliament, in a speech in favor of arbitration, sets forth the necessity for trade-unionism so forcibly that an extract is given below:

Trade-Unionism is, as I have said, to the laborer what capital is to the employer; and without trade-unionism we would not feel that there could be any real freedom of contract between the laborer and the employer.

Freedom only exists when those on either side are free to accept or reject the terms that are offered. To secure that freedom is the object of trade-unionism, because it recognizes that in order to have a fair bargain made, each party to the bargain must be on a footing of equality.

The labor organization not only helps those who belong to it, but it also helps those who are not members. For even those on the outside share to a greater or less extent in the better wages, the shorter hours and the more favorable conditions secured by the labor organizations. If unions or federations make mistakes it must be remembered that perfection is not to be expected in any work of human hands. The good done by these organizations far outweighs the errors which they have committed.

THE BOERS—GOD BLESS THEM.

The reports from South Africa revive the stories of ancient heroism. That a force so small should be able to hold the British army at bay and even re-take some of the surrendered places seems too wonderful to be true. Millions here and throughout the world who believe in self-government and deny the right of a strong nation to cast its sovereignty like a net over a weaker people, are watching with intense interest the unequal struggle of the Boers in defense of their independence. If they succeed in forcing a recognition of their republics, their victory will mark the turning point in the recent trend toward imperial ideas and their

sacrifices will be of incalculable value to the human race. If, however, they fail and are compelled at last to submit to the English yoke, their valiant resistance will have furnished innumerable themes for poetry and song, and the lovers of liberty for centuries to come will find inspiration in their courage and patriotism.

THE PARTY ORGANIZATION.

After the defeat of 1896 the gold democrats met and congratulated themselves upon their part in the republican victory and demanded a re-organization of the party. A second defeat has brought forth another chorus of criticism and a demand that the party management be turned over to those who for the past four years have held themselves aloof from the organization and spent their time in condemnation of the policies endorsed in the party platform.

Men who have repudiated the party creed and the party candidates, and yet pride themselves upon their superior democracy, urge a return to what they call the first principles of democracy. Pressed for some definite statement of their views they either evade the question or resort to language too ponderous for the understanding. Whatever differences of opinion may exist concerning the various planks of the Kansas City platform, the indisputable fact remains that that platform embraces the essential principles of democracy as taught by all the great leaders of the past and as accepted by the rank and file. Many democrats who left the party in 1896 came back in 1900 and were cordially welcomed. While not agreeing to every policy set forth, they gave hearty support to the democratic candidates because they believed that the platform was sound in its cardinal principles.

Exact fulfilment of national pledges and adherence to the Constitution, perfect compliance with the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, firm advocacy of the Monroe Doctrine, stern antagonism to militarism, relentless opposition to trusts, uncompromising hostility to an unjust dollar and to a surrender to national banks of the money issuing functions of the government, strong protest against entangling alliance with any other nation, vigorous objection to the plan of wasting the people's money in subsidies to a few individuals, earnest appeal for the restoration

of popular government and the principles which have given life and prosperity to the nation—these must represent the fundamental principles of democracy and these received the endorsement of the convention which met at Kansas City.

There is a marked difference between the methods employed by the democrats who believe in the Kansas City platform and the methods employed by those who oppose that platform. The former have fixed principles, state them without ambiguity, and invite judgment upon them; the latter prate about principles, assume a "holier than thou" attitude and declaim about national honors and party traditions, but never put their principles into concrete form or outline a plan for dealing with present political problems. They are against the Kansas City platform, but what are they for? They are against the silver plank, but what financial policy do they propose? Do they favor the national bank note or the greenback? Are they for an income tax or against it? Do they favor the popular election of senators, or do they oppose it? What is their attitude on the question of private monopolies? What would they do with the Philippine Islands? How large an army do they think necessary? What do they think of government by injunction?

The party as now organized has taken a position on these questions and is ready to defend it. Let the re-organizers present a statement of their views, equally definite and detailed, so that the voters, or the rank and file, if you please, may act understandingly.

When these self-styled democrats left the party they said that they preferred principles to success; now they ask those who remained true to the party to surrender principles in order to secure success under their leadership and they promise success notwithstanding the fact that the defeat of 1894, which came under their leadership, was the most disastrous since 1872, and notwithstanding the further fact that the ticket which they nominated in 1896 carried but one precinct in the United States.

If any change in the present organization is necessary it can be made by the voters in the regular way and at the proper time. If in the meantime, any member of the organization dies, resigns or is replaced, the new member ought to be in harmony with the people who select him, for, as a member of the organization, he acts in a representative capacity.

The only way to insure this harmony, is to insist that the candidate shall be frank and candid in making known his views to those to whom he appeals, and every honest democrat seeking party prominence with a sincere desire to aid the party will be willing to make known his views on every disputed question. Beware of the man who boasts of his democracy but refuses to define it.

The so-called democrats who voted the republican ticket showed by so doing that they were nearer to the republican position than they were to the democratic position. In order to regain their confidence, they must undergo a change or the democratic party must move over toward the republican position. As the re-organizers have manifested no change of heart the effort to re-organize might more properly be called an effort to republicanize the democratic party. To make the effort a success the democrats must either be converted to republican ideas, or be deceived into the support of men who wear the livery of democracy, but lean toward republican doctrines.

SECRET INFLUENCE.

The people have nothing to fear from open enemies. The man who boldly proclaims a principle, no matter what it may be, can do but little injury. No amount of intellect, learning or eloquence can make him dangerous. As Jefferson has expressed it, "Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." Truth grows in the open field; the sunshine nourishes and strengthens it. It is secret influence which is constantly corrupting government and securing special privileges for the few at the expense of the many. The man who advocates a thing which he believes to be good for the people as a whole has no reason to conceal his purpose, but the man who tries to secure an advantage which he knows to be beneficial to some class or combination but hurtful to the public, naturally and necessarily employs stealth.

Would the directors of a railroad company adopt and publish a resolution designating their favorite candidate for the legislature, congress, the senate or the bench? Would they candidly set forth why they wanted him and what they expected of him after they got him? And yet it is well known that railroads often take an active part in the selection of public officials.

Would the directors of a trust adopt and publish a resolution naming the presidential candidate they would support and announcing the contribution they would make to the campaign fund? And yet it is certain that the trusts have in the past interested themselves in campaigns.

Eternal vigilance is the price of protection against bad laws and misrule as well as the price of liberty. Since laws are made, construed and enforced by public officials, it is necessary that great care should be exercised in the selection of them in order that they, when selected, shall guard the interests of the whole people and not be the mere agents of some corporation.

ANOTHER ENDLESS CHAIN.

Secretary Gage recently appeared before a House committee and urged the enactment of a law specifically requiring silver dollars to be redeemed in gold on demand. He argued that, as the legal tender law makes silver the equivalent of gold, the government might as well offer to furnish gold in exchange for silver, as to allow silver to be presented in payment of revenues. To use his own expression:

The government might just as well face the situation and meet this silver with its right hand at the front door as to take it with the left hand at the back door.

And this is the reasoning of a financier! He sees no difference between a credit money and a standard money; he thinks it a matter of no moment that his plan reduces the quantity of basic money and increases the quantity of redeemable money—or, in other words, contracts the foundation and expands the superstructure.

But of this later. It is worth while to point out at this time that the argument now made by Secretary Gage is similar to the argument which led to the custom of redeeming treasury notes in gold, although the practice of redeeming treasury notes in gold simply surrendered the government's option to select the coin and did not convert a standard money into a credit money. After the custom of redeeming in gold was established the financiers

pointed out that the redemption and re-issue of treasury notes formed what they called an endless chain for the draining of the treasury. This argument was used with great effect in securing the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Law. As soon as that legislation was accomplished the financiers set to work to secure the retirement of the greenbacks as well as the treasury notes on the ground that the greenbacks also constituted an endless chain when redeemed and re-issued. Now that the greenbacks and treasury notes are in process of retirement an attack is to be made upon the silver dollar.

The argument that worked so well against government paper is now to be used against coin. The present law does not require the redemption of silver dollars; a bill containing such a provision passed the House a year ago but a republican Senate was not willing to go on record as favoring such a measure at the beginning of a presidential campaign, so the matter was left to executive construction.

Now that the election is over the republican leaders are a little more bold and will probably make the law specific in requiring redemption.

Next will come the demand for the retirement of silver dollars by an issue of bonds, or for a withdrawal of their legal tender qualities.

As a reason for retiring silver we will be told that a silver dollar redeemed and then re-issued forms another endless chain. It will be pointed out that there is no limit to the amount of gold that may be drained from the treasury if silver dollars are paid out again after they are once redeemed. The same argument made against the greenback and treasury note will be repeated against a redeemable silver dollar.

The redemption of the standard silver dollar is the first step toward its ultimate retirement, and those who are opposed to its retirement will not be induced to aid in making it redeemable. When the gold standard is complete, gold will be the only legal tender money and bank notes the only paper money. Until this end is reached the financiers will deprecate any agitation of the money question during campaigns and will spend the years between campaigns urging legislative enactments in furtherance of their plans.

TRIAL BY JURY DENIED.

The President, in his instructions to the Philippine commissioners, is careful to exclude trial by jury from the blessings conferred upon the Nation's oriental subjects. The omission is the more noticeable because the sixth amendment to the Constitution is quoted entire with the exception of the clause guaranteeing trial "by an impartial jury of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law."

Below will be found the sixth amendment and the instruction taken from it:

THE SIXTH AMENDMENT.

In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY OF THE STATE AND DISTRICT WHEREIN THE CRIME SHALL HAVE BEEN COMMITTED, WHICH DISTRICT SHALL HAVE BEEN PREVIOUSLY ASCERTAINED BY LAW, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

THE PRESIDENT'S INSTRUCTION.

In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial; to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

One by one the safe-guards of the Constitution are being abandoned; one by one the doctrines of imperialism are being adopted. There is not a vital principle of government, heretofore considered sacred, which must not ultimately be abandoned if this Nation continues to tax subjects without representation and govern them without the consent of the governed.

TOLSTOI ON IMPERIALISM.

Tolstoi is credited with a severe criticism of American imperialism. He is quoted as saying:

You Americans are worse than the Mohammedans. They preach war and they fight; you preach liberty and peace and yet you go out to conquer through war.

He believes in "strenuous life," but he thinks that human activity can better be employed doing good than in killing people.

Russia's philosopher is wise enough to see and know that commercialism is the moving spirit behind imperialism and that "duty and destiny" are only masks.

THE PRESIDENTIAL TERM.

The suggestion made by ex-President Cleveland, to the effect that the presidential term should be extended to six years and the president made ineligible for re-election, has excited discussion. The latter part of the proposition has met with the more cordial reception. There seems to be a widespread opinion that a president should be limited to one term in order to prevent his using the first term to secure a re-nomination.

President Jackson suggested this limitation in his first inaugural message.

Mr. Hayes in 1876, in his letter accepting the republican nomination said:

The declaration of principles by the Cincinnati convention makes no announcement in favor of a single presidential term. I do not assume to add to that declaration, but believing that the restoration of the civil service to the system established by Washington and followed by the early presidents can be best accomplished by an executive officer who is under no temptation to use the patronage of his office to promote his own re-election, I desire to perform what I regard as a duty in stating now my inflexible purpose, if elected, not to be a candidate for election to a second term.

Mr. Cleveland, in his first letter of acceptance stated, in even stronger language, the objections to a second term, saying:

When an election to office shall be the selection by the voters of one of their number to assume for a time a public trust instead of his dedication to the profession of politics; when the holders of the ballot, quickened by a sense of duty, shall avenge truth betrayed and pledges broken, and when the suffrage shall be altogether free and uncorrupted, the full realization of a government by the people will be at hand. And of the means to this end, no one would, in my judgment, be more effective than an amendment to the Constitution disqualifying the president from re-election.

When we consider the patronage of this great office, the allurements of power, the temptation to retain public place once gained, and, more than all, the availability a party finds in an incumbent whom a horde of office-holders, with zeal born of benefits received and fostered by the hope of favors yet to come, stand ready to aid with money and trained political service, we recognize in the eligibility of the president for re-election a most serious danger to that calm, deliberate and intelligent political action which must characterize a government by the people.

Human nature is as yet too frail to withstand the temptation to use for selfish purposes the great patronage of the executive.

If it is argued that a nation might be in such a crisis that it could ill afford a change in the administration, it may be said in reply, first, that the same argument could be made at the close of a second term, and, second, that when the nation reaches a condition where only one man out of the whole population is able to assume and properly discharge the duties of the executive it will scarcely be worth saving.

As to the lengthening of the term considerable difference of opinion has developed. The principal affirmative argument is that business interests are disturbed by a presidential election. If this argument is to have a controlling influence we might as well choose the executive for life, or, in order to reduce the disturbance to a minimum, establish an hereditary succession. There are political reasons in favor of the present length which outweigh any business considerations.

Jefferson was an advocate of frequent elections. In a letter written to Samuel Adams, in 1800, he said:

A government by representatives, elected by the people at short periods, was our object; and our maxim at that day was "where annual election ends, tyranny begins;" nor have our departures from it been sanctioned by the happiness of their effects.

Sixteen years later he said:

The rights of the people to the exercise and fruits of their own industry can never be protected against the selfishness of rulers, not subject to their control at short periods.

The fact that commercial reasons are deemed sufficient with some to justify the surrender of a principle absolutely necessary for the protection of the public shows the dangerous pre-eminence given to money and money making.

To lengthen the presidential term is simply to enlarge the stake for which great interests play. The trusts could increase their campaign contributions fifty per cent. if they could secure control of an administration for six years instead of four.

Short terms are necessary not only to protect the people from their public servants, but also to moderate disappointment and discontent. The sooner the people can hope for remedy the more patiently do they submit to that which they consider error or injustice.

A four years term is long enough for a good president and too long for a bad one.

THE WAGES OF SIN.

Press dispatches announce that Neely, the embezzler of Cuban postal funds, who, by the decision of the Supreme Court, is to be sent back to the island for trial, has broken down and is a complete wreck. If the report is true, it is only another illustration of the fact that the wages of sin is death. Aside from the moral principle involved, nothing pays a larger dividend of suffering on the investment than a breach of trust.

The gnawing of conscience and the fear of detection rob the offender of happiness before he is found out, and when his wrongdoing is discovered, personal disgrace and the anguish of friends embitter his life. And yet, in spite of the warnings which come from every age and from every country, scarcely a day passes but some trusted employe in private life or in public position is blazoned forth as a defaulter.

Most defalcations grow out of the temporary use of trust funds for personal advantage, when the trustee feels sure that he can re-

turn the amount on demand. Everybody should be taught the rule that no one can safely use trust money as a private fund, no matter how certain he may be of his ability to make good the loan.

Trust funds and private money should never be mingled.

SUBSIDIZED INSTRUCTION.

It is a bad sign when the founder of a university seeks to dominate the mind of the teacher of that university. It is a good sign when the teacher rebels and surrenders his salary in preference to surrendering his principles.

Stanford university has lost six professors, and the upheaval is the result of the attempt of the founder's widow to regulate the convictions of some of the instructors in the institution.

In May, 1900, Professor Ross attended a mass meeting held in San Francisco for the purpose of protesting against the coming of Japanese laborers to this country. He delivered an address on this occasion in which he insisted on the exclusion of the Japanese as a measure of wisdom in the light of our experience with the Chinese. It seems that for many years Senator Stanford, who was president of the Southern Pacific railroad, had the habit of importing coolie labor, and for this he was frequently denounced by those opposed to that labor. This, it is said, explains Mrs. Stanford's sensitiveness on this point.

It may have been that Mrs. Stanford was further prejudiced against Professor Ross because she had been informed that he was an advocate of bimetallism and in favor of restricting the power of corporations. It has never been claimed, however, that Professor Ross ever carried his politics into the classroom. On the contrary, it is said of him that in his lectures to his classes he was eminently fair, invariably presenting both sides of every question with which he had to deal.

Although Professor Ross' notions had greatly prejudiced him in Mrs. Stanford's eyes, he was a favorite not only with the president of the university, but with all with whom he came in contact. But as soon as the report of his anti-Japanese speech reached Mrs. Stanford she insisted upon his resignation, and the resignation was forthcoming. Subsequently, Professor George E. Howard, of the same university, took occasion to criticise the policy of

interfering with the liberty of speech in university discussion. Professor Howard boldly declared that Professor Ross' dismissal was "a blow aimed directly at academic freedom, and to the cause of American education." He added:

The blow does not come directly from the founder. It really proceeds from the sinister spirit of social bigotry and commercial intolerance, which is just now the deadliest foe of American democracy. In order that we may attain the highest ideal of social, moral, and intellectual life our university must be the inviolable sanctuary of free inquiry.

Soon after Professor Ross' dismissal, Professor Aldrich resigned, declaring that he could not teach in Stanford university under the circumstances.

As soon as Professor Howard's remarks became known to Mrs. Stanford, she asked for an apology from the professor for his criticism of the university's course toward Ross. Professor Howard defended himself by saying that he had simply made a fair presentation of the influences that resulted in Professor Ross' dismissal. He declined to apologize, and on Monday of last week, he was informed that his resignation would be accepted, but was given the privilege of remaining until the end of the term. He refused to avail himself of this privilege, and immediately left the university.

On Tuesday Professor Hudson, of the English department, and Professor Little, of the Chair of Mathematics, resigned. On Wednesday Professor Spencer, of the History department, tendered his resignation—all giving as a reason that they did not care to teach in a university where liberty of speech was curtailed as it was at Stanford.

It is significant that the six instructors who thus left Stanford university were among the most popular and successful teachers in the institution. It is no surprise to be told that this university has lost considerable prestige because of the attempt to control the convictions of teachers. The student has small prospect of acquiring valuable information when the conscience and conviction of his teacher are dominated by one whose power and authority come exclusively from financial connection with the school. If the men and women whose lives are dedicated to the instruction of the young are not to speak what they conceive to be the truth,

for fear of offending the university financiers, then little care need be exercised as to the character and ability of university instructors. A college diploma and a post-graduate course in a corporation atmosphere is, then, all that is necessary to fit a man or woman for a college professorship. But if the young people who attend our universities are to make the most of their opportunities, then it is essential that men and women who instruct them shall have the brains to think for themselves and the courage to express their opinions without fear or favor.

The policy that resulted in the six resignations at Stanford university may endear that institution to those who imagine that the champions of class privilege are the only ones who have the right to independent thought, but among men and women who believe that the successful college must have as its professors men of thought and conviction in order to produce results, Stanford university will not take high rank. And it is no wonder that to-day all California is blushing for the policy of a university that otherwise might be a credit and advantage to the great state in which it is located.

TOWNE'S GREAT SPEECH.

Just before closing his brief senatorial career, Mr. Towne delivered a speech which may fairly be regarded as the best of his many excellent productions. Mr. James Creelman, the distinguished newspaper correspondent, describing the delivery of the speech and the immediate effect produced, says that no speech delivered in the senate in recent years has created such a profound impression or brought to its author such general and hearty congratulations. As an arraignment of imperialism the speech has never been surpassed. The following is the peroration:

I do not wish to convey the impression that in my opinion the present policy will at one fell swoop convert this republic into an empire in fact. But I do say that the seeds of empire lurk in this policy, and that time, and favoring environment will and must bring them to their flower and fruit unless we make a seasonable prevention. God speed the day when the American people, whose annals blaze with records of unequaled heroism, and who again and always, if some great cause demand it, would freely pay with

life itself the price of its defense, shall have the moral courage to do their civil duty—a rarer thing than to face undaunted the cannon's mouth—and with their sovereign voice declare that this unholy war for greed and empire shall be stopped, and that no soldier of the United States shall ever again in all our history be sent to other lands to war on people fighting for their liberty.

I shall not willingly cease to dream of a twentieth century devoted to the demonstration, the first and only one in history, that a government of the people, for the people, and by the people need not perish from the earth. There is an inspiration in the thought that to our beloved country may be reserved the culminating glory of the ages in crowning with success the long experiment of righteous self-government.

THE CUBAN CONSTITUTION.

The Cuban constitution, as it has been drafted and will probably be adopted, is, in many respects, similar to that of the United States. Cuba is declared to be “a sovereign and independent state under a republican form of government.” The provision for citizenship is as liberal as ours. The guarantees of personal liberty, religious freedom, freedom of speech and of the press, are similar to those in our Constitution. The president is to be elected by a direct popular vote, “an absolute majority thereof cast on one single day” being essential to election. The term of office is for a period of four years. The president may be re-elected, but is ineligible for a third consecutive term. The vice-president has powers and authority similar to ours. The congress is to be composed of a senate and house of representatives. The senate will consist of thirty-six members, elected for six years, one-third retiring every two years. The house will have one member for every 25,000 inhabitants, or fraction above 12,500. The house members are to be elected for four years, one-half the membership retiring every two years. The congress has powers similar to ours. The judicial power is vested in a supreme court, and it is provided that “justice shall be ministered gratuitously.” The judges of the court are to be appointed by the president with the approval of the senate and are to hold office during good behavior. Each of the six provinces is to have a governor elected for three years and a “departmental assembly” elected for three years. These provinces are given the right of independent action in their local affairs, pro-

vided that no law is enacted inconsistent with the Cuban constitution.

Municipalities are given powers and privileges not enjoyed by towns in the United States. Here the municipality is recognized as a creature of the state, having no powers which the legislature does not bestow. But the Cuban constitution prohibits the "departmental assemblies" or province legislatures from enacting any law that shall be antagonistic "to that which pertains to the inherent right of the municipalities." The most liberal home rule is given to the towns, and these towns are immediately governed by a mayor and board of councilmen. The Cuban congress is given authority over telegraphs and railroads.

On the whole, the draft of the Cuban constitution is a meritorious document. Such errors as it has are for the most part copied from our own Constitution, and we are not in position to criticise them until we adopt amendments here.

The people demonstrated their right to liberty by their willingness to fight for it. The proceedings of Cuba's constitutional convention have demonstrated that the fortunes of the people of that island are more secure in the hands of Cuban statesmen than they would be in the custody of American politicians.

POPULAR ELECTION OF SENATORS.

While it may be impossible to secure favorable action at this time, an effort ought to be made in the Senate to bring up for consideration the resolution looking to the election of United States senators by a direct vote of the people.

The House of Representatives in both the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses adopted resolutions submitting the necessary constitutional amendment, but each time the Senate defeated action. That there is a popular demand for the change is evident from the fact that a similar resolution passed the House of Representatives of the present Congress by an almost unanimous vote.

In 1868 President Johnson, first in a special and later in an annual message, urged the submission of an amendment placing the election of United States senators in the hands of the people at large, and from that day to this there has been a constant growth of sentiment in favor of this reform. Wherever the matter has been

acted upon by the people an overwhelming majority has been recorded in favor of the proposition. The affirmative arguments may be summed up as follows:

First. The people have a right to speak through senators of their own selection.

Second. Corruption and corporate influence are bringing scandal and disgrace upon senatorial elections and impeaching the integrity of a legislative body which ought to stand above suspicion.

Third. Senatorial elections, as conducted at present, interfere with the legitimate work of state legislatures.

Whatever causes may have led to the adoption of the existing method of selecting senators, experience has not only shown that the people can be trusted with the direct choice of their public servants, but it has also demonstrated that the nearer the Government is brought to the voters the better it is for both the Government and the people. There is more virtue in the masses than ever finds expression through their representatives, because representatives are influenced, to a greater or less extent, by their personal interests.

It is true that even with popular elections the nominations would be made by conventions, but the fact that the voters would afterwards sit in judgment upon the work of the delegates would be a constant restraint.

The last few years have furnished so many instances of corporate influence or corruption operating in the election of senators that no elaboration of the second argument is necessary. It has become apparent to the most casual observer that candidates backed by railroads and other large corporations have an enormous advantage over men who must rely upon their personal popularity or worth.

While in some instances money has been used to purchase votes outright, the method more frequently employed is to place the legislators under obligation to a particular candidate by pecuniary aid furnished during the campaign. Organized capital is also able to bring pressure to bear upon legislators by the bestowal of favors.

But aside from the arguments which affect the character of the men selected, the best interests of the state require that the legislators shall be relieved of the duty of electing senators, because legislative candidates cannot now be voted for according to their fitness for legislative work. As one-third of the United States senators are elected every two years, two legislative sessions (where

they are biennial) out of every three are called upon to settle a senatorial controversy and this controversy, as a rule, overshadows all other matters.

When the contest is prolonged, the regular business is interrupted by daily balloting and attention is diverted from state affairs.

Two years ago there were deadlocks in four states, and this year two legislatures are having obstinate struggles.

Some object to the proposed change on the ground that the Constitution should not be disturbed, but this is always the argument of those who are satisfied with things as they are. The best friends of the Constitution are those who desire to strengthen it in the affections of the people by making it conform to the wishes of the people.

There is no force in the objection urged by some that a senator should be selected by a legislature because he represents the state. This draws a distinction between the state and the people of the state. Surely the choice of a majority of the people would be more truly a representative of the state than the choice of a minority.

It will be a great victory for popular government when the selection of United States senators is taken away from legislatures and given into the custody of the voters where it rightfully belongs.

LIBERTY A SUPREME GOOD.

Buckle, whose "History of Civilization in England" has given him a permanent place in the literary world, was a passionate lover of liberty. In one of his productions, to be found in the "World's Best Essays," he expresses himself with so much clearness and emphasis that an extract is given below. It is worth while for the reader to compare the vigorous logic of the historian with the complacent philosophy of the present-day imperialists, who assume that a defeated monarch can bargain, sell and convey, for pecuniary consideration, the bodies, souls and inalienable rights of eight millions of Filipinos.

Buckle says:

Liberty is the one thing most essential to the right development of individuals, and to the real grandeur of nations. It is a product of knowledge when knowledge advances in a healthy and regular

manner; but if under certain unhappy circumstances it is opposed by what seems to be knowledge, then, in God's name, let knowledge perish and liberty be preserved. Liberty is not a means to an end, it is an end itself. To secure it, to enlarge it, and to diffuse it, should be the main object of all social arrangements and of all political contrivances. None but a pedant or a tyrant can put science or literature in competition with it. Within certain limits, and very small limits too, it is the inalienable prerogative of man, of which no force of circumstances and no lapse of time can deprive him. He has no right to barter it away even from himself, still less from his children. It is the foundation of all respect, and without it the great doctrine of moral responsibility would degenerate into a lie and a juggle. It is a sacred deposit, and the love of it is a holy instinct engraven on our hearts.

MISTAKEN IDENTITY.

The political editor of the Cincinnati *Times-Star*, feeling it necessary to register his disapproval of THE COMMONER, seized his pencil and dashed off the following brilliant criticism:

In initiating his editorial duties Mr. Bryan is as unfortunate in his choice of quotations as in his political speeches. The last man of American public men whom Mr. Bryan should quote is Webster. There is not a principle which the great Massachusetts statesman stood for which Mr. Bryan represents. * * *

Mr. Bryan errs whenever he attempts to quote Webster in support of any of his political ideas. The use of the phrasing of a partial sentence, selected without regard to the center thought, is a favorite trick of Mr. Bryan, but an unfortunate one, because he has almost invariably chosen a phrase which was inappropriate when read in a fuller light.

When our much esteemed but incautious contemporary can withdraw himself from the contemplation of Webster the Statesman long enough to examine a compilation prepared by Webster the Lexicographer, he will find the definition given in the first editorial of THE COMMONER. The language quoted was not, as he intimates, taken out of its connection.

It must be admitted that the writings of Noah Webster, of Dictionary fame, are marred by frequent change of subject, and seem somewhat disconnected, but while they lack the stately and flowing style of the Massachusetts orator, the editor of the *Times-Star* will find them worthy of occasional perusal.

II.

MILITARISM.

During the last campaign the democrats pointed out that republican success would encourage the party in power to increase the standing army. The republicans evaded the question for the most part, and, when they were challenged to meet it, resorted to subterfuge and deception. They claimed that the army then in service was made necessary by the war in the Philippines and called attention to the fact that the increase expired by limitation in 1901. They pretended to believe that the army could be reduced before that time if the republicans won at the election and the Filipinos were assured that there would be no change in the administration. These arguments ought not to have misled any one because the President, two months before hostilities broke out at Manila, asked for authority to raise the army to one hundred thousand.

A republican House of Representatives passed a bill giving him the authority, and the democrats and their populist and silver republican allies in the Senate secured the limitation which the republicans were afterwards so anxious to hide behind. The election resulted in a republican victory even more pronounced than the leaders of that party had expected, but the war in the Philippines did not terminate and then the imperialists came out from under cover and boldly demanded an increase in the military establishment. A bill was introduced, hurried through the House and Senate and is now a law. The title of it is a confession of cowardice. It is not a bill to increase the SIZE of the standing army, but a bill "To increase the EFFICIENCY of the permanent military establishment of the United States." It provides that the army of the United States shall consist of fifteen regiments of cavalry, a corps of artillery, thirty regiments of infantry, one lieutenant-general, six major generals, fifteen brigadier generals, etc., etc., etc. Each regiment of cavalry and infantry has one colonel, one lieutenant-colonel, three majors, fifteen captains, fifteen

first lieutenants and fifteen second lieutenants, besides sergeants, sergeant-majors, corporals, etc.—the etc. including among other persons, privates, ranging from forty-three to seventy-six in each cavalry troop, and from forty-eight to one hundred and twenty-seven in each infantry company. The President is given the dangerous power to increase the army to the maximum. The number of enlisted men is limited to one hundred thousand. The maximum of enlisted men may include twelve thousand natives to be enlisted in the Philippine Islands if the President sees fit to enlist them.

If any one will read the bill complete and count the number of generals, colonels, lieutenant-colonels, majors, captains, first lieutenants, second lieutenants, adjutants, inspectors, quarter-masters and other officers with life tenure, he can understand something of the force which militarism can command in any legislative contest with the taxpayers.

It is easier to increase an army, especially the official part, than reduce it, and the people have before them a difficult task, but the burdens and menace of militarism can be relied upon to arouse the people. When the awakening comes it will be found that the people who profit by a large military establishment, however powerful in present influence, are insignificant in numbers compared with those who are injured.

A WORTHY AMBITION.

Hon. Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, O., announces that he has retired permanently from business and intends to devote all of his time and energy to social and political questions, with a view to aiding in the enforcement of the doctrine of equal and exact justice to all and special privileges to none.

It is a worthy ambition, and he carries into his work an honest heart, a clear head, an eloquent tongue and an enthusiasm which comes from deep conviction.

During his service in Congress he gave evidence of both ability and fidelity to the public weal, and his present determination is not a surprise to those who have known him intimately.

Mr. Johnson, though comparatively young, is a man of large means and has laid aside enough to keep the wolf from his own

door while he is battling for the rights of others. His success as a business man will protect him from the contempt which the well-to-do usually visit upon the reformer.

Long life to him, and may he find in his labor for his fellows a higher and more enduring enjoyment than is within the reach of those who strive only for themselves, or who make the accumulation of wealth their sole object.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Had Abraham Lincoln lived until February 12, 1901, he would have reached the age of ninety-two years; that is not an impossible age for a sturdy man. When we remember that the years have not multiplied to the extent that, under ordinary circumstances, Lincoln would be precluded from being a living witness to this country's attitude to-day, we are reminded that it is an easier thing to forget a good man's teachings than to lose recollection of the man himself.

The anniversary of Lincoln's birth will be generally celebrated throughout the country. Republican orators will claim him as the patron saint of their party; but the claim must seem a mockery when we realize the fact that that party had ignored Lincoln's warnings and violated Lincoln's precepts.

Society is not benefitted by observing the birthday of a bad man; nor is society benefitted by the observance of a good man's birthday if the lessons he taught are banished from the minds of the observers.

If we would not appear as hypocrites, we must in our observance of Lincoln day associate Lincoln's principles with the man whose memory we pretend to revere. Lincoln's fame is imperishable because of his contribution to society. A crisis confronted his country, and in the solution of the problems, he applied rules which, if correctly applied in Lincoln's time, may be correctly applied to similar problems in any period of human history.

On one occasion in replying to Stephen A. Douglas, Mr. Lincoln said:

We cannot say people have a right to do wrong. That is the real issue. That is the issue that will continue in this country when the poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent.

It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood the test since the beginning of time, and they will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity, and the other the divine right of kings. It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself.

Lincoln recognized that the great struggles of society are over fundamental principles—principles which remain unchanged from generation to generation, from century to century, although the application of the principles varies from time to time as new questions arise.

To-day Lincoln's memory is glorified, and yet it is significant that the party that claims him as its own, is now antagonizing every vital principle taught by the martyred president.

That government "should express the highest spirit of justice and liberty," was Mr. Lincoln's idea; government for the advantage of the few at the expense of the many, is the republican notion of to-day.

Lincoln believed that the Declaration of Independence was written for all men and for all time, and provided the only safe rule for human government. To-day the republican politician has nothing but sneers when the Declaration is invoked as a safe guide for the solution of present day problems.

Lincoln believed that a people should never "entrust to hands other than their own, the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions." The republican notion of to-day is, that one set of men has the right to give to another set of men only that degree of self-government which in the estimation of the former the latter is capable of enjoying.

Lincoln had faith that right makes might. The republican notion of to-day is, that might makes right.

What a vast difference between the preaching of Lincoln and the practice of the party that claims Lincoln as its patron saint.

At this time, when the republican party is engaged in policies involving the doctrine that this nation may trample with impunity upon the rights of men, and that our reliance is in becoming a world power, it is interesting to recall Lincoln's reference to "the sure logic of history." It was in 1858 that Mr. Lincoln said:

Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which

prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism around your doors. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you are preparing your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of those around you, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you. And, let me tell you, all these things are prepared for you, with the sure logic of history.

There is not a lesson taught by Lincoln, there is not a principle defended by Lincoln, there is not a rule of government proclaimed by Lincoln to be the truth that the republican party is not now arrayed against.

Every policy of the administration violates in practice the lessons which Lincoln taught; and as the wealth of trusts and syndicates increases, as the power of mercenary politicians becomes greater, pretense is more and more being cast aside. Some of the foremost leaders of the republican party do not now hesitate to drop the mask entirely and boldly antagonize the truths that Lincoln proclaimed.

CHINESE ATROCITIES.

Mr. George Lynch, an Englishman who has been doing newspaper work in China, gives a very uncomplimentary report of the action of the powers in the Orient. He says that a wave of fear and horror preceded the advent of the allies to such an extent that in many of the villages people committed suicide to save themselves from their Christian conquerors. He adds that some of the soldiers were so busy looting that they did not attempt to bury the bodies until finally the fear of disease compelled them. Other reports from apparently trustworthy sources seem to leave no doubt that the foreign troops have felt relieved from observing the usages of war which prevail among civilized combatants. This is not mentioned for the purpose of captious criticism, but only as an illustration of the fact that in a war between different races, the superior race as a rule sinks to the level of the inferior. The result is, that for generations to come the power of the superior race to benefit the inferior race by moral influence and example is entirely destroyed. The Boxers who used the open threats of dis-

memberment to arouse prejudice against foreigners will find new facts upon which to base their hatred. The foreign merchant and the missionary must live and labor under great disadvantages for years hence.

GAMBLING.

The Philadelphia papers are discussing with astonishment and indignation the gambling which has recently been discovered among the school children. The evidence shows that a large majority of the schools habitually buy chances at what is known as "policy," the amount invested sometimes being as low as two cents. A teacher of one of the schools has been largely instrumental in securing an investigation and the *North American* charges some of the police officers with protecting the gambling places and ignoring the complaints made. About the same time word comes from Chicago that President Harper, of the Chicago University, made a raid upon some students who were engaged in gaming.

While gambling is probably less common here than in other countries, it is still entirely too common. It is not long since a great lottery establishment required suppression, and even now a great many lottery tickets are sold in the United States, while slot machines, cigar-counter wheels and similar devices give constant testimony to the fact that the mania for games of chance has not been entirely cured. It is difficult to conceive of anything more demoralizing than the gambling habit when it once becomes fixed. In condemning it one need not consider so much those who are driven to despair by losses as those who are encouraged by occasional success. Cases are not infrequent where gambling has led to the use of trust money and to the sacrifice of a life's accumulation, but more pernicious still, if possible, is the adoption of the doctrine that one should try to get something for nothing.

The only sound economic theory upon which society can be built is that each person shall make to society a contribution equal in value to the benefits which he receives; that is the basis of the compact between the individual and society. The same principle applies in all exchange; each party to an honest transaction furnishes an equivalent for that which he receives. People will not willingly make exchanges unless they think they are receiving equal value, and if one party deceives the other he is guilty of fraud.

Gambling destroys this economic principle and substitutes a system wherein to secure the possibility of large gain one accepts the probability of a small loss. It is difficult, however, to make much headway against small gambling by children while it is considered respectable for grown people to gamble on a large scale.

The same paper which describes the investigation of policy dealing in Philadelphia reported a "cotton corner" in New York. So long as society bows before the successful market speculator, who wins his game with loaded dice, it is going to be hard to impress college students with the immorality of poker or to teach kindergarten school children the wickedness of a two-cent investment in a policy slip.

AN EXPERT OPINION.

What is the purpose of a railroad in giving a pass? If it is given by the freight department to a shipper it is probably given for business reasons, but suppose it is given to a legislator, is it given for business reasons also? Some say that it is a courtesy extended without any reason in particular. In order that the readers of THE COMMONER may have the highest expert testimony on this subject the following letter is reproduced:

Your letter of the twenty-second to President Ripley requesting an annual over the railroad of this company has been referred to me. A couple of years ago, after you had been furnished with an annual over this line, you voted against a bill which you knew this company was directly interested in. Do you know of any particular reason, therefore, why we should favor you with an annual this year?

This letter was written to a member of the Illinois legislature by the attorney of the Santa Fe railroad, of which Mr. E. P. Ripley is president. It is of recent date and was read on the floor of the house of representatives. It states as plainly as language can that a railroad gives passes to legislators as a matter of business, expecting to receive a valuable consideration in return, and it shows further that the legislator who refuses to recognize the pass as a bribe must not expect to get any more passes. A similar case occurred in Nebraska a few years ago when a pass issued to a member of the legislature was recalled because he voted for a

maximum rate bill which the railroad objected to. Unless a legislator can produce better evidence of the railroad's purpose than the railroad's own admission, he cannot accept a pass without admitting either that he intends to repay the railroad in service or that he secures the pass under false pretenses.

LET THE LEGISLATURES ACT.

The people are nearly unanimous in their support of the proposition that United States Senators should be elected by a direct vote of the people.

The National House of Representatives has three times adopted a resolution, practically without opposition, submitting the necessary constitutional amendment; a resolution is now before the Senate and could be acted upon in a few hours. It is hardly probable that any senator would make an argument against the resolution and certainly no group of senators would filibuster against it. If the state legislators now in session would act at once and urge their senators to call up the resolution and insist upon immediate action, the amendment might be submitted by this Congress. It is worth while to try.

A PROSPEROUS TRUST.

The par value of a share of stock in the Standard Oil Company is \$100. Since the republican victory of 1896, the market value of Standard Oil stock has been steadily increasing. Soon after the election of 1896 this stock was quoted at \$200 per share. In February, 1899, it sold for \$439 per share; in February, 1900, it sold at \$512 per share; in September of 1900 it dropped back to \$500 per share. But after "confidence" was once more restored by a republican victory, this stock went up to \$600 per share. In January, 1901, it sold for \$794. On February 4, it sold at \$805, and the latest quotation at hand is \$815.

When one reads the record of recent dividends declared by this great concern, it is not difficult to understand why the market value of the stock has increased so rapidly.

The capital stock of the Standard Oil Company is \$100,000,000.

In 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894 and 1895, the Standard Oil Company paid dividends amounting for each year to \$12 on each share of stock. In 1896 the dividends amounted to \$31 per share; in 1897 they were \$33 per share; in the month of January, 1900, they were \$20 per share; in April, 1900, the dividends amounted to \$10 per share; in July, \$8 per share; in November, \$10 per share; and the company has now declared a dividend payable March 15th of \$20 per share.

This latest dividend means the payment of \$20,000,000 upon the capital of \$100,000,000 of capital stock.

The total dividends paid by this company for the entire year of 1900 amounted to \$48,000,000.

The dividends to be paid on March 15th brings the aggregate up to \$68,000,000 of dividends paid upon a capital stock of \$100,000,000 during a period of fourteen months and fifteen days.

It will be readily understood from the figures why Standard Oil stock is quoted so high in the markets.

But where will we find an explanation of a condition that within a period of less than fifteen months a concern whose working capital is \$100,000,000 is enabled to roll up profits to the extent of \$68,000,000?

This certainly indicates that the stockholders of the Standard Oil Company are prosperous. But someone must have paid this \$68,000,000. Who paid it?

DELIGHTFUL UNCERTAINTY.

There seems to be a movement toward the establishment of civil government in the Philippines. The Spooner resolution which receives most favor in administration circles is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when all insurrection against the sovereignty and authority of the United States in the Philippine Islands, acquired from Spain by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, shall have been completely suppressed by the military and naval forces of the United States, all military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the said islands shall, until otherwise provided by congress, be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the president of the United States shall direct for maintaining and

protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion.

This is an innocent looking resolution, but only a few explanatory words are necessary to make it fully understood. Translated into plain English it would read as follows:

Resolved, That when the war is over (nobody knows when that will be) the President shall establish some kind of a government (nobody knows what kind) and maintain it (nobody knows how long) until Congress does something (nobody knows what).

It is more than two years since the treaty was ratified and this is the nearest approach that the republicans have made toward a definite plan. They are not willing to give the Filipinos their independence and they are not yet willing to openly repudiate the doctrine of self-government. Therefore they find cover behind commissions and delegations of authority which conceal, so far as possible, their imperialistic purposes.

A PARTIAL REMEDY.

Ex-Attorney General Harmon, of Mr. Cleveland's cabinet, and ex-Attorney General Miller, of Mr. Harrison's cabinet, have recently suggested the free list as a remedy for trusts. Such suggestions, coming from such high authority and from such opposite sources, are encouraging as showing a reaction against the high tariff doctrine which has dominated republican councils. That the trusts take advantage of a tariff wall is no longer open to question; neither can it be disputed that much extortion would be prevented by placing every trust made article on the free list, but this must not be accepted as a complete remedy. We find ourselves exporting every year a larger variety of American manufactures, and wherever a trust can export it can live and flourish without the aid of a protective tariff. While the free list remedy would be a step in the right direction, it must be accompanied by other legislation if private monopolies are to be exterminated. Aside from the imposition practiced upon the public in the way of high prices, the trust destroys industrial independence and places all employes in that line of work at the mercy of one employer.

A remedy to be complete and satisfactory must prevent the establishment of a monopoly, for while extortionate prices are bad, a private monopoly was declared by the Kansas City platform to be both indefensible and intolerable. Let trust made articles be placed on the free list, but to stop there would be a disappointment to those who are in earnest in their opposition to private monopolies.

BY WHAT AUTHORITY?

We are told that an extra session of Congress will be necessary in order that the Cuban constitution may be "ratified" or "rejected."

By what authority does the American Congress presume to pass upon the Cuban constitution? Unless the United States has sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over the island of Cuba, no such authority exists. And it will be remembered that the war resolutions distinctly stated that the United States would not exercise "sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island except for the pacification thereof."

With the adoption of these resolutions Congress delivered the Cuban question over to the executive who is charged with the disposition of that question according to the terms of the war resolutions.

Since the Spaniards were driven out, all authority in the island of Cuba has been exercised by the President, or by men deputized by him. The people of that island were able to choose members of a constitutional convention at an orderly election; if that constitutional convention adopts a constitution molded on the lines of republican form of government, and an improvement in some respects over our own Constitution, it certainly must be admitted that "pacification" has taken place.

The Cuban people alone have the authority to adopt or modify their constitution. When a government in compliance with that constitution is organized, it will be the duty of the President to withdraw the military forces of the United States from that island, and leave its people to work out their own destiny, overcoming obstacles in their own way exactly as other peoples have been required to do.

The withdrawal of the United States from Cuba and delivery of power there to the constituted authorities of that island, is purely an executive act. The question of pacification involves a very simple fact. The executive knows, as the world knows, that Cuba has been pacified. But if Congress should assume the authority to approve, reject or modify the Cuban constitution, the United States would be assuming sovereignty, jurisdiction and control over the island of Cuba, things which the United States expressly disclaimed.

It is contended by some friends of the administration that it is essential that the United States shall be given suzerain powers in that constitution—that the Cuban people shall obligate themselves not to enter into treaties with foreign countries without the United States' consent.

It is further claimed that it is necessary, that the constitution shall declare that there shall be no interference with "vested rights" in the island of Cuba.

In the first place, the claim to suzerain rights is a distinct violation of our disclaimer that the United States would not seek to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof. It is a distinct violation of our pledge that after pacification is accomplished it is our intention to leave the government of that island to the Cuban people.

In the next place there are no such things morally or legally as "vested rights" in the island of Cuba accruing during our military occupation of that island.

It is true that since our military forces took possession there, syndicates having the favor of the administration have rushed in and have obtained valuable franchises, but these franchises are the property of the people of Cuba. Our military forces were there for the purpose of aiding in pacification, and were not given authority to vest any rights in administration favored syndicates.

The anxiety of these syndicates to maintain possession of valuable franchises is perhaps the explanation of the disposition manifested by the administration politicians to violate the solemn pledge of this nation with respect to the island of Cuba.

It may be that Congress will insist upon passing upon the Cuban constitution, but this will be mere assumption. It may be that Congress will seek to modify that constitution according to the whims of administration politicians and for the benefit

of administration syndicates, but Congress will be treading on dangerous ground. In law and in morals it will be acting without authority. In fact, it will be trifling with a people whose history repudiates the presumption that they will submit to imposition at the hands of American syndicates and American politicians any more willingly than they would submit to imposition at the hands of Spanish tyrants.

The President has been very quick to encroach upon congressional prerogative in the selection of a Philippine Commission empowered by him with authority to make laws and to collect and disburse revenues in the Philippine Islands. He now seems to be equally ready to surrender a plain and exclusive executive prerogative in carrying out the war resolutions with respect to Cuba.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE PRESS.

LINCOLN, NEB., Feb. 8th, 1901.

Mr. G. P. Brown, President Correspondent's Club, New York.

DEAR SIR:—I am in receipt of your favor announcing that the annual reunion of your club is to be held on the fourteenth of February, and asking for some suggestions upon the theme, "How can the influence of the Press be increased?"

I thank you for the honor you do me, and take pleasure in submitting an opinion. Taking it for granted that the members of your club will deal exhaustively with the news features of the press, I shall confine my observations to the editorial department.

The influence of the press must, in the long run, depend upon the character of the press and, as the character of the press is determined by the character established by individual newspapers, it follows that improvement must begin with the units which make up the whole.

Improvements are always possible, but three occur to me as of especial and immediate importance.

First. A newspaper will exert a greater influence, other things being equal, if it is known to represent on public questions the deliberate convictions of some person—a person of flesh and blood, not a corporation. The New York *Tribune*, under Greeley, was a good illustration of such a paper.

Second. The influence of a newspaper, other things being equal,

will be greater if it is known who owns the paper and controls its policy, and that that person has no interests adverse to the interests of the readers. So many newspapers are owned by, or mortgaged to, speculators, capitalists and monopolists, and are used for advocating or excusing legislation, having for its object the conferring of special privileges upon a few of the people at the expense of the rest of the people, that the Press has been robbed of much of its legitimate influence.

Third. The influence of the Press will be increased by greater unity in the support of any good cause and in the condemnation of any bad practice. The character of a paper is affected less by priority in the discovery of a felony than by persistence in the prosecution of the felon. In other words, a principle is more important than a "scoop."

Very truly yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

THE COST OF MILITARISM.

"Peace is the imperious necessity of advanced democratic civilization," says the *New York World*, "and only the despotically governed nations can afford to maintain huge military establishments."

The World points out that free countries whose fighting forces must be raised by voluntary enlistment instead of by universal conscription must pay for them in open competition with the labor market. Pointing out that we pay, for an army and navy of 120,000 men, \$253,696,870, exclusive of pensions, *The World* says that this is \$14,000,000 a year more than England pays, including pensions, for an army and navy that number 364,000 men.

Including pensions, our military budget aggregates \$398, 942, 103, which *The World* says is more than twice as large as the military budget of France, with her army and navy of 622,000 men; almost twice as large as Russia with nearly a million soldiers and sailors; nearly double Germany's with her half million enlisted men and almost five times as large as Austria's with 278,000 men.

Aside from pensions, the cost of the American army and navy, according to *The World*, averages \$2,100 per year for our enlisted men. To Great Britain the cost is something less than \$700 a year

for every man. The cheapest of all is the Russian soldier and sailor who costs \$200 per year.

The World's contention that only the despotically governed nations can afford to maintain huge military establishments was not particularly in need of confirmation, but if confirmation was required, accepting these figures as correct, the point has been fully sustained.

SENATORIAL WIT.

Mr. Towne's speech on the Philippine question brought out a passage at arms between him and Senator Depew, which has been widely circulated.

The New York Senator said: "I congratulate you, Mr. Towne. Your delivery was fine, your diction elegant and your peroration superb, but your argument was damnable." "I am delighted to know," instantly replied the Senator from Minnesota, "that you approve of the only features of it you could comprehend."

This recalls an exchange of compliments which is reported to have occurred between Senator Beck, of Kentucky, and Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts.

The former likened the Senator from Massachusetts to a tract of land in Virginia described by Randolph as "barren by nature and impoverished by cultivation." The gentleman from the Bay State awaited his opportunity, and when a fellow senator, commenting on Mr. Beck's continuous speaking in the discussion of a tariff bill, asked: "When does his mind rest?" replied, "When he talks." Evidently the Senate is not always prosy.

"WARNINGS OF A PARTING FRIEND."

"The disinterested warnings of a parting friend," is the way George Washington referred to the admonitions contained in his farewell address. The observance of the birthday of that great American will be of no value to this generation unless the American people shall turn seriously and intelligently to an inspection of the things which made this man great, and a careful study of the warnings which his love for his country prompted him to place before the American people.

Washington's birthday is a national holiday, and it will be very generally celebrated throughout the country. And yet at this time the men in charge of our national affairs are violating every admonition contained in the farewell address of the soldier and statesman whose memory all should revere.

It was Washington's solicitude for his country's welfare, which he declared could not end but with his life, that prompted him to give detailed warnings against the dangers which his experience and foresight anticipated for this nation.

Washington wrote of the love of liberty as being "interwoven with every ligament of your hearts," and, he added, that no recommendation of his was necessary "to fortify or confirm the attachment." If Washington lived to-day, would he not be justified in suspecting that this attachment was in need of at least some "fortification"?

Washington urged that "the free constitution which is the work of your hands may be sacredly maintained." Can it be said that this hope has been fulfilled when to-day the executive branch of the government violates with impunity the letter and the spirit of the Constitution?

Washington expressed the hope that the happiness of the American people "under the auspices of liberty" might be so complete that the people might acquire the glory of recommending liberty "to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it." Can it be said that this hope approaches fulfillment at a time when we have turned our backs upon two republics in South Africa, whose people are fighting for freedom, and when we are sending armed forces to the Philippine Islands to subjugate a people who aspire to liberty?

Washington urged us to avoid the necessity of "those overgrown military establishments, which, under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty." And yet to-day our national authorities have just completed an "overgrown military establishment," and the army and navy appropriation, exclusive of pensions, made at the present session of congress amounts to \$253,696,870.

Washington declared that "the constitution, which at any time exists till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all." How widely did Washington's views differ from those of the republican leaders of to-

day? A republican congress violates the constitutional requirement that tariff duties shall be uniform, and ignores the constitutional prohibition against a tax on exports. A republican president in the absence of congressional authority declares war, signs an agreement whereby purchase is the method for emancipation on United States territory, transfers to a commission of individuals appointed by himself the power to make laws, to collect and disburse the revenues, and to exercise all powers of sovereignty in a territory which our national authorities claim to be subject to United States jurisdiction.

Washington warned us to "resist with care the spirit of innovation" upon the principles of our government, "however specious the pretexts." Have we manifested the anxiety on this point which Washington would have had us cultivate?

Washington warned us against a disposition toward factionalism, pointing out that "sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction more able or more fortunate than his competitors would turn this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty." It is not difficult to see how this admonition has been ignored at a time when congress and president have abdicated their privilege of originating and enacting wholesome measures, have surrendered their duty of disposing of public questions in the light of public interests all in favor of one individual, whose public importance is due to the skill he has displayed as a politician.

No more striking warning was given by Washington than when he said:

It is important that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department any encroachment upon another.

The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against innovations by the others has been evinced by experiments, ancient and mod-

ern, some of them in our own country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them.

Of all Washington's warnings none are more pertinent to the present day than this. In every instance where one department has encroached upon the other, it has been on the pretense of public good, and on this point Washington gave to us an explicit admonition. "Though this in one instance," said Washington, "may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

Washington held that virtue or morality was "a necessary spring of popular government," and he added that no sincere friend to free government "can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric." What has become of this "necessary spring" when ship-subsidy grabbers, trust magnates, and other representatives of a privileged class are accorded high seats in the national councils, and make and unmake laws according to their own whims and to the advantage of their own interests? What has become of the "necessary spring" when we are appropriating millions of dollars in order to carry on a war of conquest, in order to subjugate a people who are fighting for principles declared by Washington and the men of his time to be true principles, and in their truth eternal as the stars?

Washington admonishes us to economy in all public affairs, and at this moment there is drawing to a close a congressional session that is appropriating, or will appropriate before its conclusion, very nearly a billion dollars.

Washington admonishes us against inveterate antipathies toward any nation, and at the same time took occasion to remind us that "affectionate attachment for any nation should also be excluded." And yet to-day our national authorities are cultivating a devotion toward Great Britain so ardent that it precludes us from building a canal on American soil without British consent; that prevented us from protesting against the American flag being hauled down on territory which for thirty-two years had been United States property, and that denied us the traditional privilege of expressing sympathy with two republics struggling for existence and doing battle against the encroachments of an empire.

Washington warned us against foreign influence, and so earnest was he on this point that he pleaded: "I conjure you to believe me, my fellow citizens." Pointing out the wide difference between the interests of a government by free men and a government by monarchs, Washington said: "Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, my fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government." Americans of to-day are in a position to realize the value of this admonition; and Americans of to-day are in a position to know that Washington prophesied well when in warning us against "excessive partiality for one foreign nation" he said: "real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools, and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests." In the opinion of some of the men to-day, the John Hays, whose favorite pastime is exchanging compliments with British ambassadors, are statesmen and patriots of the highest character; while men who protest against the "insidious wiles" of British influence are enemies to national progress and dangerous foes to national order.

These admonitions were, in the language of Washington, "the counsels of an old and affectionate friend." He said he dared not hope they would make the strong and lasting impression he could wish; but they did make a strong impression, and, written in 1796, they were lasting for a period of 100 years. Until the days of the present administration they provided the rules for our national conduct. That these principles are yet strong in the American heart cannot be doubted. Washington himself said that if these suggestions might "now and then recur" to warn "against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism, this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated."

If it was ever important that interest be revived in a great state paper, it is important at this time that interest be revived in Washington's farewell address.

II.

BUT WHAT IS THE REMEDY?

The *Chicago Chronicle* says that to a larger extent than ever before the wealth of the country is enlisted on the side of the republican party and it charges that this is due, in part, to the fact that the republican party favors manufacturing and other enterprises, and, in part, "to some recent deliverances by democrats which have been construed as hostile to public and private credit."

The latter suggestion, taken in connection with previous utterances of the paper, justifies the inference that it refers to the speeches made in defense of the Chicago and Kansas City platforms. The *Chronicle* itself has been inclined to construe such speeches into an attack upon wealth, whereas a distinction has always been made between honest accumulations and money made by illegal means. It is chief among the western advocates of reorganization and is persistently using its great influence to make the democratic party more like the republican party with a view to winning back those former democrats who have been supporting the republican tickets during recent years. The charges which the *Chronicle* has so often brought against the Chicago platform, the Kansas City platform and the men who defend those platforms are wholly without foundation. There is not a plank in either of those platforms which can fairly be construed as an attack upon property or upon those who accumulated money by legitimate methods, neither can the speeches made in support of those platforms be so construed.

The democratic party and those who believe in its policies are really the conservative element of the country. They are trying to protect life and property and to advance the public welfare by the application of old, tried and well settled principles; they would relieve that wealth which is the reward of industry from the odium cast upon it by wealth which is the result of exploitation or governmental favoritism.

There is no tenable middle ground between the position occupied

by the republican party and the position occupied by the democratic party. Republican policies are all of a kind; they all violate the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

It is not a mere coincidence that the party which in 1896 was willing to turn over the finances of the nation to the financiers, was also the party which, in 1900, furnished nearly all the advocates of imperialism, a large army, trusts, subsidies, etc. Is it merely a coincidence that the *Chronicle*, which in 1896 aided in the election of a republican president, celebrated Mr. McKinley's second election by repudiating the position taken by the democratic party on the Philippine question and the financial question and by adopting republican phraseology in protesting against the use of harsh words in condemning industrial combinations?

The democratic party cannot accept the republican position on one question and then make a successful fight against the republican position on other questions. In other words, the democratic party must be consistent and apply democratic principles at all times and everywhere. It must be the exponent of popular rights and the friend of the producing classes, or it will become the tool of predatory wealth.

After discussing the purpose of the republican party to run the government for the benefit of the few and after warning the republican leaders that there is a limit to public endurance the *Chronicle* makes this significant prediction:

The democratic party is opposed to class privilege as exemplified in protective tariffs and subsidies. It has made an unsuccessful effort to eliminate the evil from our government politics. Its failure in this respect under Mr. Cleveland is what gave rise to the more radical movement under Mr. Bryan. If the great conservative class of the republic, the men who stand between the very rich and the very poor, and who have twice saved the republican party from deserved defeat, shall at length revolt at the practices which have made republican triumph synonymous with robbery and jobbery, we may be sure that in their wrath they will call for some remedy more radical than any that has been proposed by the democratic party of Cleveland or the democratic party of Bryan.

It will be noticed that tariffs and subsidies are the special privileges emphasized. What about the other evils that demand attention?

In prophesying that radical measures will be resorted to if conservative ones fail, the *Chronicle* is simply judging the future by the past; but what remedy does it propose? The democratic party must be prepared to meet every emergency, to combat every wrong, and to apply a remedy to every disease which afflicts the body politic.

The democratic party declares that the Filipinos should be given their independence and then protected from outside interference as the republics of Central and South America have been protected. What other remedy is there for imperialism and militarism? The democratic party has declared war on every form of private monopoly. What other honest course can it pursue?

The democratic party is in favor of the greenback as against the bank note. How can those democrats who favor a national bank currency, issued by private corporations for private benefit, oppose other special privileges of the same kind? And what are such democrats doing to prevent the conversion of five hundred millions of legal tender silver dollars into subsidiary coin or to protect the jury system from the assault that is being made upon it by government by injunction?

There is some encouragement in the fact that a paper like the *Chronicle* admits the dangerous tendencies of republican policies, even though it has no plan for meeting those dangers. Having discovered the disease it may now seek a remedy, and when it does set out in earnest to find a remedy, it will find it in converting republicans to democratic principles as set forth in the party's latest platforms, rather than in the conversion of the democratic party to republican ideas.

THE ROOT OF ALL EVIL.

Rev. W. B. Wright, in a sermon recently delivered at Buffalo, N. Y., discussed the dangers which threaten our republic. After mentioning the disinclination of many to take part in political affairs, the abuses of party organization, the corruption of officials and the demoralizing influence of the war spirit, he condemned what he called the "cult which the euphemism of to-day has named 'the spirit of commercialism' but what Christ called 'the worship of Mammon,'" and added:

I am not sure but this last includes the four preceding dangers, as an acorn includes its oak. Democracies, we are told, are specially tempted to seek money with excessive eagerness, because where there is no recognized aristocracy the possession of great wealth offers to ambition the same prizes which in aristocratic nations are conferred by birth. Calm and conservative thinkers view with alarm the dangers which the worship of money threatens us.

Dr. Wright is correct in emphasizing the evils which come from the worship of mammon. This is the tap-root of all the trouble; out of it grow all the dangers enumerated. It is the overweening desire to get rich that so absorbs the attention of many that they have no time left for the discharge of civic duties; it is the same thirst for wealth which perverts party organizations, corrupts officials and rushes nations into wars of conquest. Experience, individual and national, confirms the truth of Holy Writ:

For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.

THE MONOPOLY MUST BE PREVENTED.

The billion dollar steel trust will serve a useful purpose if it awakens the people to a realization to the menace of private monopoly. The existence of such a combination of capital, absolutely controlling several lines of business, doling out daily bread to tens of thousands of working men and dominating a large part of the business world, is in itself indefensible and insufferable. The Kansas City platform points out a remedy—the only effective remedy proposed. Congress has power to regulate interstate commerce; it has power to prescribe the terms upon which a corporation organized in any state can do business outside of the state. Let Congress compel all corporations to take out a federal license before engaging in interstate commerce, or, if that is too harsh, let it require that corporations having a capital above a designated amount shall take out a license. This license could be granted by the interstate commerce commission, or by some commission created for the purpose, to corporations upon certain conditions. The first condition should be that there is to be no water in the stock, and the second, that the corporation is not attempting to

monopolize any branch of industry or the production of any article of merchandise. The license should be subject to revocation if the conditions are afterwards violated. It should be made unlawful for such a corporation to use the mails, the telegraph lines or the railroads outside of its own state until the license is granted. Such a system would confine a monopoly to the state of its origin, and even New Jersey would soon tire of a monopoly under such conditions. This is the remedy suggested in the democratic platform; if the republicans have a better one let them produce it. They are in power, and are responsible for the continued existence of every trust. They have the president, the senate, the house, the attorney general and the courts. They can destroy every trust if they desire to do so.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The Chinese Exclusion Act expires in 1902, and the American people must prepare themselves to pass upon the subject of oriental immigration.

Those who are opposed to the introduction of cheap labor from across the Pacific, are urging an extension of the existing law, and those who look with favor upon the employment of Chinese in this country are not idle. The *Portland Oregonian*, in a recent editorial, assumes that the labor agitator is the only one who is alarmed by the "yellow peril," and presents the usual argument against exclusion. It says:

Elsewhere is noted at some length the question of cheap labor immigration, suggested by Senator Inman's joint memorial to Congress. A word might also be said concerning the local aspect of the matter. What basis of fact exists for this terror of Chinese and Japanese competition in Oregon? What American mechanic is kept out of a place by any Chinaman or Jap in the city of Portland? The Chinese are mostly house servants, vegetable peddlers, and laundrymen. Now, where is the representative of organized labor that hankers to cook in the kitchen or wash undershirts or get up at 4 o'clock to load his wagon with vegetables? The Japs are generally railroad hands or do menial work about the house. It is hard for the railroads to get the section hands they need, and American mechanics are not looking for chances to scrub porches or wash dishes. It is a common remark that these "heathen devils" are "keeping poor white girls out of work."

It is a pitiful falsehood, for the fact is that, with all the Chinese and Japanese servants available, domestic help is next to impossible to obtain. Equally baseless is the cry that the Asiatics spend no money. They spend about as much as the thrifty American. As their position rises, they wear good clothes, ride in street cars and indulge the luxuries Chinatown affords. They do not work for starvation wages, as is sometimes alleged, as the efficient Chinese cook or butler is frequently able to command higher figures than American girls in the same line of work. Perhaps the most despicable of all the outcries against the Chinaman is that he saves his money and sends some of it home to his relatives. If he earns his money, what business is it of Mr. Labor Agitator what he does with it?

It will not be surprising if this editorial is re-echoed in republican papers throughout the country. The same sentiment was whispered ten years ago, but the corporations are bolder now.

Let us analyze the question. We had reached a point where it was necessary to decide whether the Chinese should be allowed to come without limit or whether restrictions should be placed upon them. The re-appearance of this question will compel the American people to consider the subject of immigration. Certainly a welcome should be extended only to those whose coming will, all things considered, prove beneficial to the country, and only those should be allowed to come who come voluntarily. Laws have been made to prevent the importation of contract labor and the justice of these laws is universally recognized. Laws have also been made to prevent the dumping of paupers and criminals upon our shores, and no one will dispute the wisdom of these laws. But for those who are not in the prohibited classes above mentioned, two general tests may be suggested. First, only those should be admitted who come because of love for our institutions and who will add to the nation's productive strength in time of peace and to its defensive strength in time of war. Second, only those should be admitted who come to cast their lot with the American people and who are capable of amalgamation with our people.

The Chinese do not comply with either condition. They do not come here because of their admiration for our form of government; they have no thought of becoming a part of our civilization, and amalgamation is desired neither by them nor by us. If the gates are opened to the Chinese they will drive our own laboring men into the streets, and they will not only be unfit for military

duty but by being the cause of race riots will be likely to involve us in international complications. We have already had some experience in this line and would have had more but for the exclusion act. Race prejudice is a social factor which must always be recognized and reckoned with. When there is a fair demand for labor, the Chinaman can slip in unnoticed, but whenever industrial depression lessens the demand for work, it will be difficult to prevent men who are hungry and idle from attacking foreigners, who work for lower wages, live on a lower scale, and are exempt from many of the burdens of government which rest upon citizens.

Home life, the center of all patriotic, purifying and civilizing influences, is almost entirely wanting among the Chinese who are temporarily abiding here. They huddle together in the cities and transplant upon American soil the vices of the Orient without accompanying virtues.

The *San Francisco Call*, speaking of Chinatown, says: "Gambling, lottery, slavery, are all there, mingled indistinguishably with the malign pus of Asiatic life, planted as an exotic in a western community."

The presence here of a race permanently separated from us by color, dress, customs and habits of thought, is a thing to be deplored. If there are only a few such, the evil can be tolerated like any other small evil, but without an exclusion act there is every reason to expect such an influx from the overcrowded provinces of China—an influx stimulated by the "Six Companies" and encouraged by corporations seeking cheap labor—as to compel prompt and rigorous restrictive measures. Prevention is better than cure. The dangers are real and will upon investigation be apparent to any one who takes a comprehensive view of his nation's welfare.

There has been a recent increase in the immigration of Japanese laborers for service along Western railroads. Many, though not all, of the objections urged against the Chinese apply to Japanese laborers, and there is no doubt that opposition will grow in proportion to the number that come. It has been intimated that the Japanese government is willing to remedy this—it will be satisfactory if it will—but whether the remedy is applied by diplomacy or by law, it is better to attend to the matter at once than to invite irritation and ill feeling by delay.

SCHLEY AND SAMPSON.

It is not a surprise to learn that Admiral Sampson has been advanced five points while Admiral Schley has been advanced only three points. Congress has also been asked to give a vote of thanks "to Admiral Sampson and the officers and men under him" for the battle of Santiago Bay. In the history of this country there have been many instances of favoritism, but in all of our history there have been none to compare with the favoritism shown to Sampson and the injustice sought to be put upon Schley. The battle of Santiago Bay was one of the greatest sea fights in the history of the world. Admiral Schley commanded in that battle and long ago the people learned the truth and accorded to him the title of "Hero of Santiago Bay." It is therefore not material that Sampson, through administration influence, has been advanced above Schley. This advancement may afford temporary gratification to the beneficiary, but it will not disturb the proud position which Admiral Schley holds in the affections of the American people. The injustice done Schley will merely serve to advance him in the estimation of the American people—an advancement which no presidential order and no act of Congress can in the least disturb.

THE PRESIDENT AN EMPEROR.

The Spooner amendment to the Army Appropriation Bill vests in the President power and authority which can be exercised only by an emperor. By voting down the amendments offered, the republicans placed themselves on record as in favor of the exercise of arbitrary and imperial power by the chief executive. No restrictions are placed upon him and no time limit is fixed to his rule. He is supreme; he can appoint whomsoever he pleases; he can vest legislative, judicial and executive power all in one person, and that person is under no obligation to observe the Constitution in dealing with Filipino subjects. And this is done in the name of liberty! This is the policy of a party which sprang into existence to apply the Declaration of Independence to men entirely

black! History presents no instance of a transformation so sudden and complete.

The amendment reads:

All military, civil and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippines, acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900, shall until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion.

Provided, that all franchises granted under the authority hereof shall contain a reservation of the right to alter, amend or repeal the same.

Until a permanent government shall have been established in said islands full reports shall be made to Congress on or before the first day of each regular session of all legislative acts and proceedings of the temporary government instituted under the provisions hereof and full reports of the acts and doings of said government and as to the condition of the archipelago and of its people shall be made to the President, including all information which may be useful to the Congress in providing a more permanent government.

Provided, that no sale or lease or other disposition of the public lands or the timber thereon, or the mining rights therein shall be made, and provided further that no franchise shall be granted which is not approved by the President of the United States and is not, in his judgment, clearly necessary for the immediate government of the islands and indispensable for the interest of the people thereof, and which cannot, without great public mischief, be postponed until the establishment of permanent civil government; and all such franchises shall terminate one year after the establishment of such permanent civil government.

The provisions in regard to franchises are of little value, because the President must rely upon the representations of appointees in the Philippines and their statement will be ex-parte. Only the men who want concessions will be heard—the Filipinos will have no voice in the matter.

What advantage is there in having the franchises terminate one year after a civil government is established, if that government is to be colonial in character and administered by foreigners?

If that provision has any influence at all, it will simply give a powerful group of concessionaires pecuniary interest in post-

poning the establishment of civil government. It may stimulate campaign contributions and lead to the establishment of a bureau in the United States for the dissemination of literature prejudicial to the Filipinos.

If the republican party is powerless to protect the people of the United States from monopoly, how can it be expected to protect the helpless inhabitants of remote islands?

In the campaign of 1900, the republicans strenuously denied that they had any imperialistic intentions and their denials deceived many, but here is proof that cannot be disputed. The President is an emperor, and will remain so until the republican party reverses its policy or until the people retire that party from power.

IS THIS ARISTOCRACY?

Read the following letters:

UNITED STATES TORPEDO STATION, NEWPORT, R. I., Feb. 13, 1901.
Admiral William T. Sampson, U. S. N.

DEAR SIR.—The new bill whereby six gunners are to be commissioned ensigns tempts me to write you, trusting you will pardon the liberty I take in so doing.

As I served on the flagship *New York* during your command of the fleet you will know whether my abilities, whatever they may be, are of such merit as to warrant me filling the position of ensign. I would say here that I never use tobacco or liquor in any form.

If in your estimation I am worthy of this position I should be most grateful to you if you will recommend me to the department. I am, very respectfully yours,
CHARLES MORGAN,
Gunner, U. S. N.

This was the indorsement which the admiral placed on the application:

NAVY YARD, BOSTON, MASS., Feb. 14.

Indorsement 1: Respectfully forwarded to the navy department for its consideration.

2. Mr. Morgan has good professional ability. He also has, which distinguishes him from most other warrant officers, a gentlemanly bearing. If he were to be commissioned as an ensign he would probably compare favorably, both professionally and in personal conduct and bearing, with other officers of that grade as far as his technical education would permit.

3. It is earnestly to be hoped, however, that the secretary of the navy will not find it necessary to take advantage of the authority which I understand is to be granted him to appoint a certain number of warrant officers to the grade of ensigns.

While it is true that these men are selected from a large class of men of very unusual ability, which distinguishes them as perhaps the professional equals of their officers as far as their technical education stands, it is also true that they are recruited from a class of men who have not had the social advantages which are requisite for a commissioned officer.

It is submitted that in time of peace the navy's function consists to a certain extent of representing the country abroad, and it is important that the navy's representatives should be men of at least refinement. While there is perhaps a certain few among the warrant officers who could fulfill this requirement, I am of the opinion that the vast majority of them could not.

Once they are commissioned they will have the same social standing as other officers, and no distinction properly could be made in extending general invitations. The consequences that would arise from their acceptance might not redound to the credit of the navy or the country which the navy represents.

I do not mean to detract from the sterling worth of the warrant officers of the navy. I merely mean to suggest to the department that, unfortunately for them, they have been deprived of certain natural advantages, and, in consequence, their proper place is that of leading men among the crew and not as representatives of the country in the ward room and steerage.

4. I request that this may be brought to the personal attention of the secretary of the navy.

W. T. SAMPSON,
Rear Admiral U. S. N., Commandant.

And when you have read them suppress your indignation long enough to ask yourself whether Admiral Sampson is a snob and an aristocrat, or whether he is merely a representative of the "new order of things" which is to follow militarism and imperialism. If this is only an individual opinion no condemnation can be too severe, but if he speaks for those who are dominating the administration and shaping our national policy, then the rebuke should be administered to the system. Gunner Morgan will prove a public benefactor if this correspondence opens the eyes of the American people to the fact that we cannot have imperialism, with its large army and navy, without accepting with it aristocracy in society and plutocracy in government.

If it is the aim of this nation to shine among the "world

powers," we will have to have titles and ranks and orders of nobility or our representatives will not feel at home abroad. Sampson's asininity can almost be forgiven if it aids in restoring that American simplicity and democracy which were once the pride of our nation.

WHERE TITLE RESTS.

Those who insist that our title to the Philippines is perfect base their opinion on the deed given us by Spain in the Paris treaty.

A republican newspaper, commenting at length upon our abstract of title, says:

Prior to the Paris treaty the record title was in Spain. Spain conveyed the Philippines to the United States and the record title is now with us. It is necessary that title rest somewhere, and the abstract will always locate it. In this instance the abstract locates the Philippine title in the United States of America.

Let us take a look at this position:

In the Paris treaty, Spain "ceded" to the United States the Philippine Islands and the Islands of Guam and Porto Rico. According to this republican organ that cession placed the title to that territory in the United States, for "it is necessary that title rest somewhere."

In the same treaty Spain "relinquished" its sovereignty over the island of Cuba.

Where did the title to Cuba rest?

It rested exactly where it belonged—with the sovereign people of Cuba; and the eminent lawyers who framed the Paris treaty knew that it was not necessary for Spain to convey title to Cuba, because the title rested in the Cuban people and the relinquishment was merely formal notice to the world that Spain recognized a fact.

Now if a simple relinquishment was sufficient in the case of Cuba, it was so because of the fact that regardless of what deeds might be executed, the title to Cuba rested with the Cuban people, Spain could have done nothing to effect that title.

If the title rested with the people of Cuba, then why did not the title to the Philippines rest with the people of those islands?

Had Spain ceded Cuba to the United States, the cession would

not have altered the fact that the title to Cuba rested with the Cuban people, and the cession of the Philippines by Spain to the United States does not alter the fact that the title to the Philippines rests with the Filipinos.

To be sure, a kingdom may hold title to a territory, so long as it maintains order. But although a government is the government of kings, "it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." This is not only an American principle; it is world wide, and the legality of a revolution depends upon its success.

Prior to the Spanish-American war, the people of Cuba and the people of the Philippines had taken up arms in defense of their liberty. Had our war with Great Britain been a failure, our own declaration of independence would have had no legal standing. But our rebellion against King George became a "revolution"—because we were successful; and it is generally agreed that our national era dates from our declaration of independence and not from the treaty which Great Britain made with us in declaring peace, and in conveying to our forefathers the territory for which they had fought.

So, long before the beginning of the Spanish-American war, the people of the Philippines and the people of Cuba had, by their own acts, laid the ground work for the record title to their native land. All that was necessary to make their declarations of independence the title deeds for the sovereign people of those territories was successful revolution against Spanish authority.

Were those revolutions successful? They were.

In the case of Cuba, the armies of the United States went to that island, and with the aid of the Cuban soldiery, swept the Spanish army to the sea. Spanish rule in Cuba was destroyed, and the Cubans' title to Cuba was complete.

In the case of the Philippines, the United States navy and army went to those islands, and with the active assistance and cooperation of the Filipinos destroyed Spanish rule. With the destruction of Spanish rule, the Filipinos' title to the Philippine Islands was complete.

In each instance the title dates back to a demand for, or a declaration of, independence.

That was the first link. The next was the government organized—on wheels, if you please—but organized, nevertheless, in both Cuba and the Philippines. The final link in the chain of title was the destruction of Spanish rule and the successful termination of the Revolution on the part of the Cuban and the Philippine people.

There is the chain of title; one that cannot be destroyed or broken, in conscience, whatever sophistry we may employ; one that cannot be questioned, in truth, whatever specious pleading we may adopt.

There is the title to Cuba resting in the Cuban people as firmly as our title rested in the colonist at the close of the war of the Revolution. There is the title to the Philippine Islands resting as firmly in the Filipinos as Cuba's title rests in the Cubans.

Our Commissioners did not dare to permit Spain to cede Cuba to the United States, because they knew that because the Cuban Revolution was successful Spain no longer had title to Cuba. And when Spain ceded the Philippine Islands to the United States Spain conveyed to this country nothing more than the title she possessed; and that title, such as it was, was destroyed the moment that the American forces and Aguinaldo's followers took possession of the City of Manila.

This republican newspaper in one respect is right. "It is necessary that title must rest somewhere, and the abstract will always locate it." In real estate transactions many deeds have been placed on record—deeds that are of no importance in determining title. Often these deeds are confusing, but the honest abstractor picks up his chain of title and follows it back in orderly lines, ignoring the inconsequential deeds in his search for the real title. So it is of no moment that there is on this record a quit claim deed from Spain to the United States with respect to the Philippine Islands. The chain of title leads directly to the people of the Philippines; and although there were a hundred deeds from a hundred kingdoms they would not affect the Filipino's title to the land of his nativity and to the soil which for a century has been baptized in the blood of Filipinos who have loved liberty enough to die for it.

THE FIFTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

The record of the Fifty-sixth Congress is completed, and it is not an enviable one. For extravagance it has never been equaled, and no previous congress has ever shown anything like the contempt for American principles and traditions. The republican party in 1896 promised international bimetallism and this Congress redeemed the promise by retiring the greenbacks and giving the country as large a dose of the gold standard as it thought the patient was able to bear.

It has fastened a large army upon the United States—an army larger than the President would have been willing to defend during the late campaign.

It has violated the solemn promise made to Cuba and demanded a supervision of Cuban affairs which amount to a denial of independence.

It has conferred upon the President authority over the Philippines as unlimited, as arbitrary and as tyrannical as George III ever exercised over the colonists.

In addition to its sins of commission it has sins of omission to answer for.

It has failed to respond to the demand of the wage-earners for relief in the way of shorter hours and it has neglected to abolish government by injunction.

It has refused to give the people any relief from extortionate railroad rates and has declined to enact anti-trust legislation, although a billion dollar trust was organized while it was in session.

It has repudiated the party's promise in regard to the inter-oceanic canal. For years the republicans advocated the Nicaragua canal; in 1900 they substituted an endorsement of an Isthmian canal, but the trans-continental railroad lines have sufficient influence with the republican party to prevent its carrying out any canal project.

It has failed to recognize the desire of the people for election of senators by a popular vote; and it would have committed the country to the infamous ship subsidy legislation but for the filibustering resorted to by the democrats, populists and silver republicans. A fifty million dollar River and Harbor bill was also defeated by a few filibusters led by Senator Carter of Montana.

This is the record—not all of it, but enough of it. These things are known to the reading public and yet republican farmers continue to vote the republican ticket, republican laboring men continue to defend their party and republican business men raise no protest against what is going on. Great corporate interests furnish campaign funds, dictate platforms, make nominations and dominate administrations. To what extreme can the republican leaders go before they provoke remonstrance and repudiation?

APPLIED CHRISTIANITY.

Dr. W. M. Hindman, of the First Presbyterian church of Lincoln, Neb., in a recent sermon on the Good Samaritan, drew a practical distinction between pity and sympathy. He said:

All believe in the Good Samaritan; all admire him for the sympathy he bore the unfortunate. His sympathy was more than sentiment; it was deeper than pity. Men of independence despise pity; they crave sympathy. He who pities feels for you; he who sympathizes feels with you. There is a vast difference between the two. The priest and Levite pitied, and passed by on the other side. The Samaritan sympathized and got down with the man in his suffering. He sacrificed his own comfort to make the needy comfortable; he suffered with the sufferer; he helped him out of his trouble.

Sympathy is applied Christianity; it is a fulfillment of the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

In the course of the sermon Dr. Hindman emphasized the fact that those who would help their fellow-men must go among them and share their burdens, and quoted the lines so often used as a rebuke to those pastors who never get within hailing distance of their flock.

A parish priest of austerity
 Climbed up in a high church steeple
 To be near to God, that he might hand
 God's word unto the people.

And in sermon script he daily wrote
 What he thought was sent from heaven,
 And he dropped it down on the people's head
 Two times, one day in seven.

In his time God said, "Come down and die,"
And he cried from out his steeple:
"Where art thou, Lord?" and the Lord replied,
"Down here among the people."

SHOULD BE ABOVE SUSPICION.

The position taken by Congressman Hull in regard to his investment in the Philippine Islands opens up a question which ought to receive serious consideration at the hands of the American people. He is chairman of the house committee on military affairs, and is also president of the Philippine Lumber and Development Company. As chairman of the committee, Mr. Hull had charge of the bill for the increase of the army; as president of the Philippine Lumber and Development Company he was interested in increasing the army for the protection of his Philippine investments. He confesses that the investment in the Philippines depended upon political conditions, for in explaining his connection with the company he said:

I will say further to the gentleman from Tennessee, and to this House, that while the campaign was on, the company with which I am associated called a halt in their enterprise and notified every one of the stockholders that if Bryan should be elected not one dollar would we invest in the Philippines, but if McKinley should be elected we would invest all the money that we pleased, believing it would have favorable return by the restoration of order and good government in the Philippines.

It will be remembered that the democratic party declared against a large army; the size of the army was, therefore, an issue in the campaign. The question arises, can Mr. Hull discharge his duty to the public and fairly and impartially do the work of a congressman and committeeman and at the same time look after investments in the Philippine Islands which are so intimately connected with the work of Mr. Hull's committee? The Credit-Mobilier scandal relegated a large number of congressmen to private life, and yet the connection between Mr. Hull, the chairman of the military committee, and Mr. Hull, the capitalist, is much closer than the connection between an ordinary congressman and the Credit-Mobilier.

Mr. Hull says if the time ever comes when he is not permitted to invest in a legitimate enterprise, he will leave politics. But would he have invested in this enterprise if he had been out of politics? He is president of the company, was there any reason for his selection other than his political prominence?

Mr. Hull is too intelligent a man not to see the impropriety of his position, and it indicates a very low standard of morality when his republican colleagues in the House defend his action.

When John Quincy Adams entered the House of Representatives he sold his bank stock in order that he might not be pecuniarily interested in legislation on that subject. The difference between Mr. Adams and Mr. Hull is obvious.

A few years ago a Senate committee investigated the charge that certain senators had speculated in sugar stock while the senate was considering the tariff on sugar, and everybody recognized that it was not legitimate. One senator explained that his son had speculated some without his knowledge, while another senator admitted a purchase of sugar stock but insisted that the servant girl sent a dispatch which he had written, but afterwards decided not to send. One senator only, Mr. Quay, of Pennsylvania, acknowledged and defended such transactions.

We now have a considerable number of men in official position who are directly and intimately connected with large corporations, and through these corporations are pecuniarily interested in the legislation which they have to pass upon. Is this fair to the public? The Express companies are interested in postal legislation because the post-office department is a competitor with them in the carrying of small packages and newspapers. Senator Platt of New York is connected with one of the great express companies; is he in position to protect the interests of the people at large on such a subject? Congress deals with interstate railroad rates and discriminations, besides having supervision over the compensation paid to railroads for carrying mail. Senator Depew is so closely connected with the railroad interests of the country that he cannot be expected to represent the people's side of any question in which the railroads are interested. Senator Depew, however, is only one of the railroad attorneys in congress; there are others.

How many senators and representatives have stock in the trusts

which are denounced by republican platforms and protected by republican representatives?

The officials whose names have been mentioned are not worse than some others, but they are the most conspicuous representatives of their class. They are not so much to blame as the people who elect them. Just as long as the voters are indifferent to public affairs, just so long will the officers and agents of great corporate interests enter public life, not for the purpose of advancing the interests of the people generally, but for the purpose of protecting or advancing their private interests. Just as long as voters are willing to forgive the offense, just so long will public officials sell their political influence to the syndicates and combinations which infest legislative halls and prey upon the public through special legislation. The public servant should be above suspicion, he should prize a clean record and a reputation for fidelity above dollars, but we cannot expect such public servants until the voters themselves are willing to punish betrayals of trust.

PROF. SHALER'S OPINION.

According to the *St. Louis Republic*, Prof. Shaler, a geologist of Harvard College, predicts such an increase in the production of gold as to lessen its purchasing power and compel a return to silver. He says:

If the price of gold goes down, another metal must be looked for as a token of international value. I think this metal will be silver, because silver is not found in alluvial plains, and because, owing to the difficulty in mining, it will never change in value.

Within the past few years men have come to realize that a large portion of the earth's surface is charged with gold. Gold is indissoluble, and when gravel banks are cut away it is not easily carried off by streams to the sea, as is the case with other metals. Instead, it is carried along, broken up into finer and finer fragments and gradually deposited over alluvial plains.

The new systems of mining which have recently been discovered will have produced by the middle of the present century an almost intolerable supply of gold. I cannot say definitely what the increase will be, but I should think at the least that the present supply will be quadrupled.

When the supply of gold becomes "intolerable," it will be interesting to watch the financiers shift over to the silver side of the question. Between 1850 and 1860, when the gold supply was increasing, the money changers were firm advocates of silver and they will be again if conditions become such as to make silver the scarcer metal. Bimetallists, however, still believe that the world can use to advantage all the precious metal, both gold and silver, that is likely to be discovered.

EXPLOITERS ON THE GROUND.

During the debate on the Philippine amendment, Senator Tillman called attention to a communication addressed by Judge Taft, of the Benevolent Assimilation Commission, to the secretary of war. The Judge asked that the message, if approved by the secretary, be transmitted "to proper senators and representatives." There is nothing to show how the "proper" senators and representatives were to be distinguished from the others, but he seems to have had confidence that Secretary Root would exercise discretion in the matter. In this remarkable message he said: "Until its passage (the Spooner amendment) no purely central civil government can be established, no public franchise of any kind granted, and no substantial investment of private capital in internal improvements possible."

Here we have the reason for the Spooner amendment. The franchise-grabbers were on hand and the private capital was waiting for a chance to begin internal improvements. What an opportunity for street car lines, water plants and lighting systems! When we see how these franchises have been given away in this country, where the people have a right to vote, we can imagine the liberty that will be allowed where the rulers are not restrained by the victims.

Judge Taft's remark recalls an interview given out by an imperialist before the treaty was signed. He was a foreign consul stationed at Manila and came to this country to help organize a syndicate for the development of the islands. He said that his syndicate would establish banks, lighting plants, water systems, street car lines, railroads, factories, etc., etc., and in his interview he explained that it was the "duty" of the United States

to hold the Philippine Islands permanently. In other words, he was satisfied that the United States ought to hold the Filipinos while his syndicate developed them. The opponents of a colonial policy have pointed out that the people would pay the expenses while the corporations would reap the profits. In the very beginning the opponents of imperialism asked: If this question is to be settled on the basis of dollars and cents, who will insure the nation that the receipts will equal the expenditures? Who will guarantee that the income from the Philippines, be it great or small, will find its way back to the pockets of the people, who, through taxation, will furnish the money?

But the Taft Commission goes on to say:

Sale of public lands and allowance of mining claims impossible until Spooner bill. Hundreds of American miners on ground awaiting law to perfect claims. More coming. Good element in pacification. Urgently recommend amendment Spooner bill so that its operation be not postponed until complete suppression of all insurrection, but only until in President's judgment civil government may be safely established.

So it seems that American miners are on hand ready to take charge of the minerals as soon as they can perfect their claims. Of course, as the President has frequently told us, our nation is not actuated by any sordid thought of gain in taking the Philippines; it is all a matter of "duty and destiny." But it is probably necessary to give away their franchises and their valuable mines in order to convince them that our interest in them is purely unselfish and benevolent.

The report of the Taft Commission shows that the islands contain "seventy-three million acres of land, of which less than five millions are held in private ownership, leaving in public lands over sixty-eight million acres." The most hide-bound partisan can have no reason to doubt the purpose of the administration to turn over the land of the Filipinos to capitalists and adventurers after reading the following from the Taft report:

It is thought that a system of laws of public lands can be inaugurated without waiting until the survey is completed. The commission has received a sufficient number of applications for the purchase of public lands to know that large amounts of American capital are only awaiting the opportunity to invest in the rich agricultural field which may here be developed. In view

of the decision that the military government has no power to part with the public land belonging to the United States, and that the power rests alone in Congress, it becomes very essential, to assist the development of these islands and their prosperity, that Congressional authority be vested in the government of the islands to adopt a proper public-land system, and to sell the land upon proper terms. There should, of course, be restrictions preventing the acquisition of too large quantities by any individual or corporation, but those restrictions should only be imposed after giving due weight to the circumstance that capital cannot be secured for the development of the islands unless the investment may be sufficiently great to justify the expenditure of large amounts for expensive machinery and equipments. Especially is this true in the cultivation of sugar land.

* * * * *

Restricted powers of a military government referred to in discussing the public lands are also painfully apparent in respect to mining claims and the organization of railroad, banking, and other corporations, and the granting of franchises generally. It is necessary that there be somebody or officer vested with legislative authority to pass laws which shall afford opportunity to capital to make investment here. This is the true and most lasting method of pacification.

This is military genius! It is all done for purpose of pacification! The Filipinos are now fighting for their homes and the land which they have occupied from time immemorial. Take away their land and they will have nothing left to defend! How simple the plan! Strange that it had not been thought of before!

Weyler starved the Cubans so that they had no strength left to fight with, but the Taft plan is much more effective because it leaves the Filipinos nothing to fight for.

Unless the conscience of the American people is seared there must be a revolt against the proposition to surrender our principles of government, our sense of justice and our ideas of public morality at the demand of the greedy and conscienceless syndicates which are hovering like vultures over the Philippine Islands.

IV.

A SAMPLE OF HARMONY.

It is fortunate for the democracy of the nation that at the very beginning of the fight that re-organizers furnish a sample of the harmony which they recommend to the party at large. St. Louis, the chief city of one of the great democratic states, is chosen as the theatre for the exhibition of this model reconciliation! A mayor is to be chosen who will hold office during the World's Fair, and certain men who did not **think it important** that the nation should have a democratic president are convinced that it is a matter of paramount importance that St. Louis should have a democratic mayor. Of course, it was thought necessary that so important an office at so important a time should be filled by a man of "eminent respectability," but it is strange that among the many thousands in St. Louis who are in the habit of voting the democratic ticket, not one could be found who measured up to the standard set by the re-organizers.

Mr. Rolla Wells, the gentleman who was nominated by the democratic city convention, renounced his allegiance to the democratic party in 1896, and resigned the presidency of the St. Louis Democratic club. He actively co-operated with the bolting contingent who supported the republican ticket that year, and in 1898 he openly opposed the democratic candidate for Congress in his district. In 1900 his influence was given to the republican national ticket, and he has not since that time returned to the democratic party, or announced his **acceptance** of democratic principles as set forth in the party platform.

The resolutions adopted by the local convention which nominated him include an endorsement of "the fundamental principles of democracy," but Mr. Wells, if elected, will be able to define and construe those principles to suit himself.

Mr. Wells is personally, no doubt, a good man. According to the *Republic*, Mr. Carpenter, of the National Lead Company, a republican, gives Mr. Wells a certificate of good character, and Mr. Walsh, of the Terminal Railroad Company, endorses the

certificate. Even the *Globe-Democrat* cannot withhold its testimony to his respectability.

It may be that the situation in St. Louis is such as to make it necessary to disregard party lines, but if such is the case, the candidate should run as a non-partisan or as an independent. Mr. Wells has been affectionately described by his friends as "a man who can win," but what if he can win? It would not be fair to hold the democratic party responsible for the administration of a man who, by his own act, severed himself from his party and repudiated its principles.

A party must have principles as well as an organization, and a national convention is the proper body to declare those principles. If, after a platform is adopted, any member cannot conscientiously support that platform, he has a perfect right to leave the party, and no one can justly criticise his action if he is honest with himself and with his party. But a man cannot be outside of a party and inside at the same time. Those who remain inside the party have rights as well as those who desert it. They have a right to insist that any one who leaves his party and opposes its platform and candidates shall return in some open and formal way before he can again consider himself a member. It is not enough that Mr. Wells condescends to accept a nomination and a chance of election to an important office; that is merely an acceptance of a benefit from a party which he repudiated and spurned. Before he is entitled to be called a democrat he must in some way manifest his willingness to accept the party creed. He may be willing to have the party accept his principles, but not willing to accept the party's principles. He may think it humiliating to return to the party, but is it not more humiliating for the party to surrender to him?

The democratic party showed in the campaign of 1900 that it was ready to welcome any returning democrat, and it is doubtless just as ready now to extend a welcome to those who opposed the ticket of 1900, provided they express a willingness to accept the principles of the party and give some evidence of their intention to support the party's candidates in the future. The prodigal son is always well treated when he sees the error of his ways and rejoins the family, but he ought not to demand a deed to the house as a condition precedent to his return.

The nomination of Mr. Wells may, in St. Louis, be attributed

to his private character or personal merits, but outside of St. Louis it is everywhere hailed as a triumph for the reactionary elements of the party.

The Louisville *Courier-Journal* says of it:

This action of the party in St. Louis (the democratic nomination of a "gold bug" for mayor) is evidence that the process of reunion is going on. It also shows how rapidly the silver issue is passing from public view in such an extreme democratic state as Missouri. It is a most auspicious indication of the decline in party strife and the return of the masses to the old leaders under whom it was led to victory in former years.

In the campaign of 1900 the democratic party stood for the Declaration of Independence and for industrial independence as well as for financial independence, and the democrats of St. Louis gave loyal support to the ticket. The republican party stood for an imperial policy and trust domination as well as for the gold standard, and Mr. Wells gave his influence to that party. The more prominent he was as a man and the more influence he had, the more valuable was his support to the republican ticket and the greater the loss to the democratic cause. If Mr. Wells has changed his views, let him publicly announce his conversion to democratic principles and his sins, though they may be many, will be forgiven. Of course, if the conversion did not occur until after he made up his mind to seek the nomination for mayor, some might doubt the sincerity of the change, but so far he has failed to give even that much comfort to the democrats.

If Mr. Wells has undergone no change of opinion, what reason is there to doubt that he will use the influence of his office to defeat democratic congressmen in 1902, as he used his individual influence to defeat democratic congressmen in 1896, 1898, and 1900? Is there any reason to believe that the environment which led him out of the democratic party has lost its controlling influence over him? If he is the same man that he was in 1896, 1898, and 1900, official position will simply increase his power to do harm and weaken the party in its effort to overthrow republican doctrines.

Mr. Wells' nomination is a part of the plan of the re-organizers—national in its extent—to capture the organization by stealth and then make the democratic so much like the republican party that there will be little choice between them.

The democratic party now stands for definite principles and it aggressively opposes republican policies. The Kansas City platform embodies the principles of the party, and the rank and file of the party are attached to those principles. Those who oppose the Kansas City platform will not make an open fight against it—even Mr. Wells would not have been willing to risk a nomination on a platform repudiating the Kansas City platform—but under the pretense that success can be won under the leadership of the re-organizers, men are being pushed forward for local offices who have no sympathy with democratic principles.

The election of 1894 gave some indication of the fate which awaits the party if it becomes the tool of organized greed and bids only for the favor of the plutocratic element of the country. Democrats cannot afford to lose sight of democratic principles in their eagerness to secure a local victory, which, when secured, is nominal rather than real.

BENJAMIN HARRISON.

The death of Benjamin Harrison, soldier, lawyer, orator, statesman and ex-president, removes one of the most conspicuous figures in American life. He ran the gamut of public office and everywhere met the expectations of those who gave him their support. He served in the Union army for three years during the civil war, beginning as a second lieutenant and finally winning the brevet of brigadier general.

He was a lawyer of great learning and experience, one of the ablest of those who have occupied the White House.

As an orator, he deserves a place among the best of his generation. His numerous speeches during his presidential term showed a wide range of knowledge and great felicity of expression.

In the senate and as chief executive he displayed rare qualities of statesmanship and retired from office universally respected.

He was a strict partisan while in office, but his uprightness and official integrity were always conceded by his political opponents.

After his retirement from the presidency, he returned to the practice of law, adding to his professional income by lectures and magazine articles.

After the Spanish war, he gave expression to his belief that the Filipinos were entitled to independence, and insisted that the honor of the nation required that the promise made to Cuba be kept. While he supported the republican ticket in the last campaign, he could not conscientiously make speeches in support of the Philippine policy of the administration, and after the election he on several occasions stated his views with great force and clearness.

His reverence for American principles and for the traditions of the nation led him to sympathize with the Boers in their unequal struggle for liberty, and his last words showed that the fate of the South African Republic was a matter of deep concern to him. The *Cincinnati Enquirer* thus describes his closing hours:

On the night preceding the sudden attack of illness, Mr. and Mrs. Harrison called on A. L. Mason, and incidentally the conversation turned to questions of national import, concerning which Mr. Harrison spoke with unusual freedom. During his talk he particularly laid stress upon the independence of Cuba, saying that America was pledged to bring this about. He also expressed himself with reference to trusts, mournfully dropping the remark, "It looks as if force and greed rule the world." * * *

In his semi-conscious condition when the sentinels of discretion and propriety had gone from their posts, and the mind of the man was wandering, he began to speak of the Boers and their hopeless struggle for national life. His voice was weak and trembling, his thoughts were not connected, but the listeners bending over him could hear words of pity for the dying farmer republic.

AN IMPOTENT REMEDY.

President Hadley, of Yale College, in a recent speech at Boston, renewed a recommendation which he made some months ago to the effect that there should be a public opinion which would drive the trusts out of existence regardless of statutes. The earlier dispatches quoted him as saying that we would have an empire here within twenty-five years unless something was done to destroy the trusts, but he has since denied making any such prophecy. The mere fact that so prominent an educator recognizes the menace of private monopolies is both significant and encouraging, but the remedy which he suggests is an impotent

one. Public opinion is necessary, first, to enact, and second, to enforce law, but public opinion alone will never give the public protection from the trusts.

It would not be safe to keep horses if public opinion was the only protection society had against horse stealing. A man is influenced by the public opinion with which he comes into contact and the horse thief does not associate with those who have conscientious scruples against larceny; neither does the trust magnate associate with those who object to trusts. It will be a long time before the opinion of an ordinary mortal or, for that matter, of all the ordinary mortals, has any influence upon the man who can make a fortune in a year by preying upon those ordinary mortals.

Mr. Rockefeller would be indifferent to a petition signed by ninety-nine per cent. of the people asking him to lower the price of oil (even at the risk of decreasing his donations to colleges), but he would heed a law made and executed by a majority of the people.

All credit to President Hadley for his effort to create a public opinion against trusts, but that public opinion must be crystallized into punitive statutes before it will check the trust evil.

\$6 REWARD.

Ex-President Cleveland has written another letter—this time to the Crescent Democratic Club of Baltimore—in which he gives expression to his yearning desire to have the democratic party “return” to what he regards as true democracy and correct principles. If this was his first utterance of the kind it might be attributed to a transitory impulse, but he has said the same thing so often as to indicate that a fixed and constant longing possesses him. The letter reads:

MY DEAR SIR.—Your invitation to attend a meeting of the Crescent Democratic Club in celebration of its twenty-ninth anniversary reaches me as I am leaving home for so long an absence, that it will prevent my participation in this interesting work.

All the political signs of the times indicate most impressively the necessity of increased activity and aggressiveness in the ranks

of Democracy. There were days when Democratic principles, advocated in Democratic fashion, gave guarantee of Democratic supremacy—or at least strength and influence in our nation's councils.

Why should there not be a return of those days?

The answer to this question is not found in less applicability than formerly of Democratic doctrine to present conditions. On the contrary, there never was a time when they were more needed to cure evils which afflict our body politic, and there never was a time when our countrymen would be more willing to accept Democracy as they once knew it as a safeguard against existing and threatened ills.

I am convinced, however, that if our party is to gain its old prestige, and become again a strong and vigorous organization, feared by its enemies and inspiring the active devotion of its rank and file, it must first, of all things, itself become truly, honestly and consistently democratic.

Yours very truly,
GROVER CLEVELAND.

PRINCETON, N. J.

His advice is so general and indefinite as to be utterly useless. All democrats believe that democratic principles should be applied to present problems, but as the Kansas City platform applies democratic principles to present problems, why use the words "return" and "old"? Mr. Cleveland and his political associates are long on ambiguous and high sounding phrases, but short on definitions; they are oracular only in the sense that their words can be construed to mean anything or nothing.

If Mr. Cleveland's recent admonition had been spoken instead of written, it might have been explained by a wink or by a gesture suggesting that he himself was the embodiment of the principles to which the party should return, but when the words appear in cold type they require a key.

The President has twice referred to the "rank and file" recently, as if he would associate himself with those who are accused of separating the common people from the uncommon ones. Since THE COMMONER circulates almost exclusively among "the rank and file," it seems proper that this paper should give the distinguished ex-Democrat an opportunity to suggest plans and specifications for a democratic structure which would be commodious enough to afford a place of refuge for him and at the same time allow standing room for real democrats.

A reward, therefore, of five dollars is offered for a written

statement, not to exceed five hundred words, signed by Mr. Cleveland, applying democratic principles, as he understands them, to at least five of the questions now before the country. The offer is open to him or to any one who can secure such a statement from him. If the statement does not cover five questions, a proportionate reward of one dollar will be given for each question covered.

An additional reward of one dollar will be given for a written statement, signed by Mr. Cleveland, explaining why he considered his opinion on public questions as of no importance during the recent campaign, but regards such opinion as important now. When the battle was on between a republic and an empire—between a democracy and a plutocracy—between bimetallism and monometallism—he refused to say a word or lift a hand in behalf of “the rank and file” for whom he now expresses such an affectionate solicitude. He knew that a republican victory meant an endorsement of an imperial policy, with its wars of conquest; he knew that it meant trust domination and the reign of monopoly, as well as a commendation of a financial policy never approved by a democratic national convention, and yet he remained silent. As soon as the election was over, he came forth from his seclusion and made the air vocal with his suggestions.

Assuming to be inspired by a purer democracy and boasting of a superior virtue, he began to offer unsolicited advice to the party to which he once belonged. He is like the soldier who was described as “invisible in war and invincible in peace.” To desertion of the party organization and betrayal of the principles of the party, he adds ostentatious pretence of interest in the plain people, while he conceals his ideas in ponderous and platitudinous phrases. If he will clearly and candidly define the democratic principles about which he is so prone to talk, the people can decide for themselves whether he is the same Mr. Cleveland who turned the treasury over to a foreign financial syndicate and intrusted J. Pierpont Morgan with the combination of the government vaults, and then supported the republican ticket because his administration was not endorsed—the same Mr. Cleveland who denounced trusts in his messages but failed to enforce the law against them—the same Mr. Cleveland who condemned imperialism and then gave passive support to an imperialistic president, or whether he has repented of his folly and is ready to accept the democratic creed.

A GOOD AMENDMENT.

Judge Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, in a recent address, called attention to a defect in the jury system, viz., the requirement of a unanimous verdict. While in criminal cases the rule which gives the prisoner the benefit of a reasonable doubt makes it necessary to preserve the unanimous verdict, there is no reason for adhering to it in civil cases. California and Kentucky have already secured this reform, and it has been discussed in other states. Under the present requirement, a jury often reports to the judge that it cannot agree, and is sent back with the instruction to remain in the jury room until an agreement is reached. In such cases it is little more than a test of endurance. The law should be amended so that two-thirds or three-fourths of a jury may render a verdict.

The *New York World*, in discussing the question, says that up to the time of Edward III. the English jury consisted of fifteen, eighteen or twenty, and that twelve were required to agree in a verdict. The unanimous verdict, it seems, is an innovation, and it has not been justified by experience.

THE CANAL TREATY.

The Nicaragua canal treaty has been rejected by Great Britain. While several minor reasons are advanced for the rejection, Great Britain's refusal to give sanction to this agreement is largely based on the amendment similar to the one so vigorously urged by the late Senator Cushman K. Davis, which provided that the United States would have the right to "defend" the canal, or to fortify it during the time of war. This action disposes of this question until the next session of Congress, unless, in the meantime, Secretary Hay shall conclude to frame another proposed treaty in the interests of Great Britain.

But the question is likely to be a full-fledged one at the next session of Congress. Senator Morgan, of Alabama, commenting on Great Britain's rejection of the proposed treaty, unquestionably voices the American sentiment when he says: "We shall proceed quietly to construct, own and control the canal, and Great Britain will be left to make her objections in such form as she may

choose." Senator Morgan refers to the compact made between the United States and the republics of Nicaragua and Costa Rica, in December, 1900. He points out that that compact gave the United States canal rights, and was made "deliberately and with full knowledge that it was in diametric opposition to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty." Senator Morgan says:

Great Britain and the United States had agreed to the same declarations in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and, in conformity therewith, had agreed to silence any objections that might arise out of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty to the exclusive ownership and control of the Nicaragua canal by the United States.

Great Britain did not urge any objections, but referred to them as being possible only, and consented to remove them. Her honorable course at that time may not continue to animate her conduct under the reign of King Edward, but she must be aware that a covert threat of displeasure at our executing our agreements with Costa Rica and Nicaragua will lose its moral force and its power to alarm the United States into a fit of paralysis. Those agreements, upon which the whole question of the canal now hinges, will be carried out, in harmony with the undivided sentiment of the American people.

If the conclusion that Great Britain is alleged to have reached had been notified to the Senate ten days ago, the Hepburn bill would now be the law of the land. All delay is to the advantage of Great Britain and to our terrible disadvantage, but she has gained another year on us. I hope it will be the last. We contemplate no breach of the peace or of good feeling, because we shall do, under our agreement with Costa Rica and Nicaragua, what we have agreed to do, as those agreements are in line with the treaty of Constantinople, to which all Europe assents.

The President has taken his stand on this question and the true American doctrine is announced in our agreements with the two American republics. It is not conceivable that the President or the people will abandon what has been thus established.

COMMISSIONER GRAY'S PROTEST.

The injunction of secrecy has lately been removed from senate document 148 (56th Congress, 2d session,) and the public have been permitted to review the correspondence which took place between the administration and the Peace Commissioners during the negotiation of the Paris treaty. The report is so lengthy that it cannot be given in full, but the readers of THE COMMONER

can doubtless secure it from their senators or members of Congress. A perusal of the instructions of the President and the opinions of the various commissioners will reveal the fact that the President and the President alone was responsible for the treaty. Not only was he responsible for the treaty, but he assumed the responsibility with a full knowledge that he was violating American principles and the government's promises.

On page thirty-four of the report will be found a remarkable communication in the nature of a protest, cabled from Paris by Hon. George Gray, a member of the commission. Whether the present trend toward empire and conquest continues until our form of government is changed, or whether the people bestir themselves and rescue the nation from its perilous course, the words of warning uttered by Mr. Gray merit attention and commendation. After reading this communication from one of his own appointees, the President could not excuse himself by saying that he sinned without light.

Mr. Gray's cablegram reads as follows:

(3) The undersigned cannot agree that it is wise to take Philippine Islands in whole or in part. To do so would be to reverse accepted continental policy of the country, declared and acted upon throughout our history. Propinquity governs the case of Cuba and Porto Rico. Policy proposed introduces us into European politics and the entangling alliances against which Washington and all American statesmen have protested. It will make necessary a navy equal to the largest of powers; a greatly increased military establishment; immense sums for fortification and harbors: multiply occasions for dangerous complications with foreign nations, and increase burdens with taxation. Will receive in compensation no outlet for American labor in labor market already overcrowded and cheap; no area for homes for American citizens; climate and social condition demoralizing to character of American youth; new and disturbing questions introduced into our politics; church question menacing. On whole, instead of indemnity—injury.

The undersigned cannot agree that any obligation incurred to insurgents is paramount to our own manifest interests. Attacked Manila as part of legitimate war against Spain. If we had captured Cadiz and Carlists had helped us, would not owe duty to stay by them at the conclusion of war. On the contrary, interests and duty would require us to abandon both Manila and Cadiz. No place for colonial administration or government of subject people in American system. So much from standpoint

of interest; but even conceding all benefits claimed for annexation, we thereby abandon the infinitely greater benefit to accrue from acting the part of a great, powerful, Christian nation; we exchange the moral grandeur and strength to be gained by keeping our word to nations of the world and by exhibiting a magnanimity and moderation in the hour of victory that becomes the advanced civilization we claim, for doubtful material advantages and shameful stepping down from high moral position boastfully assumed. We should set example in these respects, not follow in the selfish and vulgar greed for territory which Europe has inherited from medieval times. Our declaration of war upon Spain was accompanied by a solemn and deliberate definition of our purpose. Now that we have achieved all and more than our object, let us simply keep our word. Third article of the protocol leaves everything concerning the control of the Philippine Islands to negotiation between the parties.

It is now absurd to say that we will not negotiate but will appropriate the whole subject-matter of negotiation. At the very least let us adhere to the President's instructions and if conditions require the keeping of Luzon forego the material advantages claimed in annexing other islands. Above all let us not make a mockery of the injunction contained in those instructions, where, after stating that we took up arms only in obedience to the dictates of humanity and in the fulfillment of high public and moral obligations, and that we had no design of aggrandizement and no ambition of conquest, the President among other things eloquently says:

"It is my earnest wish that the United States in making peace should follow the same high rule of conduct which guided it in facing war. It should be as scrupulous and magnanimous in the concluding settlement as it was just and humane in its original action."

This and more, of which I earnestly ask a re-perusal, binds my conscience and governs my action.

Wednesday, 12:30, night.

GEORGE GRAY.

AMENDMENT BY CONVENTION.

Article V of the Federal Constitution provides: "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several

states, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress.”

The above mentioned provision makes it possible for the states to take the initiative in securing an amendment to the Constitution and is another illustration of the foresight of the early statesmen. For nearly ten years the people have been trying to secure an amendment providing for the election of senators by a direct vote of the people. In the Fifty-second, Fifty-third, and Fifty-sixth Congresses the necessary resolution passed the House of Representatives but died in the Senate.

Not only did the resolution pass the House, but it passed each time by more than two-thirds vote.

Among the people there is practically no opposition to this reform, but the senate deliberately refuses to permit this change and defies public sentiment. The time has come for securing the amendment in spite of the senate's opposition. The voters, irrespective of party, should demand of the state legislatures such action as will result in compelling Congress to call a convention. When two-thirds of the states present their demand in a formal manner, the senate will yield and the victory will be complete. Now is the time for action. When United States senators are elected by the people, and therefore, directly responsible to them, it will be easier to secure any reform which the people desire.

THE PRESIDENT'S GROWING POWERS.

A writer in the *Forum*, discussing the growing power of the President, shows that aside from the offices in War and Navy departments, the President has patronage at his disposal as follows:

State Department—	
318 Consular and Diplomatic appointments.....	\$1,000,000
Treasury Department—	
743 Customs, Revenue, Marine hospital, etc.....	617,355
Post-Office Department—	
4,015 Postmasters	6,931,000
Interior Department—	
747 Pension officials, land-office agents, etc.....	1,997,640
Department of Justice—	
Judges, attorneys, marshals, etc.....	1,126,000
Total	<u>\$11,671,995</u>

It is estimated that, including all departments, the President is, as the *Chicago Times-Herald* says, "able to divert into the pockets of his supporters annually the sum of \$20,000,000, a total distribution of \$80,000,000, during his term of office." The *Times-Herald* declares that "there is much apprehension among the students of our political system concerning these growing powers of the President." This republican newspaper says:

In adjusting some of the problems growing out of the recent war we have seen Congress practically abdicate in favor of the President. The framers of the Constitution rightly appreciated that in a republic the popular branch of the government must be paramount. We have recently seen the President become the autocratic ruler of hundreds of thousands of people in Cuba and of millions of people in the Philippines. He has appointed and removed officials without asking the consent of the Senate. The laws promulgated by the Taft Commission in the Philippines declare that they were enacted "by the authority of the President of the United States"—not of Congress.

And then the *Times-Herald* concludes that "the only remedy appears to be through the extension and enforcement of the merit system." This is, indeed, a profound suggestion. A more sensible one, however, would be that we restore the machinery of our national government to its proper order; that the law-making and war-declaring power be exercised exclusively by the congress; that the President resume his constitutional place as an executive, content with being the beloved magistrate of a nation of freemen, rather than the autocratic ruler of peoples who have never consented to United States government.

POLITICS IN MEXICO.

Those who have watched the progress of Mexico during the last twenty-five years will earnestly hope for the recovery of President Diaz, about whose sickness such contradictory reports have been circulated. He has shown wonderful executive ability and under his administration great improvement has been noticeable in every direction. Education has become more general among the people; the army has been largely reduced—the number of commissioned officers as well as the number of privates; business

has prospered; human life and property rights have been made more secure, and the nation has constantly advanced in the opinion of the outside world. The Americans residing in Mexico have found in the president a just and faithful friend, and his death would cause universal sorrow.

There is, however, no reason to predict, as some have done, disorder or revolution in case of his demise. Mexico has many able men. They are not well known abroad because the extraordinary merit of Diaz has overshadowed them, but they are men of education and executive experience.

General Reyes, who is often mentioned as "the next president," was for some time governor of Nuevo Leon, one of the larger states of the republic, and is now a member of the cabinet. At Monterey, the capital of his state, there is a considerable colony of Americans, and General Reyes speaks our language fluently. He is a man of extended learning, courage and capacity.

Mr. Limenteur, the present secretary of finance, has also been mentioned as a possible successor to Diaz. He is of French descent and speaks that language in addition to Spanish and English. His management of the nation's finances has been very satisfactory and he is quite popular.

Whether the neighbor to the south of us is fortunate enough to retain the services of the present chief executive or is, by his death compelled to choose a new president, there is every reason to believe that she has reached a point where she can count upon an indefinite continuation of her present period of development.

The Republic of Mexico is closely bound to us by political interests as well as by location, and her welfare must always be a matter of deep concern to our people.

ON DANGEROUS GROUND.

Hon. David B. Hill, like ex-President Cleveland, was invited to the dinner given a short time ago by the Crescent Democratic Club of Baltimore, and like Mr. Cleveland he sent his regrets. The letter which he wrote for that occasion contains several sentences which indicate that Mr. Hill is on dangerous ground. He seems to confess the criticisms made against the democratic party by the republicans and by the democrats who opposed the ticket.

He says "Labor and capital should be equally respected, but neither should be unnecessarily assailed." The democratic party has never been accused of assailing labor, but it is a favorite pastime with the republicans to accuse it of assailing capital. The democratic party distinguishes between legitimate accumulations and predatory wealth, but whenever predatory wealth is attacked it tries to shield itself behind honest capital.

Mr. Hill says "Opposition to dangerous corporate combinations should not be allowed to degenerate into indiscriminate attacks upon chartered rights." That is almost identical with the language used by the republicans in defending the trusts. They are always careful to assure the public that they condemn "hurtful," "injurious" and "dangerous" combinations, but they are solicitous about vested rights and are fearful lest the attacks may be "indiscriminate." The language used by Mr. Hill is generally employed by those who have no remedy to propose for the trusts, but oppose any remedy suggested.

But he gets even nearer to the republican line, if possible, when he says, "The people want a safe and conservative administration of public affairs." That is just exactly what the republicans always promise. "Safe and conservative"—everybody wants a safe administration and conservatism is an almost universal trait. But the republicans prate so much about "safety" and "conservatism" that a democrat ought not to use the terms without explaining what he means by them. An administration that would be "safe" for the monopolies would not be satisfactory to those who are the victims of every private monopoly, and an administration so conservative that it would not undo anything that the republican party has done would be no better than a republican administration.

Mr. Hill adds: "There must be no question of our intention to fearlessly maintain the national credit under any and all circumstances." As the democratic party has never attacked the national credit that advice is gratuitous unless Mr. Hill means to condemn the Chicago and Kansas City platforms; and if such is his intention, he ought to make the attack openly and boldly.

In another part of the letter he says, "We should conciliate rather than antagonize the great business interests of the country." How is this conciliation to be accomplished? The policies advocated by the democratic party are as good for the ordinary business man

as they are for the laboring man or the farmer, but the great railroad interests are opposed to the democratic party because the party opposes extortionate rates, rebates and discriminations; because it opposes watered stock and fictitious capitalization. It cannot conciliate these interests without abandoning the people generally. The great banking interests of the country are against the democratic party because the democratic party is not willing to turn seventy-five millions of people over to the tender mercies of a few financiers. It cannot conciliate these interests and at the same time protect the rights of the wealth producer. The great manufacturing interests want a protective tariff and the great trust interests want to be let alone. Mr. Hill says that the great business interests can easily be conciliated "without the surrender of a single essential party principle." It is to be hoped that he will at an early day give the party the benefit of his definition of "essential" party principles.

Mr. Wells of St. Louis was nominated for mayor to please the "business interests"—they would not be satisfied with a candidate who had voted the democratic ticket or who was willing to admit that he believed in democratic principles. Shall we teach them democratic principles or at their demand abandon democratic principles?

Mr. Hill is so skillful in the use of words that he should have no difficulty in making his meaning plain. It is not necessary for him to borrow republican phraseology. He owes it to the party to give expression to his views in clear and unambiguous language. If he joins with Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Whitney et al. in their effort to republicanize the democratic party he will be a tower of strength to their side. If he intends to cast in his lot with the six millions and more who kept the faith in 1896 and 1900 he should avoid the verbiage that republicans and gold democrats have employed to conceal their sinister purposes.

V.

HARRISON'S LAST WORDS.

The March number of the *North American Review* contains an article from the pen of the late Benjamin Harrison. Having been written so shortly before his death, and dealing with public questions of the first importance, this article will probably be remembered as his last public utterance. It is fortunate for his memory and for the country that it presents sentiments so truly American and so thoroughly consistent with international morality, as well as with our nation's traditions. The following extract presents a glimpse of his argument, but it deserves perusal entire.

Mr. James Brice recently said:

"Indeed the struggles for liberty and nationality are almost beginning to be forgotten by the new generation, which has no such enthusiasm for these principles as men had forty years ago."

And the moment when two republics are in articulo mortis, some of our journals congratulate us over the prospect of an increased trade with the "Crown Colonies" that are to be set up in their stead and over the increased output of the Johannesburg mines. The emperor of Germany is reported to have forestalled President Kruger's personal appeal by the statement that Germany's interests would be promoted by the British conquest of the republics. And Bishop Thoburn asks: "Why should people lament the absorption of the small powers by the large ones?"

Never before has American sympathy failed, or been divided, or failed to find its voice, when a people were fighting for independence. Can we now calculate commercial gains before the breath of a dying republic has quite failed or the body has quite taken on the rigor mortis? If international justice, government by the people, the party of the nations, have ceased to be workable things and have become impracticable, shall we part with them with a sneer or simulate regret, even if we have lost the power to feel it? May not one be allowed to contemplate the heavens with suppressed aspirations, though there are no "consumers" there? Do we need to make a mock of the stars because we cannot appropriate them—because they do not take our produce? Have we deceived ourselves?

* * * * *

There was plainly no call for an armed intervention by the

United States in South Africa, and perhaps our diplomatic suggestions went as far as usage would justify. But has not public opinion here been somehow strongly perverted or put under some unwonted repression? If we have lost either the right to denounce aggression or the capacity to weep when a republic dies it is a grievous loss.

JUSTICE TO THE POPULISTS.

The populist party, ridiculed by the republicans and denounced by the gold democrats, has really been a great educator. It is an historical fact that many political organizations have been influential in moulding public opinion, even though they have never secured control of the federal government. The populists have never had at any time more than a score of members of Congress, and yet they have given an impetus to several reforms which must ultimately be accomplished.

For years the democrats preached tariff reform in states like Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado and the Dakotas, but they seemed to make little progress because republican prejudice was a barrier to democratic doctrines. The populists did not denounce a protective tariff in their platform, but in attacking the republican party they weakened the protective sentiment among their members and to-day tariff reform is much stronger in the west than it would have been without the assistance of populism. The Wilson Bill, the only tariff reform measure enacted since the war, could not have passed without the aid of populist votes in the senate.

The first national platform written by the populists demanded the election of United States senators by a direct vote of the people. That was before the matter received serious attention in Congress, but since then the House of Representatives has three times adopted a resolution proposing the necessary amendment. In 1900 the democratic platform endorsed this reform and it is now receiving the support of many prominent papers which until recently have been silent upon the subject or opposed to the change.

The populist party is an advocate of the system known as the initiative and referendum, whereby the people can compel the submission of important questions and pass upon the acts of legislatures. This reform has been endorsed by many democratic state conventions and was last year approved by the national convention

of the party. South Dakota, at the 1898 election, adopted an amendment providing for the initiative and referendum, in spite of the fact that the republicans carried the state by a considerable majority. Even more recently, a republican legislature in Oregon has given its endorsement to direct legislation.

The republican governor of Wisconsin is urging the adoption of a system abolishing political conventions and providing for party nominations by a direct vote of the people—a system entirely in keeping with the contentions of the populist party.

Prior to the organization of the populist party, comparatively few men advocated the municipal ownership of public utilities, and yet to-day business men in every part of the United States are openly defending this policy. Whenever the question has been submitted to the voters a large majority has generally been polled in favor of this reform, once denounced as populist but now regarded as prudent business policy for a community.

The populists favor a postal telegraph system operated in connection with the post-office department; this reform has already been recommended by one republican postmaster general, Mr. Wanamaker, and the matter is now being investigated by an industrial commission.

The populists, while holding to their belief in the government ownership of railroads, have given their influence to all legislation which tended toward the regulation of railroads or the securing of reasonable rates.

On the money question the populist party has done a great deal of educational work. It has steadfastly defended the greenback against the attacks of the national banking interests and has insisted that the right to issue money is a sovereign function of government which cannot safely be delegated to private individuals or corporations. The democratic party has in two conventions supported this doctrine, although differing from the populists on the subject of redeemability. The democrats advocate a legal tender greenback, issued by the government, redeemable in coin, the government to exercise the option as to which coin, while the populists believe in an irredeemable greenback. This difference, however, has not prevented the democrats and populists from acting together to save the greenback from annihilation.

The populists believe in the quantitative theory of money and favor bimetallism because it would give more money than mono-

metallism. While the democrats in the Senate and House of Representatives had for twenty years been voting for free coinage at sixteen to one, the populists were the first to name the ratio in a national platform. The unexpected and unpromised increase in the supply of gold, while it has tended to lessen the immediate importance of the money question, has vindicated the quantitative theory which is advocated by democrats and populists but was until recently denied by republicans.

The populists, as might be expected, oppose imperialism and trusts. They also unite with the democrats in favoring arbitration and condemning government by injunction and the blacklist.

No one who understands the history of the last ten years can doubt the influence which the populist party has exerted upon public affairs. It has been a great educational factor and the democratic party has strengthened rather than weakened itself by endorsing a number of propositions which are called "populistic." To repudiate our populist allies and surrender to the corporate influences which now dominate the republican party would be as impolitic as it would be unpatriotic. The democratic party has no reason for existence except to champion the cause of the people. It must stand ready to co-operate with those who are fighting organized greed, for to refuse such co-operation is to give aid and comfort to the common enemy.

JACKSON VS. IMPERIALISM.

Congressman Gaines, of Tennessee, who represents the Hermitage district, has had printed in the *Congressional Record* a letter in which he presents evidence to show that Jackson was not an imperialist. The quotations given by Mr. Gaines prove that the hero of New Orleans specifically repudiated the doctrines which the republicans now advocate. The following is taken from the letter:

To the Editor of the American:

The republican speakers throughout the country, by way of justification of the injustice done the Porto Ricans, say that the laws recently passed to govern Porto Rico are exactly alike or similar to the laws passed in 1821 by Congress for the govern-

ment of Florida until "the first session of the next Congress," and that Andrew Jackson, as governor of Florida, enforced these laws. I deny that the laws are even remotely identical, but even if it were true, we nevertheless find Andrew Jackson refusing to enforce the Florida statute except for a few months (June to October), and after setting up the government under this law as best he could, he resigned and returned home (in October, 1821), and in severe and unmistakable language condemned the law. Here are his words:

"I am clothed with powers which no one in a republic ought to possess, and which, I trust, will never be again given to any man. Nothing will give more happiness than to learn that Congress in its wisdom shall have distributed them properly and in such a manner as is consonant to our earliest and deepest convictions." (Frost's History of Jackson, and Monument to Jackson.)

At another time he said: "I hope that no living man shall ever in the future be clothed with such extraordinary authority." (State Papers, p. 100, Seventeenth Congress.)

How can any one conceive of language more severely condemnatory of the un-republican law that conferred such imperial power.

The Statesman's Manual, volume 1, says: "Jackson took possession of Florida in August, 1821, and remained but a few months, for, disliking the situation and disapproving the extent of power invested in him as governor, he resigned the office and again retired to Tennessee."

What Jackson then condemned, McKinley now endorses. He condemned both the policy and the law under which he acted, even although it was a temporary law and a temporary policy, and the people made him President and continue to honor his memory. McKinley now upholds this policy and law, and demands that we make both the policy and law permanent for the control of our new imperial possessions, because he has determined to hold them permanently, thus making this policy and law necessarily continuous, since he does not propose to make them into states nor the inhabitants into citizens of the United States, nor to acknowledge that the Constitution of the United States applies to them, but must go there, if at all, "by statute as a statute," repealable at any time. And yet he asks the American people to uphold what Jackson condemned and declined to uphold, and for that reason make him again President, and thus make him and his successors, if he ever has any, the imperial rulers of 11,000,000 inhabitants who can claim no rights nor benefits under the Constitution.

The Florida territory contained about 10,000 inhabitants, white and black, and our treaty acquiring them made them citizens, if they so elected, gave the immediate right of future statehood and the protection of the Constitution, now no longer doubted to apply to the territories, as the Supreme Court of the United

States has held in many opinions, while the President and his party propose to hold them indefinitely, and perhaps perpetually, outside the protection of the Constitution, without ever intending to make states of the territory or citizens of the people.

A few days before he resigned and came home from Florida, General Jackson, in a public letter addressed, not to serfs, colonists or dependents, but "to the citizens of Florida," said:

"They (the secretaries of east and west Florida) are charged faithfully to protect and maintain all the citizens and inhabitants of whatsoever description, in the said provinces in the peaceful enjoyment of their rights, privileges and immunities secured to them under the treaty with Spain and under the Constitution of the United States, so far as the same is applicable."

The republicans say that the Constitution does not extend to our new possessions, but only to the states, thus threatening Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma with imperialism; whereas Jackson held that the Constitution applied to the territories, and that, too, at an early day, when the courts had not fully construed or settled that question, now declared no longer to be an "open question" by the Supreme Court of the United States, composed of both republicans and democrats.

"CONQUEST," SAID THE PRESIDENT.

In the correspondence concerning the Paris treaty, referred to in a former issue, will be found some interesting telegrams which passed between the commission and the state department discussing the theory to be advanced for the holding of the Philippine Islands. Mr. Day, speaking for a majority of the members of the commission, cabled the President on November 3, 1898, saying that the demand for the Philippine Islands could not be based on conquest. The following is the message:

UNITED STATES PEACE COMMISSION, PARIS, November 3, 1898—
10 a. m. (For the President.—Special.)

After a careful examination of the authorities, the majority of the commission are clearly of opinion that our demand for the Philippine Islands cannot be based on conquest. When the protocol was signed Manila was not captured, siege was in progress and capture made after the execution of the protocol. Captures made after agreement for armistice must be disregarded and status quo restored as far as practicable. We can require cession of Philippine Islands only as indemnity for losses and expenses of the war. Have in view, also, condition of islands, the broken

power of Spain, anarchy in which our withdrawal would leave the islands, etc. These are legitimate factors. Have written fully. Thursday, 11:30 morning. DAY.

Secretary of State Hay immediately replied:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, November 3, 1898.

The President has received your dispatch of this date and awaits your letter. Meantime, however, the question may be ultimately determined. He assumes you have not yielded the claim by right of conquest. In fact, the destruction of the Spanish fleet on May 1 was the conquest of Manila, the capital of the Philippines. The President is confident that the commission will be able to make a treaty on just and honorable grounds; a failure to do so would be greatly to be regretted. HAY.

On the following day Mr. Day renewed his protest and Commissioner Davis added a separate opinion in support of Mr. Day's communication. They read as follows:

PARIS, November 5, 1898—2:20.

(For the President.—Special.)

Telegram of November 3 from the Secretary of State received. We have not yielded the claim by a right of conquest. Telegram to you on that subject was on the afternoon of discussion with Spanish commissioners. We shall not foreclose important matters without advising you. We are doing all in our power to secure treaty in accordance with your views. In the opinion of a majority of the commission we shall not promote this end by putting forth the claim that Manila was taken by conquest on May 1. Subsequent military operations and capitulation, no less than mutual acceptance of protocol, preclude making demand upon that ground. Our opinion as to ineffectiveness of capitulation after protocol has already been stated. DAY.

I think we can demand cession of entire archipelago on other and more valid grounds than a perfected territorial conquest of the Philippine Islands, such as indemnity or as conditions of peace imposed by our general military success and in view of our future security and general welfare, commercial and otherwise. I think the protocol admits all these grounds, and that the ground alone of perfected territorial conquest of the Philippine Islands is too narrow and untenable under protocol. Friday, 3:30 afternoon.

CUSHMAN K. DAVIS.

The President, in his reply, again insisted that the commission should rely, in part, upon our right to hold the islands by con-

quest. It will be seen, therefore, that the President deliberately and after repeated warnings clung to the doctrine that conquest can give title to lands and peoples.

Jefferson, in 1791, said, in a letter to William Short, "If there be one principle more deeply written than any other in the mind of every American, it is that we should have nothing to do with conquest."

Mr. Blaine, in 1890, introduced in the Pan-American conference, a series of resolutions, the first of which declared, "That the principle of conquest shall not, during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration, be recognized as admissible under American public law."

The second declared, "That all cessions of territory made during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration shall be void if made under threats of war or in the presence of an armed force."

Jefferson, speaking for democrats, repudiated the doctrine of conquest; Blaine, speaking for republicans as well as democrats, adds his condemnation, but President McKinley insists upon conquest as one of the sources of title to the Philippine Islands. If we have a right to take the Philippine Islands by conquest, we have a right to take any other islands or continents in the same way. The doctrine of conquest is absolutely destructive of the doctrine set forth in the Declaration of Independence. If one is true, the other must be false; the President chose the European doctrine and abandoned the American doctrine when he gave his instructions to the commission.

THE FUTURE OF CUBA.

A subscriber asks what position the democratic party takes in regard to the annexation of Cuba. The democratic party has not had occasion to take a position on this question. A discussion of annexation at this time would be premature; it would be like proposing to a widow at the funeral of her husband. The United States declared the Cubans entitled to independence and went to war with Spain to enforce the declaration. To discuss annexation now would cast suspicion on the good faith of the nation; neither is there anything to be gained by raising that question.

No matter whether annexation is desirable or undesirable, it is both right and expedient that the Cubans should be given their independence. If annexation is undesirable, there can be no excuse for delaying independence; if, on the other hand, annexation is desirable, the granting of independence will hasten it. Annexation to be satisfactory, must be voluntary, and it will never be voluntary unless the Cuban people have confidence in and affection for the people of the United States. And how can they have confidence in or affection for the American people, if our nation violates its promise and shows more interest in the franchises secured by private syndicates, than in the nation's honor.

The imperialistic policy of the republican party has induced the leaders to abandon the peaceful and persuasive methods formerly employed by our government, and to adopt the harsher methods employed by arbitrary rulers. As a result we are apt to lose the prestige which a war for humanity gave us; by inspiring hatred where we should have implanted love, we are apt to make enemies of people who wanted to be friends.

THE CAPTURE OF AGUINALDO.

A most important event was the capture of Aguinaldo. General Funston planned, and with the aid of a few Americans and a number of natives, executed a brilliant and daring plot for the trapping of the leader of the Filipino forces. Learning of the whereabouts of Aguinaldo, he organized a small band and arranged with some friendly Filipinos to conduct the Americans in the guise of prisoners through some ninety miles of the enemy's country to the presence of the chief, who was then taken into custody by General Funston and conveyed to Manila.

The already famous Kansan displayed great courage in the undertaking, for he risked a double danger—the treachery of the natives who accompanied him, and the possibility of encountering a superior force.

It is difficult to say what will be the immediate effect of the capture, but it is more than possible that it will hasten the end of hostilities.

When the administration comes to deal with its distinguished prisoner, it will be compelled to decide whether it is dealing with

a rebellious subject or with a foreigner who owes no allegiance to this government.

To treat Aguinaldo as a rebellious subject, the administration must assert that a defeated monarch can bargain, sell and convey title to the subjects, and that a republic can first incite the subjects of a monarch to rebellion, or assist them in rebellion, then make allies of them and afterwards buy title to them from the king whose sovereignty was disputed.

Aguinaldo has proven his ability as a leader and his military genius; it remains to be seen whether in prison he will continue to proclaim the right of his people to independence or advise his countrymen to submit to the conquest of their country by an overwhelming force.

The question of imperialism is not settled by the imprisonment of the commander-in-chief of the native forces, nor will it be settled by the surrender of all who are in arms. If the Filipinos fail in their appeal to force there is still left an appeal to the American conscience. The republicans have taken refuge behind the fact that war existed, and have tried to cry down criticism as unpatriotic; they have asked, "How can we treat with people who are shooting down our soldiers?" Peace will multiply the embarrassments of the administration, for it cannot long conceal the real character of the civil government which is to be imposed upon the Filipinos.

The war in the Philippines has been an hindrance rather than an aid to those who have been resisting the introduction of European ideas and methods of government into the United States.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

On the second day of April, 1743, Thomas Jefferson was born, and his life of eighty-three years spanned an important epoch in the nation's history.

At the age of thirty-one, he drafted the address to the king, setting forth the rights of the colonists. Two years later, at the age of thirty-three, he wrote the Declaration of Independence, and for fifty years thereafter, until his death, on July 4, 1826, he was the greatest champion of human rights in all the world.

His service as a representative in state and federal legislatures,

as governor of Virginia, ambassador to France, secretary of state under Washington, vice-president, under Adams, and president, together with his service in minor offices, covered more than forty years of his eventful career. But the work which he did for mankind was so far-reaching in its effect and so enduring in its character, that he is remembered for his ideas rather than for the positions which he held.

He was the greatest constructive statesman known to history. His birth and environment were such as might naturally have made him an aristocrat, but he became the greatest democrat; his wealth, considerable for that day, might naturally have made him partial to the rich, but he cast his lot with the common people. Many with less education have from a feeling of superiority held aloof from their fellows, but he employed his knowledge of history, of law, of science and of art for the defense and protection of the masses.

He believed in the right of the people to govern themselves and in their capacity for self-government. When near the end of life, fortified by an experience and observation such as few men have had, he wrote: "I am not among those who fear the people. They, and not the rich, are our dependence for continued freedom."

Only four years before his death he said: "Independence can be trusted nowhere but with the people in mass. They are inherently independent of all but moral law." At another time he said: "No other depositaries of power than the people themselves have ever been found, which did not end in converting to their own profit the earnings of those committed to their charge."

And, to add still another extract from his writings: "The people are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty."

He not only believed in the people, but he understood the people and recognized the distinctions which everywhere exist, however much concealed or denied. Read the analysis which he gave of parties and see how completely it has been born out by the history of the last hundred years:

Men, by their constitutions, are naturally divided into two parties: 1. Those who fear and distrust the people, and wish

to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes. 2. Those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish them and consider them as the most honest and safe, although not the most wise depository of the public interest. In every country these two parties exist, and in every one where they are free to think, speak and write, they will declare themselves. Call them, therefore, liberals and serviles, Jacobins and ultras, whigs and tories, republicans and federalists, aristocrats and democrats, or by whatever name you please, they are the same parties still, and pursue the same object. The last appellation of aristocrats and democrats is the true one expressing the essence of all.

Jefferson not only announced great fundamental principles, but he applied them to so many different questions that he can be read as an authority on all questions of to-day. He was opposed to imperialism and believed in self-government; he was for a republic composed of equal and self-governing states and entirely opposed to the colonial idea.

He was opposed to a large army and believed that a government was stronger when resting upon the love of the people than when tolerated only because of fear.

He was so opposed to the principle of monopoly that he only excepted copyrights and patents. Here is the amendment which he suggested to the Constitution: "Monopolies may be allowed to persons for their own productions in literature, and their own inventions in the arts, for a term not exceeding — years, but for no longer term, and for no other purpose." At another time he suggested fourteen years as the limit for patents.

His hostility to monopoly was exemplified in 1787, in a communication to John Jay, in which he said: "A company had silently and by unfair means obtained a monopoly for the making and selling of spermaceti candles (in France). As soon as we (Lafayette assisted him) discovered it, we solicited its suppression which is effected by a clause in the Arret."

He denounced as a fatal fallacy the doctrine that a national debt is a blessing.

He was the relentless enemy of banks of issue. At one time he declared that banks of issue were more dangerous than standing armies. At another time he said: "I hope we shall crush in its birth the aristocracy of our monied corporations, which dare

already to challenge our government to a trial of strength, and bid defiance to the laws of our country."

In 1819 he said, "Interdict forever to both the state and national government the power of establishing any paper bank; for without this interdiction we shall have the same ebbs and flows of medium, and the same revolution of property to go through every twenty or thirty years."

He was a believer in bimetallism, and no one who understands his principles can for a moment conceive of him yielding to the financial influences which controlled Mr. Cleveland's administration and the republican administrations which preceded and followed it.

He warned his countrymen against the dangers of an appointive judiciary holding office for life.

Of the freedom of speech he said: "The liberty of speaking and writing guards our other liberties."

Of the freedom of the press he wrote, "Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost."

He was the author of the statute of Virginia guaranteeing religious liberty, and was also the father of the University of Virginia. He favored a free school system which would bring to every child an opportunity to secure an education.

He was an advocate of the jury system; and he argued in favor of freeing the slaves three-quarters of a century before Lincoln issued his emancipation proclamation.

His writings fill many volumes and cover almost every conceivable subject, but through all that he said there runs the evidence of a great heart as well as a great intellect.

There is need to-day of a revival of Jeffersonian principles. He was not an enemy of honestly acquired wealth, but he believed that the government had no right to exaggerate by favoritism the differences between individuals. He believed that all should stand equal before the law and that every department of government, executive, legislative and judicial, should recognize and protect the rights of the humblest citizen as carefully as it would the rights of the greatest and most influential.

Jefferson's principles, applied to the problems of the twentieth century, would restore the republic to its old foundations and make it the supreme moral factor in the world's progress. The

application of his principles to-day would restore industrial independence and annihilate trusts. The application of his principles to-day would drive the money changers out of the temple, insure to the people a stable currency and harmonize labor and capital by compelling justice to both.

Society to-day has its aristocratic and its democratic elements; whether Jefferson's principles are applied depends upon which element controls the government.

TWO OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE.

General MacArthur has notified the War Department that Aguinaldo has taken the "oath of allegiance." The oath to which he has subscribed is as follows:

I hereby renounce all allegiance to any and all so-called revolutionary governments in the Philippine Islands and recognize and accept the supreme authority of the United States of America; I do solemnly swear that I will bear true faith and allegiance to that government; that I will at all times conduct myself as a faithful and law-abiding citizen of the said islands, and will not, either directly or indirectly hold correspondence with or give intelligence to an enemy of the United States, nor will I abet, harbor or protect such enemy; that I impose upon myself these voluntary obligations without any mental reservations or purpose of evasion, so help me God.

It will be observed that this oath provides that the subscriber shall conduct himself as "a faithful and law-abiding citizen" of the Philippine Islands, but he also swears that he will "bear true faith and allegiance to the United States government."

Allegiance is not a one-sided affair. No less an authority than Blackstone has described it as "The tie that binds the subject to the sovereign in return for that protection which the sovereign affords the subject."

If Aguinaldo shall fulfill this oath and "bear true faith and allegiance" to the United States government, what will be his political status?

In the McEnery resolution, the United States Senate disclaimed any intention of making the Philippines an integral part of the union, or of making the inhabitants of those islands citizens of the

United States. And it is the generally recognized policy of the administration that the spirit of the McEnery resolution shall be carried out.

So while we require Aguinaldo to make oath that he will "bear true faith and allegiance" to the United States government, we, in fact, prohibit him from actually fulfilling that oath; because no individual can "bear true faith and allegiance" to a government which denies to him the privileges of citizenship, which prohibits him, in fact, from "bearing true faith and allegiance" to the government.

The trappings of empire seem strange to American eyes. None are more novel, however, than a so-called "oath of allegiance," wherein a man swears allegiance to the greatest republic on earth, in the face of the fact that that republic will not accept his allegiance in the full meaning of the term.

And, speaking of oaths, it is worth while to compare the oath of allegiance above given with the following oath formerly administered. It reads:

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE
FOR
NATIVE INHABITANTS OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Manila, }
Philippine Islands. } ss.

I,, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I am a native inhabitant of the Philippine Islands, and I do further swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely and without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion.

Sworn to and subscribed this day of, before me.

Form 45.

Collector of Customs.

It will be noticed that the Filipino is no longer required to swear that he "will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies." This change is eminently proper for, since the republican party has shown itself to be an enemy to the Constitution, the original oath might require the

Filipino to resist republican attacks upon the Constitution. The republican party discarded the Constitution in fact some months ago; it seems now to have discarded it in form.

DENMARK'S GOOD EXAMPLE.

The *London Daily News* is authority for the publication of the conditions to be imposed by Denmark upon the United States in the case of a transfer of the Danish West Indies. Its Copenhagen correspondent says:

I am enabled to state, on the very best authority, that Denmark has communicated to the United States the following conditions for the sale of the Danish West Indies:

1. Four million dollars to be paid to Denmark.
2. The population to decide by vote whether to remain Danish or to be transferred to the United States.
3. If the vote is favorable to the United States, then the inhabitants to become immediately not only American subjects, but American citizens.
4. Products of the island to be admitted to the United States free of duty.

It is supposed here that Washington will not readily accept the third and fourth conditions.

A few years ago it would not have been considered necessary for any nation to insist upon such conditions for our nation would have suggested them, but recent events have made it necessary for nations dealing with us to provide for the future welfare of their subjects. Denmark sets a good example but it is humiliating for this nation to be compelled to accept instructions in liberty.

LINCOLN AND THE SILVER REPUBLICANS.

The *San Francisco Call*, speaking of the action of Senator Dubois and other silver republicans in joining the democratic party, takes occasion to misrepresent the position of Abraham Lincoln on the silver question. It says: "The messages and writings of Mr. Lincoln prove him to have been the predecessor of Mr. Cleveland in declaring the principles of sound money, which Mr. Cleveland made the pole star of his administration. Both Lincoln and

Cleveland stood exactly in line with Jefferson and Jackson on the issue of sound money."

It also denies the right of the silver republican to claim any kinship with Lincoln, or his principles. It is not strange that the gold standard papers attempt to distort history, for they are compelled to do so in order to find any support for their financial theories.

Jefferson believed that the money unit should rest on the two metals, gold and silver; while Mr. Cleveland believes that the money unit should rest on one metal, gold. Jackson affixed his signature to the bill which provided for the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the legal ratio of sixteen to one, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation, and in changing the ratio from fifteen to one, to sixteen to one he reduced the size of the gold dollar. Mr. Cleveland is the leader of those democrats who are opposed to the coinage of silver into legal tender money at any ratio or under any circumstances.

Raymond's *Life of Lincoln*, published soon after the death of President Lincoln and before the republican party began its crusade against silver, reproduces a message which Lincoln sent to the miners of the west. The following is an extract from it:

Mr. Colfax, I want you to take a message from me to the miners whom you visit. I have very large ideas of the mineral wealth of our nation. I believe it practically inexhaustible. It abounds all over the western country, from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific, and its development has scarcely commenced. During the war, when we were adding a couple of million dollars a day to our national debt, I did not care about encouraging the increase in the volume of our precious metals. We had the country to save first. But now that the rebellion is overthrown, and we know pretty nearly the amount of our national debt, the more gold and silver we mine, we make the payment of that debt so much the easier.

It will be seen from the above that Mr. Lincoln held to the quantitative theory of money—a theory denied by the republicans in the campaign of '96. It will also be seen that he was willing to make the payment of the national debt easier by increasing the amount of money; while Mr. Cleveland tried to make the debt harder to pay by decreasing the volume of money.

On the subject of paper money also the silver republicans are

in line with the early statesmen and opposed to the latter day policies of Mr. Cleveland and the republican leaders. Jefferson was opposed to banks of issue, state or national; Jackson made the greater part of his reputation by his fight against the recharter of the national bank; and Lincoln signed the bill which provided for the greenback. Jefferson considered the issue of paper money a function of government and insisted that the banks should go out of the business of governing. Mr. Cleveland considers the issue of paper money a function of banks and believes that the government should go out of the business of banking.

Lincoln assisted in establishing the national bank in order to furnish a market for government bonds during the war; now the republicans are retiring the greenbacks in order to give the banks a chance to issue more paper money.

Senator Teller, Senator Dubois, ex-Senator Towne and the other silver republicans are adhering to doctrine which in former times was republican as well as democratic. The republican leaders and gold democrats are the revolutionists.

THE YOUNG MAN'S CHANCES.

The million dollar salary voted to Mr. Schwab by the steel trust caused numerous republican editors to write enthusiastic articles on the opportunities offered to young men by the great corporations. The subject has now been taken up by debating societies and the school boys are investigating the matter for themselves. That Mr. Schwab's rise to fame and fortune has been rapid, there is no doubt, neither is there any doubt that his present position is attractive to many, but the very fact that his case has attracted so much attention is conclusive proof that it is extraordinary. He has won the capital prize in the industrial lottery, but where a system of monopoly offers such an opportunity to one man, it closes the door of opportunity to thousands of others equally able and deserving.

When all the great industries are controlled by trusts, there will be a few big salaried officials and the remainder of the employes will be condemned to perpetual clerkships with no possibility of independence in the business world.

If the present tendency toward consolidation becomes perma-

ment, it is only a question of time when the principal positions in the corporations will go to relatives and favorites, and descend from generation to generation. Competition puts a premium on brains; monopoly puts a premium on blood.

Young men, and old men for that matter, will find that industrial independence will give a sufficient opportunity to a large number of people, while the trusts will give an unusual opportunity to a small number of people.

A DISASTROUS VICTORY.

In the election of Mr. Wells, as mayor of St. Louis, the re-organizers have scored a triumph. The democrats of St. Louis and Missouri will, however, find it worth their while to calculate the cost of the victory and to prepare for the struggle that awaits them.

In November, 1900, the republican national ticket received 60,608 votes in St. Louis, and the democratic national ticket, which Mr. Wells refused to support, received 59,941. At the recent city election, Mr. Wells received 43,012 votes—nearly seventeen thousand less than the democratic vote of last fall, while Mr. Parker, the republican candidate for mayor, received 34,840 votes—about twenty-six thousand less than the republican vote of last fall. Mr. Merriwether, a democrat in national politics, running upon a municipal ownership platform, received 30,568 votes and Mr. Filley, a republican, running on an independent ticket, received 2,068 votes. It will be seen that the total vote cast for mayor was large for a local contest, amounting to about ninety per cent. of the vote cast last fall. If Mr. Wells and Mr. Parker had polled the same proportion of the total vote that the national candidates of their parties polled in 1900, Mr. Wells would have received about 55,000 votes and Mr. Parker about 55,500.

It is impossible to ascertain how many democrats voted for Mr. Merriwether and how many voted for Mr. Parker, just as it is impossible to say how many republicans voted for Mr. Wells and how many for Mr. Merriwether, but it is reasonable to suppose that the republican vote which left Mr. Parker went largely to Mr. Wells, while the democratic vote which left Mr. Wells went principally to Mr. Merriwether.

Mr. Wells lost at least twelve thousand democratic votes, if he gained no republican votes, and to this must be added a sum equal to the republican votes received. If, for instance, he received 10,000 republican votes, the account would stand thus: For Wells, 33,000 democratic votes and 10,000 republican votes—total, 43,000 votes. But this would show a loss of 22,000 democratic votes; can the re-organizers afford to trade 22,000 democratic votes, good at all elections, for 10,000 republican votes, good only in local elections and when a republican is nominated on the democratic ticket?

If Mr. Wells only received 5,000 republican votes, the account would stand: Wells, 38,000 democratic votes and 5,000 republican votes—total, 43,000. This would show a loss of seventeen thousand democratic votes, or an exchange of three democrats for one republican. Is there anything in this victory to boast of? If the democrats who voted for Mr. Merriwether had followed the example set by Mr. Wells and voted the republican ticket, Mr. Parker would have been elected by a considerable majority.

But what of the future? The *Republic*, with commendable frankness, recommends a national application of the St. Louis plan of harmonizing. It says:

St. Louis has supplied the example of a thoroughly united democracy. With little evidence of reluctance all elements of the party joined hands in the recent campaign. They worked together harmoniously and voted without scratching.

To obtain national ascendancy, this unification must proceed heartily all over the country.

With a united democracy the party is certain to win the next national election. The republican party has drifted so far away from American principles, that the revolt of the people will be overwhelming when the forces naturally democratic are found acting together.

The St. Louis democracy has set its face to the future. Give us such a union of popular forces in all the states, and the next national election will be from that moment won.

This is exactly what might have been expected. Mr. Wells was not nominated because the re-organizers were especially interested in a good municipal government; he was nominated because he represents a corporate element which calls itself democratic, as a matter of habit, but gives its pecuniary and political support to the republican party. It will never be found supporting a democratic ticket unless that ticket is selected and controlled by those

who have some special privileges which they desire protected by the government.

If the democracy of St. Louis had defeated Mr. Wells, the democracy of Missouri would have been spared the fight which must now be made. The contest which resulted in the Pirtle Springs convention was fought over the silver question, the fight which is now opened will be a broader one, and will involve the very existence of the party.

The *Republic* will lead the Francis-Wells element and will be supported by the railroad attorneys and corporation agents as well as by the gold standard advocates. Every democratic newspaper in the state will be compelled to take sides and a contest which might have been settled in a day, if confined to St. Louis, will keep the state stirred up for the next four years.

What is the use, it may be asked, of opposing the *Republic*-Francis-Wells combination? Why not allow it to control the party organization? The answer is found in the election of 1894. Such a slump in the democratic vote as that which occurred in that year or in St. Louis a few days ago, would give the state to the republicans. There is no room in this country for two parties representing republican principles; unless the democratic party faithfully and courageously opposes plutocracy all along the line, it has neither chance nor reason for existence.

If the St. Louis contest had been purely a local one, THE COMMONER would have taken no part in it, but as it was a link in the chain—a part of a plan, national in extent,—to republicanize the democratic organization, this paper called attention to the facts and pointed out the purpose of the re-organizers. The daily papers outside of St. Louis openly discussed the scheme, and since the election, the rejoicing has been general among those self-styled democrats who have twice aided in electing a republican president. The election of Mr. Wells was a disastrous victory for the democracy of St. Louis, Missouri and the nation.

VI.

AN UNFORTUNATE COMPARISON.

A New York firm has published in book form an address delivered last November by Joseph H. Choate, our ambassador to Great Britain. This address was delivered before the Edinburg Philosophical Institution. At that time Queen Victoria was living. Mr. Choate read to the assembled Britishers the famous letter written by Abraham Lincoln to the Boston mother, Mrs. Bixby, who had given five sons to the union cause. That letter cannot be printed too often.

I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from your grief for a loss so overwhelming—but I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation which may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and the lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

When Ambassador Choate had finished reading this splendid epistle, he said to the assembled Britishers:

Hardly could your illustrious sovereign from the depths of her queenly and womanly heart have spoken words more touching and tender to soothe the stricken mothers of her own soldiers.

Such a comparison was exceedingly unfortunate.

Mr. Choate was quoting from Abraham Lincoln, a man among the most famous of all the men of the world for his ability to say the right thing at the right time, for the purity and the eloquence of his language, for the tenderness and the gentleness of his heart.

One of the sweetest things Lincoln ever wrote was the epistle to the woman who had lost five sons on the field of battle, and yet its tenderness and its eloquence were characteristic of the man, and

entirely in keeping with his record as an orator and writer. But this American ambassador, standing before a British audience, thinks he has paid a remarkably high tribute to one of the greatest orators and writers in all history when he has said, "hardly" could the British sovereign have done better. The British sovereign was a good woman, but she was not at all famous for her literary ability. The comparison made by Mr. Choate was doubtless pleasing to his British audience but it was unworthy of the great lawyer who made the comparison and it was a piece of flunkeyism of which no man in his position should be guilty.

A SAMPLE OF WHITEWASHING.

Whitewashing is so common in legislative bodies now-a-days that the ordinary resolution denying charges and vindicating the accused attracts little attention, but the resolution reported by a special committee of the Nebraska legislature deserves to rank among the prize specimens of this kind of literature.

On the last day of the session (such resolutions are generally brought forward on the last day) Representative Wilkinson of Cass County presented a report from his committee—but let the report speak for itself.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislature: Your house committee appointed to investigate and report regarding rumors to the effect that undue influence was exerted by railroad companies and candidates for United States senators, with the members of the legislature, beg leave to make the following report:

We have made a thorough and personal investigation, and find the members of this Twenty-seventh session as a body, regardless of party, to be of exceptionally high moral character; that an honest effort was made by the members to promote the best interests of the state by the passage of good laws and the careful appropriation of the state's money, and that class and unjust legislation was honestly opposed; that transportation given the members by the railroad companies (which is a common custom) was purely complimentary, and without in any way attempting to influence the vote of members and their choice of candidates for United States senators, or for the passage of any special act of legislation.

"In the investigation the members were without exception willing and ready to answer every question that would lead to the discovery of anything irregular, as far as they knew, with the result that in

not a single instance could anything be charged or proved against any member or candidate for United States senator; on the contrary, the true spirit of western and manly independence exerted itself throughout the entire session, and which we believe was most thoroughly demonstrated in the contest for the selection of two United States senators just ended, and that all reports to the contrary are false.

WILKINSON,

Chairman of the Special House Committee.

What more could have been desired? The examination was "thorough and personal;" the members "regardless of party" were found to be "of exceptionally high moral character;" they had all put forth an "honest effort" to promote "the best interests of the state" by the passage of "good laws" and the "careful appropriation of the state's money," etc.

The lexicon of eulogy was exhausted and complimentary and congratulatory expressions were used to the limit. The passes given to the members (a common custom, as the report explains) were "purely complimentary" and were not given with any thought of "influencing the vote of members and their choice of candidates." The members were "without exception" willing to answer "every question," but not in "a single instance" could anything be "charged or proved against any member or candidate for United States senate," etc., etc.

Here was a vindication that vindicated and an exoneration that exonerated. Did the House adopt the report and thus seal for all time the lips of the critic? Nay, not so.

Up rose Mr. Whitmore, a republican and enquired why the committee had not called upon him for evidence. He intimated that he could have given some information about the "hordes," "sometimes several hundred in one day" brought in by the railroads to help "one certain candidate."

Chairman Wilkinson admitted reluctantly that Mr. Whitmore may possibly have been overlooked by the committee.

Then Mr. Dahlsten, a fusionist, took the floor. He said that, as the matter was up, he would like to testify that he had been offered money to absent himself from the joint session and thus aid in the election of "a certain candidate." He added that other members of the House had spoken to him of receiving similar offers. It was evident that Mr. Dahlsten had also been overlooked by the committee.

Then a third member ventured the opinion that the investigation had not been conducted in such a manner as to make the report of any value and said that as all the members were honorable men, he did not see any use of any resolution at all. By this time Chairman Wilkinson was in a mood to accept almost any suggestion which would put an end to the discussion and he lost no time in withdrawing the resolution.

The legislature adjourned, the members separated and wended their ways to their respective homes, but they carried with them no self-bestowed vindication. When the finger of suspicion is pointed at them and revilers attack their fair fame they will be defenseless. Their children will never know, as a matter of record, that they are all "of exceptionally high moral character" and that they all made "an honest effort" "to promote the best interests of the state."

But while the members generally languish under suspicions which they refused to remove by resolution, Mr. Wilkinson of Cass County will go thundering down the ages as the author of one of the most artistic and comprehensive resolutions ever offered for the purification and glorification of Solons.

If any republican reader doubts the correctness of the above report he is respectfully referred to that uncompromising, though not always courteous, republican newspaper, the *Nebraska State Journal*, from the columns of which the above information has been gleaned.

THE RICE DEPORTATION.

The American people do not take kindly to deportation, but many of them will be amazed when they learn all the facts concerning the deportation of George T. Rice, the newspaper editor who was sent out of the Philippine Islands because he made charges affecting the integrity of a public official.

When Mr. Rice landed in San Francisco he made a complete statement, which was printed in the *San Francisco Star*, a weekly newspaper. Mr. Rice states that in his capacity as an editor he criticised a custom house official. Rice obtained his information from sea captains and merchants who had had dealings with the custom house, and who claimed that they had been defrauded. Rice states that he made an investigation and found the charges to be true.

The custom house official then decreed that Editor Rice should be debarred from the custom house. The military authorities went to the aid of the customs official, and in a star chamber proceeding, to which Rice was not admitted, a pretense of investigating the accused official was made.

The official was then given a clean bill, and the military authorities summoned Editor Rice before them.

Colonel Crowder acted as inquisitor on this occasion, and Mr. Rice says the following dialogue took place:

Crowder—Don't you think you were wrong in this matter?

Rice—No, sir.

Crowder—Then you still think you are right?

Rice—Yes, sir; I know I am.

Crowder—I am sorry for you, young man; if you still persist in saying you are right, my orders are from General MacArthur to deport you.

Rice—If you will give me a fair trial in court I can prove that I am right.

Crowder—Under martial law, such characters as you receive no trial. We have not the time.

Rice—Can I see the evidence in the investigation which you claim proves my charges false?

Crowder—No; the investigation was placed in competent hands and does not need your approval. Your statements have been proven to our satisfaction to be without foundation, and you will be deported as an incendiary character and a menace to the military situation. You are too young to let go on slandering men of honesty and capability, and I consider your character as having fallen to its lowest level. In writing and publishing such articles you endanger the foundation of our military system. Such conduct as this I consider equal to traitorism.

Rice—So far as being a traitor, I have served my country in the field for over a year, and never had my love of country so much as questioned, while you have never been under fire and never expect to be, and you dare question my patriotism! I have more patriotism to the square inch than you have in your whole carcass.

Crowder—Be careful; a few more words and I will put you in Bilibid! (the jail.)

Rice—Put me there! I would rather be an honest prisoner than be a craven and deny the truth through fear of your power.

An order was then issued directing the deportation of Rice.

Before this order was put into execution, Colonel Crowder called upon Rice, and this dialogue is self-explanatory:

The military governor (MacArthur) directs me to ask you that if your conduct is satisfactory up to the time of your deportation and he sees fit to remit your sentence, will you promise that in the future you will never write articles of a similar character against any officer of the military?

Rice—No, sir. I hold the right to publish anything anywhere, whenever I have proof of my statements.

Crowder—Your case is hopeless.

Upon Crowder's order Rice was delivered to the provost marshal. The editor was then placed in solitary confinement on January 23, where he remained until January 27. On January 29, Editor Rice sailed for the United States.

Evidently it does not pay to criticise public officials in the Philippines under the carpet-bag régime.

WATTERSON ON DESTINY.

In a recent issue of the *Courier-Journal*, Mr. Watterson, that quaint and always interesting journalist, advises his party to raise the white flag and surrender to the republican party on the question of imperialism. He does not announce that he is convinced of the righteousness of the republican position, but he excuses himself by assuming that it is impossible to combat the forces which seem to be behind the republican party. He admits that imperialism is an innovation upon American principles and antagonistic to the teachings of the earlier statesmen. Here are his words:

Let us say at once that the scheme of occupying a territory remote from our borders, of subduing a people alien to our character and institutions and of undertaking a system of colonial government over this territory and these peoples without their consent—and apparently in opposition to their will—is not merely a serious innovation upon the original plan embodied by the Constitution of the United States, and contemplated by the authors of that Constitution, but that is repugnant to the prudent counsels delivered by the wisest of our older statesmen, to say nothing about the teaching of history.

After a brief review of the past one hundred years, he accepts the republican doctrine of Providence and says:

God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. He made the Spanish war. He was not less behind Dewey in Manila

than He was behind Shafter and Sampson and Schley at Santiago. What was His all-wise purpose? We know not. But there we were and there we are; and nothing is surer in the future than that we shall be there a century hence unless some power turns up strong enough to drive us out. Instead, therefore, of discussing the abstraction of imperialism, illustrated by the rights and wrongs of the Philippines, Mr. Bryan were more profitably engaged in considering how we may best administer possessions, which, for good or for evil, are with us to stay.

It will be noticed that he adopts the republican theory that God is responsible for what we have done; that it is a matter of destiny, and that we are being swept along by influences over which we have no control.

The doctrine enunciated by the rebuplicans since the Spanish war, and now endorsed by so great an editor as Mr. Watterson, is not only dangerous, but it is immoral. It is politically dangerous because it encourages the republican party to shirk responsibility for its sins and shield itself behind the pretense that it is working out the will of the Almighty; and it is immoral because it obliterates the distinction between right and wrong. The republican argument is built upon the theory that wrong done upon a large scale loses its evil character, and becomes an integral part of God's plan. It is in keeping with the tendency to call an embezzler a Napoleon of finance, provided the amount embezzled is large.

Mr. Watterson has not in the past been in the habit of defending his position with the philosophy which he now employs. In former years he was known as the special champion of "the star-eyed Goddess of Reform." When the democratic party went down to defeat, as it often did, he did not say: "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. He made protection and the republican party, and, therefore, we must bow to both." On the contrary, he raised the democratic banner aloft and appealed time and again to the intelligence of the American people. Neither has he been in the habit of excusing the crimes of individuals by attributing them to divine inspiration. When Gov. Goebel was assassinated Mr. Watterson did not say: "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform; He prompted the assassin to kill! We cannot understand His all-wise purpose, but there we were, and here we are, and there is nothing to be done about it."

Instead, he insisted that a murder had been committed and that the guilty should be brought to justice.

When the Louisville and Nashville Railroad entered the arena of politics, and began its work of corruption and intimidation, Mr. Watterson did not say: "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. This Railroad Company has sprung into existence and must be carrying out the purposes of an all-wise Ruler."

Far from it! He insisted that the railroad should keep out of politics, and attend to the business for which it was organized.

There is no more reason for throwing upon the Almighty the responsibility for a war of conquest, and for an imperial policy which burdens our nation with a large army and suppresses the aspirations of distant peoples for self-government, than there is to blame Him because one individual chooses to kill another, or because a great corporation attempts to control a state government.

Questions must be decided by the application of fixed and immutable principles. Jefferson said: "I know of but one code of morality for men, whether acting singly or collectively"; and Franklin expressed the same idea, only in different language, when he said: "Justice is as strictly due between neighbor nations as between neighbor citizens. The highwayman is as much a robber where he plunders in a gang as when single, and the nation that wages an unjust war is only a great gang."

If Jefferson and Franklin were right, how can we delude ourselves with the doctrine of destiny which is being developed now?

Yielding to a bad principle because it seems triumphant is simply an easy method of avoiding labor and sacrifice. It is a complacent but unsound philosophy, which teaches compromise with wrong merely because the enemy is strongly entrenched.

No one has a right to assume that error will be permanently victorious. If some of our citizens condemn small crimes but seem inclined to condone grand larceny and killing on a large scale, Mr. Watterson should remember his lecture on morals and point out to the deluded ones that a nation can, no more than an individual, avoid the consequences of transgression. If he believed the authors of the Constitution and "the wisest of our statesmen" wrong he would be justified in repudiating their counsels, but believing them right it is surprising that he should be carried away by the brutal and barbarous doctrine upon which empires are built. His influence might help to restore American ideals; he cannot afford to aid in their overthrow.

The position of Mr. Watterson would be untenable, even if the

issue of imperialism had been the only issue presented last fall and the people had deliberately endorsed the republican policy. Suppose the campaign of 1900 had been fought with no other question before the people, even then it would still be the duty of those who are conscientiously opposed to imperialism to continue the discussion, with the hope of convincing a majority of the people. But, as a matter of fact, there were a number of issues in the campaign. While imperialism was declared by the democratic convention to be paramount, every one knows that other questions entered into the contest, and it is also well known that the republican party constantly denied that it had any thought of attacking fundamental principles, or of converting a republic into an empire. The indictment brought against the republican party was so severe that a great many refused to believe the party capable of such intentions as were charged.

Then, too, the republicans sought cover behind the fact that a war was in progress. They circulated misleading reports from the Philippine Islands, and declared that the lives of American soldiers were imperiled by the fact that the democrats were criticising the administration.

What the democratic party needs is not advice to surrender, but courage to resist the attacks which are being made upon American doctrines and democratic principles.

The campaign of 1896 was the first one in recent years when there was a radical issue between the parties. The republican party pretended to want international bimetalism, when it really wanted the gold standard. It won its victory under the cover of international bimetalism and as soon as the election was over, threw off the mask and came out for the gold standard. Many of the democratic papers which had supported the ticket, and all of the democratic papers which had deserted the party in that year, counseled the party to accept a decision, won by fraud, as conclusive of the question. And for four years the leading democratic dailies gave no assistance whatever to the democratic party in its fight against the money power.

In the campaign of 1900 the republican party practiced another fraud upon the people on the subject of imperialism, and now Mr. Watterson and a few other democratic editors advise the acceptance of the republican position on that question.

On the trust question the republican party also practiced decep-

tion, and some of our democratic papers seem willing to concede the triumph of the trust principle.

Nothing is to be gained from a party standpoint, and everything is to be lost from the standpoint of principle by Mr. Watterson's method of dealing with the questions at issue. He expects the democratic party to endorse the colonial system, and then promise to send better carpet-baggers to Manila than the republicans have sent. Such a course would make our party a laughing stock.

No party is good enough to administer a colonial system honestly and for the benefit of the subjects. A nation that is selfish enough to want a colony is too selfish to do justice by it, and a party demoralized enough to endorse a colonial system would be impotent to administer it satisfactorily.

THE COMMONER is pained to see so able and brilliant an editor as Mr. Watterson, unconsciously lend his influence to the republican party. Far better that his voice should command a charge upon the republican strongholds than that it should call a retreat in the midst of a battle which must determine, not only the fate of this republic, but the fate of all republics for years to come.

THE MONEY QUESTION.

A Kansas paper has inquired why the editor of THE COMMONER does not explain the failure of prices to fall, as predicted by the advocates of free silver. The readers of THE COMMONER are well enough acquainted with the money question to know that the quantitative theory is the basis of the science of money. Other things being equal, the value of the dollar depends upon the number of dollars—an increase in the volume of money increasing the prices, and a decrease in the volume of money decreasing prices. This is the foundation of all argument made in behalf of bimetallism. For twenty years the price level fell, and during that time the producers of wealth and the debtors throughout the world suffered an almost incalculable loss, while the owners of money and fixed investments enjoyed an enormous advantage. Silver was struck down by those who desired a dearer dollar, and bimetallists were called advocates of silver, because they favored the restoration of silver to its former place in the currency. If the advocates of dear money had attacked gold instead of silver, the same people who favored the restoration of silver would have formed the restora-

tion of gold. On one side of the question stood those who wanted, as Mr. McKinley once expressed it, to make "money the master, and all things else the servant;" on the other side stood those who wanted a sufficient volume of money to maintain the level of prices, and the free and unlimited coinage of silver, as well as gold, at the present legal ratio was urged as a means to this end.

Since 1896 there has been an unexpected increase in the production of gold, and this increase, which the republicans neither promised nor desired, has brought, in part, the advantage which the restoration of bimetallism would have brought more completely.

In so far as business conditions have been improved by the increased production of gold, bimetallists have been vindicated. If any one will take the trouble to read the literature circulated by the gold standard advocates in 1896, he will find that the quantitative theory of money was denounced, and a rising dollar eulogized. Nobody eulogizes a dear dollar now, but the advocates of the gold standard are seeking to secure credit because of the increased volume of money, which they did not contemplate and did not want.

Business conditions have not been normal during the last three years. War in the Philippines and in South Africa has operated to raise the price level,—first, by withdrawing a large number of men from the labor market; and second, by increasing the demand for provisions, army supplies and equipment for soldiers. Nations have been mortgaging the future to secure money to spend in the present.

There is a theoretical advantage in the double standard, but the practical necessity for it has been based upon the scarcity of gold. If the production of gold increases to such an extent as to furnish a volume of money which will keep pace with population and business, the restoration of bimetallism will not be necessary. But if such a condition comes it will be more gratifying to bimetallists than to the advocates of the gold standard, for bimetallists will have secured that which they desire, namely, a stable dollar, while the advocates of the gold standard will be disappointed because of the disappearance of the dear dollar.

Whether this increase in the production of gold will be sufficient to maintain the level of prices, is a question which no one is prepared at this time to decide.

Not all of the annual product enters into the currency. A very considerable proportion of the production goes into the arts and some gold is necessary to compensate for the shrinkage by abrasion and loss of coin. No one can say with certainty just how much will be added to the gold coin of the world annually. It must be remembered that a large addition to the annual supply of money is necessary to keep pace with population and industry. In 1890, Senator Sherman made a speech in support of the bill which bore his name, and in that speech he argued that an annual addition of more than fifty million of dollars was then necessary in this country alone. How much would be necessary for the entire world if all nations adopted the gold standard? Then, besides furnishing the necessary annual increase there would have to be enough gold to replace the standard silver money now in use in the world, which amounts to some \$4,000,000,000. There is also a large quantity of uncovered paper, which might absorb a great deal more.

It requires a period of years to measure the influence of the money supply on prices. All that any one can say now is that the increased production of gold has brought a measure of relief; no one can say that it will be found entirely adequate.

Even now the tendency of prices is downward again, and nearly every week shows a greater number of business failures than the corresponding week of last year. According to the index numbers of the *London Economist*, the price level reached the highest point in March of 1900, and remained nearly stationary until September of that year. Since the later date there has been a perceptible fall. If the reaction from high prices continues for a considerable period it will be proof that the gold supply is not equal to the demand made upon it, and the necessity for bimetallism will again become apparent.

Whether improved conditions will force the money question into the background or whether less favorable conditions will give it a new emphasis, no one can predict with certainty. The same principle, however, which divided the people upon the money question will divide them upon a number of other questions, and those who take the side of the masses on the money question will take the people's side on other questions which separate the wealth producers from those who seek an unearned and undeserved advantage over their fellows.

A BIT PERSONAL.

The Springfield (Massachusetts) *Republican*, in a recent issue has this to say:

There is some speculation here and there in view of Mr. Bryan's opposition to the regular democratic candidate for mayor of St. Louis, as to what he is up to. Judging from a letter concerning the St. Louis contest which he wrote, it is a fair presumption that Mr. Bryan has determined to make the stiffest possible warfare against the re-organization of the democratic party by the Cleveland democrats. In the letter referred to he expressly stated that Wells should be defeated because his election would encourage every so-called re-organizer in the country. Mr. Bryan's course in this matter together with his COMMONER editorship and the freedom of his editorial writing, would indicate that another democratic presidential nomination is of less moment to him than the defeat of the plans of the conservatives to recapture the party. It is probable that Mr. Bryan has no expectation of being nominated again, but doubtless he intends to have something to say as to who shall be nominated and as to the principles the next convention shall adopt. An editorship is a bad place for a candidate, but an editorship is not so bad a place for naming candidates. On the whole Mr. Bryan's present attitude is distinctly belligerent, but not necessarily belligerent in his personal behalf. His present course is entirely consistent with a determination that his principles, on the whole, shall prevail.

It is only fair that the readers of THE COMMONER should know what I am "up to," and if they will pardon me for being a little bit personal I will tell them. I have twice received at the hands of my party the highest honor it can bestow, and twice has my nomination been endorsed by our allies, the populists and silver republicans. The first nomination came from the delegates in attendance upon the three conventions, the second nomination came directly from the voters of the three parties. These honors were bestowed, not because of personal merit, or as a personal compliment, but because of my advocacy of democratic principles. I still believe in those principles, and expect to advocate them during the remainder of my life. New issues will arise from time to time but the principles set forth in the Chicago platform and in the Kansas City platform are fundamental, and can be applied to all questions.

I am not planning for another presidential nomination—if I

were I would not be editing a paper; if I ever become a candidate again it will be because it seems necessary for the advancement of the principles to which I adhere, and that does not now seem probable. I shall, however, take an interest in politics for several years yet, if I live, and can be relied upon to support those who as candidates advocate democratic principles, and who can be trusted to enforce them if elected.

I have no enemies to punish. No matter what a man may have said or done against the ticket in 1896 or in 1900, that man becomes my friend the moment he accepts democratic principles. Neither have I any disposition to reward political friends at the expense of our cause. No matter what a man may have said or done for the ticket in 1896 or in 1900, that man becomes an opponent the moment he turns against democratic principles. Political battles are fought, not in the past or in the future, but in the present. The heretofore cannot be recalled, and the hereafter cannot be anticipated, but the NOW is all important.

I shall say whatever I think ought to be said, and shall write whatever I think ought to be written. This course may not be popular, but I trust that it will aid in the restoration of Jeffersonian principles.

I shall ask no reward, because I am not working for others entirely. As a citizen I am interested in having a good government under which to live; as a father I am interested in leaving a good government to my children. If a good government can be secured it will be reward enough for all that I or any one else can do.

POLITICS IN BUSINESS.

When THE COMMONER was ready to take advertising, a card giving rates and terms was sent to a list of advertisers published in one of the directories. Among the answers received was one reading as follows:

Replying to yours of the 13th, would say that we would not place an advertisement in your paper if it cost us nothing. We do not agree with the principles brought forth by Mr. Bryan during the last campaign, and do not wish to do anything that would throw encouragement or assistance in his way.

The matter is referred to for a double purpose. First, to show the readers of this paper the disadvantages under which one labors who attempts to protect the public at large from the evils of private monopoly. It will be noticed that the advertiser did not refer to the money question, which was the paramount issue of the campaign of 1896, but to the principles brought forward in the last campaign, evidently referring to the democratic platform on the trust question or on the question of imperialism. As an advertiser would hardly make such a protest against the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence—for they were the principles applied to the question of imperialism—it is probable that this corporation took offense at the effort made by the democratic party to prevent the organization of trusts. It is hardly possible that any democratic paper will be led to compromise with wrong merely because the wrong doers, or the supporters of wrong doing, threaten to withhold their patronage. But those who are interested in reform ought to know the means resorted to by our opponents.

The second reason for calling attention to this letter is that it suggests what might happen if voters generally were as illiberal and as partisan as some of the so-called business men. There is as much reason why the ordinary citizen should refuse to patronize a store owned by a political opponent, or to purchase an article manufactured by one differing from him in political opinion, as there is for a business man to refuse to advertise in a paper which antagonizes his views on public questions. No principle is sound which is not capable of general application. The principle adopted by the corporation whose letter is quoted would inject strife and bitterness into every business community.

Bankers have sometimes refused loans to, or threatened to withdraw loans from, persons holding opposite political views, without seeming to realize that the application of the same principle by depositors would bankrupt the institution.

As a rule, however, men mingle together in business, in society, and at church without regard to their political opinions. It is not because they lack convictions, but because they have a proper conception of the privileges and duties of citizenship, and recognize the right of each person to have and to express his views on all subjects. It is fortunate that narrowness is the exception rather than the rule.

THE REPRESENTATIVE'S DUTY.

A reader of *THE COMMONER* has asked whether a representative should give expression to his own convictions or be governed by the wishes of his constituents. There are two theories on the subject. The first is that the people think for themselves and select representatives to give legislative effect to their wishes; the other theory is that the people are incapable of thinking for themselves and choose representatives to do the thinking for the rest of the people.

The former is the democratic theory. There is more intelligence and integrity among the people than ever finds expression through representatives. The fact that constitutions are referred to the people for adoption is evidence of this, as is also the fact that the voting of bonds, the selection of county seats, and other important matters are usually decided by popular vote. The fact that platforms are adopted by party conventions is conclusive proof that the voters have a right to know the candidate's views before they vote for him.

Accepting this theory to be the correct one, it follows that a representative has no moral right to misrepresent his constituents. Upon all questions covered by the platform, a representative is bound by the platform. A public official who secures an office without intending to keep the platform pledges obtains office under false pretenses, and certainly to obtain an office by such means is as reprehensible as to obtain money or merchandise in that way. As a rule a representative is elected to office as the candidate of a party, and his platform applies the principles of the party to the questions then before the public. If new questions arise after the election the representative is in duty bound to apply to them the same principles applied by the platform to other questions. If the constituents change their views they cannot with propriety demand that the representative change his convictions during this term, but if the representative undergoes a change of opinion which separates him from his constituents upon an important question, he ought to resign. A representative ought to speak and vote his convictions, but when his convictions are so altered that he cannot conscientiously carry out the wishes of his constituents, he ought to give way to some one who is in harmony with the con-

stituency. Sometimes when a great question arises, causing new party alignments, the representative returns to his people, presents the new issue, and endeavors to convert his constituency to his way of thinking: such a course is entirely honorable and often successful.

The second theory, namely, that the representative should act independently of the wishes of his constituents, is the aristocratic one, and rests upon the assumption that the voters are not competent to think out and decide the questions which concern their own welfare. It is only a step from this theory to the doctrine that the people should not be allowed to vote.

It is important that the representative himself should have a proper conception of his relation to his constituents. Most of the corruption that finds its way into the government comes from the tendency of the representative to regard his office as private property rather than as a public trust. When a representative decides that he is not bound to respect the wishes of his constituents, he is on the down grade, and usually the next step is to make all the money he can out of the office.

A LESSON TO RULERS.

Lord Macaulay, in his history of England, describes the growth of trusts and monopolies three hundred years ago. He tells how the people at last arose and demanded redress, and how the queen, seeing that she could no longer resist public opinion, gracefully yielded. The historian points to her example as a lesson to rulers. In the hope that the lesson may not be lost upon those now in power, the description is reproduced:

It was in the Parliament of 1601 that the opposition which had, during forty years, been silently gathering and husbanding strength fought its first great battle and won its first victory. The ground was well chosen. The English Sovereigns had always been entrusted with the supreme direction of commercial police. It was their undoubted prerogative to regulate coin, weights and measures, and to appoint fairs, markets, and ports. The line which bounded their authority over trade had, as usual, been but loosely drawn. They therefore, as usual, encroached on the province which rightfully belonged to the legislature. The encroachment was, as usual, patiently borne, till it became serious. But at length the Queen

took upon herself to grant patents of monopoly by scores. There was scarcely a family in the realm which did not feel itself aggrieved by the oppression and extortion which this abuse naturally caused. Iron, oil, vinegar, coal, saltpetre, lead, starch, yarn, skins, leather, glass, could be bought only at exorbitant prices. The House of Commons met in an angry and determined mood. It was in vain that a courtly minority blamed the Speaker for suffering acts of the Queen's Highness to be called in question. The language of the discontented party was high and menacing and was echoed by the voice of the whole nation. The coach of the chief minister of the crown was surrounded by an indignant populace who cursed the monopolies and exclaimed that the prerogative should not be suffered to touch the old liberties of England. There seemed for a moment to be some danger that the long and glorious reign of Elizabeth would have a shameful and disastrous end. She, however, with admirable judgment and temper, declined the contest, put herself at the head of the reforming party, redressed the grievance, thanked the Commons, in touching and dignified language, for their tender care of the general weal, brought back to herself the hearts of the people, and left to her successors a memorable example of the way in which it behoves a ruler to deal with public movements which he has not the means of resisting.

PLAGIARISM.

The charge of plagiarism made against a college orator in a Missouri contest is a sad reminder of the fact that many young men have brought upon themselves an odium difficult to remove by borrowing the language of others without giving proper credit. Doubtless this is sometimes explained by what is called "unconscious cerebration," but often the evidence is so plain that it is difficult to distinguish the borrowing from a plain case of stealing. As the wrongfulness of ordinary larceny does not depend upon the discovery of the theft, so the offense of plagiarism is the same whether it is found out or not.

The object of an oratorical contest is to test the ability of those who participate in it, and not to ascertain their acquaintance with the speeches of others. It is well for the student to remember that integrity is even more important than genius, and infinitely more so than a reputation for genius built upon the ability of others. The possibilities of our language are such that it is not necessary for one person to express himself in the words used by

another, and every mind is so different from every other that a man is hampered rather than aided by trying to say something just as some one else has said it. The object of education is to draw out and develop the mind, and the student will find that it is not only the part of honor, but the part of wisdom as well, to be himself and no one else, in all that he says and does. A speech to be successful must be appropriate to the occasion of its delivery and while the principles set forth may be applicable to other times and other places, the speech itself will not fit into any other occasion. The young man will find it to his advantage to read and digest what others have written, but that which bears his own name should be as distinct from that which he has read as the flesh is distinct from the food out of which it is created.

SENATOR McLAURIN'S BOLT.

The republican papers are making much of the speech recently delivered by Senator McLaurin, of South Carolina, at Charlotte, in that state. And well they may, for it marks the beginning of a movement in the south which will have an influence upon the politics of the nation. It is not likely that Mr. McLaurin will be the leader of the movement because he is handicapped by the fact that he is using his official position to misrepresent the views and interests of his constituents, but some leader will arise to give direction and force to the aristocratic and plutocratic element for which Mr. McLaurin speaks. There is such an element in every community, and now that the race question no longer unifies the white people of the southern states, it will doubtless manifest itself. Then, too, the corporations are increasing in number and magnitude in the south and with their growth will come attempts to secure from the government privileges, favors and immunities. The commercialism which has debauched municipal and state governments in the north will soon be apparent in the south and the senatorial contests which thus far have been comparatively free from scandal south of the Mason and Dixon line will show the handiwork of organized capital.

Senator Tillman has already taken up the gauge of battle thrown down by Senator McLaurin, and will doubtless be able to marshal a considerable majority in that state, but the same influences are

at work in other states where there is greater danger of their success.

Imperialism gives to the plutocrat his opportunity. He can hide behind a pretended patriotism and conceal his mercenary purposes by profuse declamation about the nation's expanding greatness and international obligations. Those who are willing to purchase trade with everybody's blood but their own and who would sell any political or moral principle for a pecuniary consideration rush to defend the administration's Philippine policy.

The democratic sentiment is strong enough to resist and overcome the McLaurin movement but those who believe that the man is more important than the dollar will have to bestir themselves. The corporations are not much on public meetings but they are diligent in securing delegates to conventions. The real democrats, confident of the merits of their cause, often lack organization and are, therefore, at a disadvantage. Their hope lies in a prompt, open and persistent appeal to the voters at the primaries.

A white republican party in the south may bring some compensation in that it is likely to divide the colored vote in the north and answer the argument of those northern republicans who have been able to give no better reason for remaining with their party than that the south was solidly democratic.

TOLSTOI'S NOBLE APPEAL.

Count Tolstoi has done much for humanity. He has been an heroic figure in his time, and although he has been excommunicated by his church and exiled by his country, he will live in history as one of the greatest of men. Tolstoi's most recent notable action was to address a letter to the Czar of Russia in which the great humanitarian made this striking appeal:

Why will you fight with what you can never subdue by force, instead of covering your name with imperishable fame by treading the way of justice? You protect injustice, sire.

Free the peasant from the brutal tyranny of the officials; give him equal rights with other ranks; do away with the present police system, which demoralizes society, degrades the empire and breeds spies and informers. Do away with the restraints on education, so that the road to enlightenment may lie open to all.

Prohibit no man from having his free belief, and let religious persecution cease.

It is indeed strange that the monarch who has taken so pronounced a stand in favor of peace as the Czar of Russia has should neglect the opportunity suggested by Tolstoi. It is strange that this monarch has not exerted himself in the direction of making his own subjects happy. As Tolstoi says, the Czar of Russia has an opportunity to cover himself with imperishable fame if he will but do those things which will best contribute to the happiness of his people. What, indeed, is the prestige of a crown that depends solely upon the sword for its existence? How much greater, how much happier, is the monarch whose authority and power do not depend upon the bayonet, but whose government is supported because of the happiness and the contentment of the people over whom he rules.

AN EXECUTIVE DUTY.

Sometime ago the federal court at New Orleans was asked for an injunction to prevent further shipments of horses and mules to the British troops in South Africa. This judicial proceeding was considered at a meeting of the cabinet, and the dispatches say that the cabinet took the position that the courts have no jurisdiction in matters affecting the international policies of the government. The members of the cabinet agreed that inasmuch as the New Orleans case involved neutrality the judiciary was without jurisdiction, and that the executive should enjoy a monopoly of authority in the premises.

It will occur to a great many people that the administration is very sensitive on any point that may appear to the disadvantage of the British Empire and to the advantage of the South African Republics.

The claim that in such cases the judiciary has no authority is not sound nor in keeping with well settled practice.

During the administration of Benjamin Harrison, while civil war was pending in Chili, the United States Court at San Diego, California, issued a writ for the seizure of a vessel that had been loaded with munitions of war, on the ground that it was engaged in the violation of the neutrality laws. While this vessel was in the custody of a United States Marshal it was forcibly wrested

from his control and put to sea. Our government made a demand upon the Chilian government that this vessel and its cargo be returned to the officers of the court, and this demand was recognized. In his message to Congress, President Harrison, referring to this point, said: "It would have been inconsistent with the dignity and self-respect of this government not to have insisted that the Itata should be returned to San Diego to abide the judgment of the court." Is it not clear here that Benjamin Harrison, who stood high among the lawyers of the country, did not entertain the notion that in the interpretation of the neutrality laws the judiciary was without authority and that the executive alone had jurisdiction?

In the same message President Harrison referred to a trial in the federal court of California which resulted in a decision holding that inasmuch as one of the contestants in a war had not been recognized as a belligerent, the acts done in its interest could not be a violation of our neutrality laws. "From this judgment," said President Harrison, "the United States has appealed that we may know what the present state of our law is; for if this construction of the statute is correct, there is obvious necessity for revision and amendment." If this was a matter of purely executive authority the government would not have appealed. A cabinet meeting would have been held and notice would have been served upon the federal court that in attempting to interpret the laws, the judiciary was trespassing upon the right of the executive branch of the government, a branch which according to old fashioned notions was designed for the execution rather than the interpretation of laws. But President Harrison, it will be observed, said that an appeal was taken "That we may know what the present state of our law is." There we have very clearly stated Benjamin Harrison's idea that when any doubt existed concerning a law, the judiciary must determine it; the judiciary was the branch of government which was to interpret law. But Benjamin Harrison was educated in the old fashioned school of law as well as in the old fashioned school of statesmanship. He had not learned that in this government the executive is the single power before which all other powers must bow. He had not learned that the mandate of men in executive positions is potent irrespective of the equities of the situation.

VII.

GAMBLING, GREAT AND SMALL.

The following press dispatches illustrate the point which **THE COMMONER** desires to make:

LE MARS, IA., April 17.—The Le Mars National bank did not open this morning. Thomas F. Ward, vice-president and manager of the institution, is a self-confessed embezzler to an amount of from \$25,000 to \$30,000. He has also absconded. Ward departed Monday night and yesterday Cashier Frank Koob received a letter from Ward saying:

“DEAR FRANK: I leave to-night for God Almighty knows where. This board of trade business has ruined me. Save me from indictment if you can. I will pay back every cent I can.”

Then the writer explained the funds from which he has been stealing to cover his losses.

VANCOUVER, WASH., April 21.—Crushed by the disgrace of their exposure President Charles Brown and Cashier E. L. Canby of the First National bank, which was closed yesterday, decided to end their troubles in death. As soon as the shortage was discovered Brown and Canby fled. It was believed that they were in hiding somewhere near town, as there had been no train on which they could have left. A posse of angry depositors searched all night for the missing bankers, and if they had been found there might have been a double lynching. But the fugitives spared their victims the trouble of taking their lives.

Soon after daylight this morning a little party of the searchers directed their attention to a clump of woods two miles north of town.

In the center of the wood is a little clearing, and here the man hunt came to an end. Lying on the ground before them the men who had sought their capture saw the dead bodies of Brown and Canby. Both had used the same weapon and Canby had evidently died first, as the revolver was found in Brown's hand. It is evident that Canby put the muzzle of the revolver in his mouth and then blew the top of his head off. Brown then took it and shot himself in exactly the same way, falling over Canby's body.

Friday evening, Canby, upon being told by Bank Examiner J. W. Maxwell that the bank would not be permitted to open Saturday, went out in the yard behind the bank and attempted to shoot

himself. His revolver failed to explode, although all five chambers were loaded. After failing to shoot himself, Canby went back into the bank and he and President Brown left together later, taking his revolver. When Examiner Maxwell confronted the bank officials with the shortage of \$81,000 which he had discovered both men admitted their guilt. It is said that Brown and Canby had been speculating in stocks.

Besides Brown's body there was found a package containing \$25 and a note saying that the money belonged to his daughter. Upon Canby's body the following brief note was found:

"Dear Wife: I feel what I am about to do is for the best. Forgive me if you can and try to live for our dear children. God bless you all. Good-by. NED.

"April 19."

These dispatches, showing how trusted business men were led from the path of honesty to crime, disgrace and, in two cases, death, suggest a contrast.

Ever and anon a crusade against vice is undertaken in New York and other large cities. Attempts are made to close the gambling dens and eloquent sermons are preached in denunciation of games of chance. Sometimes the crusades are led by ministers and there is no question that these ministers would immediately secure the expulsion from their churches of any person convicted of running a gambling place or of frequenting one. This is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough.

Tell one of these crusaders that a young man who has, by the exercise of industry and economy, saved up five hundred dollars, has been enticed into a gambling place and has there lost his little fortune, and no language will be sufficiently severe to condemn the folly of the young man, the crime of the keeper of the house and the wickedness of the officials who permit such an establishment to exist.

But change the details of the picture; tell the crusader that it was a middle aged man instead of a youth, that the amount lost was fifty thousand dollars instead of five hundred, that the speculator used trust money and that the gambling was done on the board of trade or the stock exchange—and what will be the reply? Will the crusader denounce the board of trade and the stock exchange and condemn the officials who permit them to exist? And yet the ordinary games of chance are innocent amusement in comparison with the greater games played where cliques, corners

and false rumors affect the market and drive prices up or down to suit the purpose of those in control.

No one will undertake to defend gambling from a moral or an economic standpoint, but why do the crusaders exhaust their energy upon the petty offenders and remain silent in the presence of big gamblers who, besides bringing ruin to thousands, lend a sort of respectability to schemes for obtaining something for nothing?

The total amount of money lost at the card table, the wheel of fortune and other games which are declared to be illegal is insignificant in comparison with the amount lost in speculation on the boards of trade and stock exchanges. Then, too, in small gambling, the parties to the games and their immediate families are usually the only ones pecuniarily affected, while speculation upon the market injures the producers, consumers and legitimate dealers who try to conduct their business honestly and who themselves do not deal in futures or options.

If the ministers who discourse eloquently on sin in the slums of the cities will arraign the speculating pew holders, they will find it easier to cure the more hideous but less harmful kinds of gambling.

If the educators who have faith in the power of public opinion to remedy evil will endeavor to create a sentiment against gambling in stocks and grain and produce, they will find it easier to prevent gambling among their students. The mania for making a fortune in short order is corrupting society and undermining the business integrity as well as the morality of many communities.

WHEN HARMONY IS POSSIBLE.

There is no word more pleasant to the ear than "harmony"; there is no condition more delightful to contemplate or to enjoy than "harmony"; and there is no phrase more shamefully abused than "harmony."

Just now some men who were formerly democrats are pleading loudly for "harmony" and they offer to deliver their particular and peculiar brand of "harmony" postpaid to any part of the country—west and south preferred. Their promises and guarantees read like the advertisement of a sorceress. "Estranged friends

reconciled, waning love revived, obstacles to reunion removed, lost property found and a happy and prosperous life ensured."—This is but a partial catalogue of the good things held out by the soothsayers who ply their avocation under the guise of re-organizers.

No one should be deceived by this pretended desire for harmony. No process has ever been discovered for welding together into one harmonious party men who differ in conviction and desire the triumph of opposite principles. There can be no difference of opinion among intelligent and honest men as to the basis of real or permanent harmony.

In Webster's dictionary harmony is defined as "concord and agreement in facts, opinions, manners, interests, etc." This is the only foundation upon which useful or enduring harmony can rest.

There was harmony in the democratic party until 1892. In that year Mr. Cleveland ran for president upon a platform which was clear and definite on the tariff question, but ambiguous on the money question. One part of the platform was emphasized in the east and another part in the south, while in the west the democrats were advised by the democratic national committee to vote the populist ticket in order to defeat the republican electors in states where the democrats were known to be in the minority. Following these instructions the democrats helped to carry Kansas, Colorado, Idaho and Nevada for the populist candidates and almost carried the state of Nebraska.

When Mr. Cleveland took his seat he surrounded himself with a cabinet composed of men who, on the money question, dissented from the views of the majority of the democrats who voted for him. Instead of calling Congress together to consider the tariff question which had been made the paramount issue and about which nearly all democrats agreed, he waited until summer and then convened Congress in extraordinary session to consider a financial measure proposed by Senator John Sherman a year before. This measure was forced through Congress by a disgraceful use of patronage, and received the support of a larger percentage of the republican congressmen. Soon afterwards a bill was passed to coin the seigniorage—a bill which was supported by a majority of the democrats and opposed by a majority of the republicans. Mr. Cleveland vetoed this bill at the demand of New York financiers.

A little later he made a contract with the Rothschild-Morgan

syndicate for the sale of gold bonds and then asked Congress to ratify the contract, but a democratic congress refused to do it. Then came the election of 1894 which gave the republicans a majority of over one hundred and forty in Congress. To understand the change which took place in two years (and that, too, before the party standard was placed "in unfamiliar hands," as Mr. Cleveland would say) it is only necessary to remember that the democrats had a majority of ninety-two in the preceding Congress. In this new Congress, elected in '94, New York had only six democrats, Pennsylvania two, Ohio two, Illinois one, and Indiana none.

At that election the republicans carried eleven of the fifteen districts of Missouri and Mr. Hill was defeated for Governor in New York by 156,108.

Of the twenty-nine senators whose terms began the following March eighteen were republicans, ten were democrats and one a populist.

In the spring of 1895 it became apparent that the next national convention would have to deal with the money question. On April 13, Mr. Cleveland wrote a letter to a Sound Money League in Chicago defending his own financial views and opposing those which he knew to be entertained by a majority of his party. Near the conclusion of the letter he said: "Disguise it as we may, the line of battle is drawn between the forces of safe currency and those of silver monometallism." The following month, Mr. Carlisle, then secretary of the treasury, went to Memphis and attempted to organize the southern democracy in support of the president's position.

In June of that year the democrats who favored bimetallism sent delegates to a meeting at Memphis and at that meeting the national Silver Committee was appointed. Then followed a contest of a year's duration between the gold element on the one side, led by the administration and supported by the banks, railroads and most of the daily papers, and on the other side the bimetallic element, led by the silver committee. The battle was fought out at the primaries and the administration, in spite of its powerful allies, lost.

When the convention met, about two-thirds of the delegates were under instructions to vote for a platform favoring the free coinage of gold and silver at sixteen to one, and yet, notwithstanding this well-known fact, the administration forces, under

the direction of Mr. Whitney, tried to induce the delegates to violate their instructions and betray their constituents.

The minority opposed the money plank of the platform and offered a substitute favoring international bimetallism. A few weeks later the same men met at Indianapolis and, forgetting all about international bimetallism, declared for the gold standard and nominated a separate ticket. Then forgetting all about the ticket which they had nominated, they for the most part voted the republican ticket. During the campaign every conceivable fraud was resorted to. Wherever a republican court would aid them (as in Nebraska) they had the bolting electors put on the ticket as "democrats" to deceive the voters.

The Palmer and Buckner ticket carried just one precinct in the United States, and yet the men who put that ticket in the field volunteer as leaders of the democratic party and promise to win a glorious victory.

They do not seem to think it necessary to discuss the principles which the platform shall contain or to suggest any remedy for existing ills.

When the election of 1896 was over, the leading gold democrats of the nation met at the Waldorf Hotel, boasted of their opposition to the democratic ticket and claimed credit for the election of a republican president.

After four years of republican administration, marked by high tariff legislation which the gold democrats always professed to abhor, marked by trust domination which the gold democrats always pretended to dislike and characterized by imperialistic tendencies against which the leading gold democrats loudly protested, another national campaign was fought. Some of the men who left the party in '96 returned in 1900, and were warmly welcomed, but a majority of the prominent gold democrats supported the republican ticket again last year, proving either that they regard the money question as more important than industrial independence, which is attacked by the trust, and the declaration of independence, which is attacked by imperialism, or else that the same principles which led them to support the financial policy of the republican party also led them to support the other policies of that party,

The election of 1900 resulted in a second defeat more pro-

nounced than that of 1896, but not as overwhelming as the defeat of 1894.

Now the men who were responsible for two national defeats are talking about harmony and offering to guarantee success, provided the party will follow the instructions which they give. And what are the conditions?

First, That the party shall abandon the doctrines set forth in the platform of 1896, reaffirmed by nearly every democratic state convention in 1900, and reiterated by the national convention of that year.

Second, That it shall drive away the populists and silver republicans who came to the support of the democratic ticket when the gold democrats went over to the enemy.

These conditions are impossible ones. The men who make these demands would not feel at home in any democratic party worthy of the name, and they would not only drive democrats out of the party, but would repel allies and keep young men with democratic inclination from coming into the party. Whether circumstances reduce or increase the importance of the silver question, the same principles are involved in other phases of the money question, in the question of monopoly and, in fact, in all the other questions now before the country.

The harmonizing of personal differences is an easy matter.

Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Hill were thought to be personal enemies, but the money question brought them together, and at the Chicago convention the latter offered the resolution endorsing the administration of the former. Mr. Hanna and Mr. Foraker are supposed to be personally unfriendly, but they act together when the roll is called. The harmonizing of radical differences of opinion between conscientious men is, however, more difficult.

Reconciliation between the two elements of the democratic party must be brought about, if at all, in one of two ways: First, by such a change of opinion in either element as will produce "concord or agreement."

The minority denies that it has changed and there is no evidence of change in the majority.

Second, the two elements might be brought together by some question of sufficient importance to overshadow the questions about which they differ. But in such case the platform must represent the views of the majority on minor questions. When

the gold democrats supported the republican ticket in '96 they did so on account of the money question and were willing to overlook the tariff plank in the republican platform. So, in 1900, some of the most loyal and earnest supporters of the democratic ticket were republicans who were opposed to imperialism and who were willing to overlook differences on minor questions.

The struggle between plutocracy and democracy must be fought out, and the democratic party must take one side or the other. There is no middle ground. If those who have opposed the party in recent years are willing to take the democratic side in this fight there will be no difficulty in "getting together" and there will be no lack of harmony. If, however, the men who have been voting the republican ticket expect to come back and convert the democratic party into a plutocratic party, to be run along republican lines and according to republican methods, they will have to announce their platform and make the issue at the primaries. The six million and more voters who supported the ticket will not be led into the republican party without a struggle. There is no sense in inviting an opponent into your house to see which can put the other out, and those who remain faithful have a right to know whether the re-organizers come as friends or as enemies.

The objection to the re-organizers is not based so much upon what they have done as upon what they are doing and propose to do, if they obtain control of the party.

BRAVO! JUDGE THOMPSON.

On another page will be found a synopsis of the opinion delivered by Judge Owen P. Thompson, of Jacksonville, Ill., in the suit brought at Springfield, against the state board of equalization to compel the assessment of some Chicago corporations which were almost entirely escaping taxation. Enough of the opinion is given to show the facts as they were brought out at the trial, the conduct of respondents and the reasoning upon which the decision was based.

It was fortunate for the tax-payers of Chicago that the case was tried before a brave and honest judge, one who could not be awed or influenced by the great corporations which were shirk-

ing their duty, and throwing upon others the burdens which they themselves ought to bear. It is to be hoped that the daily papers which report with fidelity the small stealings by obscure persons will give due attention to this suit which involves \$235,000,000 withheld from assessment by well-known corporations.

Solomon Simon seems to have been the only member of the Board of Equalization who tried to protect the plain every-day citizens.

Long life and health to Judge Thompson and Solomon Simon!

ROOSEVELT ON DUTY.

The Vice-President delivered a speech a few nights ago before the Home Market Club of Boston. A perusal of his remarks convinces one that he shares with the President the tendency to apply the term "duty" to those things which he desires. He says:

For good or for evil we now find ourselves with new DUTIES in the West Indies and new DUTIES beyond the Pacific. We cannot escape the performance of these DUTIES. All we can decide for ourselves is whether we shall do them well or ill.

The fact that these "duties" were self-imposed and are clung to in spite of the fact that they involve a violation of American principles, cuts no figure. It is all in the definition of duty. According to republican logic it is very wrong to steal unless you find something which is very valuable—then larceny becomes a duty. The fact that you may be compelled to take human life in order to get the thing desired is immaterial—call it duty and sin becomes a virtue.

A little later on in his speech the real secret of the Philippine policy leaks out. Mr. Roosevelt says:

In developing these islands it is well to keep steadily in mind that business is one of the great levers of civilization. It is immensely to the interest of the people of the islands that their resources should be developed, and therefore it is to their interest even more than to ours that our citizens should develop their industries. The further fact that it is our duty to see that the development takes place under conditions so carefully guarded that no wrong may come to the islanders, must not blind us to the first great fact, which is the need of development.

The reasoning is complete. Business is a civilizer; the Filipinos need civilizing, and we are nothing if not business-like. Therefore, it is to the interest of the Filipinos that we should develop them for their good. This is strenuous life, and lest some might be restrained by conscientious scruples, the Vice-President felt it necessary to impress upon his hearers that "the first great fact" is the "need of development." The "duty to see that the development takes place under conditions so carefully guarded that no wrong may come to the islanders" is simply a "further fact"—not "the first great fact"—and, "must not bind us" to the principal thing—"the need of development."

Nowhere does Mr. Roosevelt discuss the effect of the new policy upon our theory of government; nowhere does he attempt to explain why a colonial system was wrong in 1776 and right now. His whole argument can be summed up as follows: We are in the Philippine Islands—no matter how we got there, we are there; whether there for good or evil, we cannot get away; it looks as if it were providential for them—and, besides, there is money in it for us.

WATTERSON'S DEFINITION.

Mr. Watterson, in a lengthy editorial in the *Courier-Journal* entitled "The Dream of the Dreamer," fixes, so far as he has power to do so, the status of the editor of THE COMMONER.

Quoting from THE COMMONER'S editorial of three weeks ago he says:

In these extracts Mr. Bryan shows himself not as a party leader, but as a moral philosopher. They in turn disclose the difference which exists, and has always existed, between fact and theory as illustrated by the conduct of men and the movement of the world. To lay down principles is easy enough. Any man can sit in his watch-tower by the margin of the sea and descant upon the rules of navigation. The mariner tossed by the raging billows applies himself to the needs of the moment, the state of his steering gear, the leaks in his hold, the character of his cargo, the condition of his crew, the weather and the points both of the compass and his destination. Yet navigation is said to be an exact science, whilst government, if a science at all, is least exact of all others; a bundle of quiddities, referable to the passions of some, the interests of others, the ignorance of all; intensely, ex-

clusively practical, the very sport and prey of the accidents of fortune.

He is no statesman who has not learned to detach his policies from his visions. He is no statesman who has not emancipated himself from that which for want of a better name dreamers call the ideal. He is no statesman who does not apply his means to his ends, going fast or slow as occasion requires, but making no mistake in reading the riddle of the time, in deciphering the mathematics of the moment, in translating the spirit and temper of the people.

Mr. Bryan, let us repeat, is a moral philosopher—not a statesman.

I would feel more overwhelmed by this crushing condemnation but for the fact that Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin also come in for their share of the censure. Their principles are swept aside as “generalities” when they attempt to hold nations to the same code of ethics which they apply to individuals. Mr. Watterson says that he will not stop “to gainsay or dispute” these generalities.

He apparently admits the correctness of the principles laid down by the opponents of imperialism, but argues that the nation is at liberty to disregard them. The difference between the honest man and the dishonest one is not generally a difference in principles—for nearly all men admit the truth when it is stated in the abstract—but the difference is that the former applies his principles to every-day life, while the latter, in the hour of temptation, waives them aside as generalities and then tries to lay upon his environment the responsibility for his sins.

Mr. Watterson’s definition of statesmanship is that it is the art of detaching one’s policies from his visions or, to speak more plainly, the art of ignoring moral principles whenever it is popular or profitable to do so. Fortunately this definition has never been—and let us hope never will be—generally accepted. The statesman must have ideals, for without them he cannot appeal to the hearts of men; and he must follow his ideals, for unless he does he cannot long retain the confidence of the people. The politician may “run with the hare and hunt with the hounds,” but in the former case he is apt to be caught and in the latter case he earns a dog’s reputation.

Mr. Watterson’s illustrations are as unfortunate as his logic, as the following will show :

Mr. Jefferson allowed no theory to stand between him and the purchase of Louisiana, though in making the purchase he had to cross his own tracks. Mr. Lincoln allowed no constitutional scruple to stand between him and emancipation, though, being a conscience Whig, to save his conscience, he issued the proclamation as a war measure.

There was no moral principle involved in the acquisition of the Louisiana Territory. Jefferson doubted whether the letter of the constitution permitted it, but having an opportunity to purchase it, not for the exploitation of a colony but as an integral part of a republic, he did so expecting to ask for a constitutional amendment approving of it.

The act, however, was so universally commended and the opinion that the act was constitutional was so general that no effort was made to amend the constitution.

Lincoln was always opposed to slavery. While he believed that slavery should be protected where it existed under the Constitution, he never attempted to conceal his opinion as to the moral question involved, and he justified his emancipation proclamation as the taking of property is always justified in time of war. Neither Jefferson nor Lincoln "detached his policies from his visions" or justified what he regarded as morally wrong on the ground that he was swept along by an irresistible force.

Imperialism is not a transient question; it is an organic disease and attacks the vital principles of the republic. The permanent retention of the Philippine Islands necessitates one of two courses. First, we can admit the Filipinos to citizenship and allow them to share with us in shaping the destiny of "The United States of America and Asia," but no considerable portion of our people favors this plan. Second, we can treat the Filipinos as subjects and give them, not such a government as we have but such a government as we think they ought to have, shooting such as interpose an objection. This is the plan which the republican party is now developing.

Buckle said that the English could not defend the war against the colonies without asserting principles which, if carried out, would have destroyed English liberty. So, to-day, the democratic party cannot defend the administration's policy in the Philippines without asserting principles which, if carried out, will destroy liberty in the United States.

The commandment thou shalt not steal, cannot be qualified so as to admit of the stealing of islands or so moderated as to excuse larceny when committed by a large nation against a small one; neither can the principles which underlie our government be so construed as to sanction a government founded on force or "taxation without representation." For more than a century our nation has been travelling upward and toward the light. Its history, its traditions and its songs have breathed the spirit of liberty and have been an inspiration to the oppressed in every quarter of the globe. The democratic party has raised its voice in behalf of human rights and blood bought blessings. It will not abandon its ideas; it will not detach its policies from its visions; it will not adopt an "anything to win" policy; it will not begin bellowing at the scent of blood.

VIRGINIA'S TEMPTATION.

Virginia seems likely to have a spirited contest over a proposed section in her new constitution restricting the appropriation for the education of the negroes. The plan suggested, and strange to say it has received considerable support, is to provide that the appropriation for negro schools shall be in proportion to the taxes paid by the colored people.

The *Richmond Times* denounces the scheme in the following language:

The state will cruelly have neglected its duty if it give to the white children the means of primary education, and withhold it from the children that are black. Nor do we believe that the people of Virginia are willing that this cruel thing be done.

Senator Daniels in a letter recently published says:

Primary education ought to be free to all. With the three R's open to everybody they have the keys that unlock the book of knowledge, and it is their own fault or peculiar misfortune if they do not then work out their own salvation. You will observe that I speak of primary education. I do so because I think much of education has been wasted, and there is ample room for improvement and reform without disturbing the foundations of education and denying to any one primary opportunities. * * * Our own people are liberal by nature and history, and there was never a time when they could better afford to be liberal by interest. Every

southern state and every border state has had a constitutional convention, and some of them two constitutional conventions since Virginia's last one, in 1867. All of these states have had racial questions to deal with, and some of them were stirred to the highest pitch of indignation by the atrocities of carpet-bag government. Yet in no one of them has any such radical move as the partition of school funds by severe racial lines ever found favor. This is a most significant fact. It shows the concurrent opinion of all commonwealths similarly situated to ours that no such step is advisable. We would isolate ourselves by taking it and chill the temper of reform.

The question raised is one of very serious importance—of far greater importance than the educational qualification which has been adopted in some of the states. An educational qualification, however objectionable it may seem at the time, is only a temporary barrier, for with a proper school system the franchise is soon within the reach of all; but to disfranchise the negro by an educational qualification and then deny him the means of getting an education, is a much more serious matter.

While it may seem a hardship for the white people to bear so large a share as they do of the expenses of instruction for colored children, they find some recompense in the fact that they own a large share of the taxable property. In no state of the union is there an attempt to make each family or class pay for its own education. In every community the expense of public schools is paid by general taxation.

Very often large taxpayers have few children or none at all, but they are compelled to contribute to the support of schools because every citizen of a community is interested in the education of all the members of the community. Life and property are more secure and existence more tolerable in proportion as the people are developed in mind and character.

If the people of Virginia are short sighted enough to yield to the temptation and abandon their efforts to educate the black people among them, they will pay a terrible penalty in being compelled to live among people brutalized by ignorance. The amount of money saved would be a small return for the peril which they would bring upon themselves and their children. Jefferson, whose dust makes sacred the soil of Monticello, was a firm believer in a common school system which would place the advantages of education within the reach of every child. Surely

Virginia, the home of Jefferson, will not be the first state to enter upon a restrictive policy which would condemn a portion of the people to enforced illiteracy.

THE PASS IN COURT.

During the recent session of the Nebraska Legislature two bills relating to railroad passes were introduced in the House of Representatives and favorably reported, but were not considered. The following extracts present the parts germane to the present discussion. H. R. No. 430: "A judge or justice is disqualified from acting as such except by mutual consent of parties, in any case wherein he is a party or interested * * * or when he shall have received or used free transportation, or transportation at less than the established or usual rate of price, or had the promise of the same in any form for his person or property, from any railroad company or over or upon any railroad or any such transportation within the time aforesaid, shall have been, directly or indirectly requested by him for himself or for any other person or property, and such mutual consent must be in writing and made a part of the record."

H. R. No. 428: "It shall be sufficient cause of challenge of a petit juror that he lacks any one of the qualifications mentioned in section two (2) of this act * * * or that he has served as a juror on the trial of a cause in any court of record in the county within one year previous to the time of his being offered as a juror; or that within such time he shall have received or used free transportation, or transportation at less than the established or usual rate or price, or had the promise of the same in any form for his person or property, from any railroad company, or over or upon any railroad, or any such transportation within the time aforesaid shall have been directly or indirectly requested by him for himself or for any other person or property."

Judge Munger of the United States Court for the District of Nebraska has recently held it cause for challenge in a suit to which a railroad was a party that a juror after he was drawn and summoned asked and received from such railroad a pass.

The principles embodied in the bills quoted from and the rule

laid down by Judge Munger are undoubtedly sound. That a pass has a pecuniary value is recognized by both the donor and the donee, and that a pass may have an influence upon the mind and decision of a juror or judge is understood by the railroad if not by the recipient of the pass. Corporations do not give away things of value without expecting a return in some form, and they would not continue to give passes unless they felt that this expectation had been realized in the past.

The parties to a suit are entitled to a fair and impartial trial, and a trial cannot be fair or impartial if the judge or a juror is under pecuniary obligations to one of the parties to the suit. As long as men can be influenced by "zeal born of benefits received and fostered by the hope of favors yet to come," as Mr. Cleveland once felicitously expressed it, they will be tempted to lean toward the side from which the benefit comes. It cannot be stated as an universal or invariable rule that a pass is a bribe, nor can it be said that it always influences the person who receives it, but until a passometer is invented which will measure the influence of free transportation upon the judicial mind, the only safe plan is to prohibit the use of passes by those who are to decide controversies to which a railroad is a party. If a judge is required to travel in the discharge of official duties his expenses are provided for; if he has occasion to travel on private business he can better afford to buy a ticket than the average man. If any one will observe he will find that those who need free transportation most are unable to secure it, and that those best able to pay their fare are the ones who have the influence necessary to secure passes.

CRIMINAL SPECULATION.

If a crime is defined as an act the doing of which is prohibited by law, stock speculation cannot be considered criminal, but when the word crime is used in its broader sense to describe an act which offends against morality or the public welfare, it certainly includes that species of gambling upon the market which endangers the community as well as injures the participants. A record of Wall Street's doings for the last week is an indictment against our boasted civilization. That such transactions are allowed is as much a reflection upon the intelligence of the country as it is upon the

conscience of the people. It is little less than amazing that a few men should be permitted to corner the market for their own selfish purposes, beat down the price of one stock and boom the price of another stock, demoralizing business and jeopardizing the interests of all classes of society. It is reported that the slump in stocks amounted to seven hundred millions in value, and that the New York banks had to put up nearly twenty millions of dollars to prevent a panic. How will the historian describe an age in which a petty thief is severely punished while great criminals go unwhipped? It often takes an object lesson to arouse the people to the evils of a bad system and the recent fluctuations in the stock market, costly as they have been, will be cheap if they lead to legislation which will put an end to stock gambling, erroneously described as "business."

CORPORATIONS ENTER PARLIAMENT.

From London dispatches it would seem that corporation influence is manifesting itself in the English parliament. The following is in point:

The discussion in the house of commons to-day of a private bill conferring additional powers on the London & Northwestern railway led to a great deal of acrimonious recrimination. John Burns, who, with the opposition generally, opposed the measure, was called to order by the speaker for stigmatizing some of the railroad representatives in the house as "ornamental guinea pigs." Mr. Burns' special reference was to Mr. Macartney, who was elected a director of the London & Northwestern railroad after having been appointed financial secretary to the admiralty.

The bill was finally rejected by a vote of 210 to 202, amid prolonged cheering.

Mr. Swift MacNeill, a liberal member, entered a protest against Mr. Macartney's vote in favor of the bill on the ground that he was pecuniarily interested. Mr. Macartney's right to vote was defended on the ground of precedent, Mr. Balfour going to his rescue. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and John Dillon advocated a rule prohibiting directors of corporations from voting under such circumstances. Mr. Kier-Hardie said that the House ought to adopt a higher standard of purity and declared that there

was a strong feeling in the country "that the House was becoming more and more corrupt financially." He declared that the "working people regarded the House as an annex to the stock exchange."

All this goes to show that corporate influence is making itself felt on the other side of the Atlantic and that there, as here, it is being exerted in behalf of privileges and favors antagonistic to the interests of the common people. It also shows that those who are under corporation influence lose all sense of propriety and insist upon voting upon questions in which they are pecuniarily interested.

MOTION, NOT PROGRESS.

A republican reader of *THE COMMONER*—and *THE COMMONER* is glad to have republican readers—complains because this paper refers with approval to the principles of Jefferson, Jackson, and Monroe and condemns the principles set forth by the republican party of to-day.

The reader referred to objects to the prevalent practice of "ransacking antiquated centuries to find a suitable standard for present day actions." He says: "All the nations are moving forward in conformity with the growth of knowledge, the birth of new thought, and the expansion of ideas; and it is neither wise, intelligent, nor patriotic to condemn progressive men and advanced measures."

The difficulty with this republican reader is that he fails to distinguish between motion and progress. Motion is change of place; progress is movement forward. He fails to distinguish between growth and inflammation. The republican party is not making progress; it is in motion, but the motion is backward instead of forward. The doctrines which it now advocates are not new; they are as old as history. Imperialism is not an invention of modern origin; it is ancient. It rests upon the doctrine of brute force, and force was the foundation of empires in the past and is the foundation of the monarchies of the old world to-day.

Cain was the first man to act upon the imperialistic idea. He killed his brother and wore the brand of a murderer forever afterward. Imperialism has been killing ever since. It disregards human rights and moral principles. The fact that a nation instead of an individual commits a wrong does not change the character

of the act; neither does the fact that punishment is delayed justify us in believing that it can be avoided. There is only one sound rule, namely, that every violation of human rights will bring its punishment—if a great many join in the violation, the punishment will be greater when it comes.

The principles of Jefferson, Monroe and Jackson are referred to because they were sound principles at the time they were applied, and they are still sound. They can be forgotten, they can be ignored, they can be trampled upon, but their truth cannot be destroyed.

THE RATIFICATION OF THE TREATY.

A reader of *THE COMMONER* has called attention to the fact that republicans try to shirk responsibility for an imperial policy by saying that I advised the ratification of the treaty. He asks that I state the reasons which led me to favor ratification.

In a speech delivered at Indianapolis, August 8, 1900, accepting the democratic nomination, I took occasion to discuss this matter, the following being an extract from that speech:

When the President finally laid before the senate a treaty which recognized the independence of Cuba, but provided for the cession of the Philippine Islands to the United States, the menace of imperialism became so apparent that many preferred to reject the treaty and risk the ills that might follow rather than take the chance of correcting the errors of the treaty by the independent action of this country.

I was among the number of those who believed it better to ratify the treaty and end the war, release the volunteers, remove the excuse for war expenditures and then give the Filipinos the independence which might be forced from Spain by a new treaty.

In view of the criticism which my action aroused in some quarters, I take this occasion to restate the reasons given at that time. I thought it safer to trust the American people to give independence to the Filipinos than to trust the accomplishment of that purpose to diplomacy with an unfriendly nation.

Lincoln embodied an argument in the question when he asked, "Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws?" I believe that we are now in a better position to wage a successful contest against imperialism than we would have been had the treaty been rejected. With the treaty ratified a clean-cut issue is presented between a government by consent and a government

by force, and imperialists must bear the responsibility for all that happens until the question is settled.

If the treaty had been rejected the opponents of imperialism would have been held responsible for any international complications which might have arisen before the ratification of another treaty. But whatever difference of opinion may have existed as to the best method of opposing a colonial policy, there never was any difference as to the great importance of the question and there is no difference now as to the course to be pursued.

The title of Spain being extinguished we were at liberty to deal with the Filipinos according to American principles. The Bacon resolution, introduced a month before hostilities broke out at Manila, promised independence to the Filipinos on the same terms that it was promised to the Cubans. I supported this resolution and believe that its adoption prior to the breaking out of hostilities would have prevented bloodshed, and that its adoption at any subsequent time would have ended hostilities.

If the treaty had been rejected considerable time would have necessarily elapsed before a new treaty could have been agreed upon and ratified, and during that time the question would have been agitating the public mind. If the Bacon resolution had been adopted by the senate and carried out by the President, either at the time of the ratification of the treaty or at any time afterwards, it would have taken the question of imperialism out of politics and left the American people free to deal with their domestic problems. But the resolution was defeated by the vote of the republican vice-president, and from that time to this a republican congress has refused to take any action whatever in the matter.

While the treaty was pending in the senate, and about two months before the vote was taken upon it, I wrote an article for the *New York Journal*, giving reasons in support of the proposition to ratify the treaty and declare the policy of the government by resolution. This article will be found on another page of this issue.

The ratification of the treaty in no way committed this nation to an imperial policy. It simply terminated Spanish authority and left the United States free to deal with the islands according to American principles. The Bacon resolution, which declared it to be the purpose of the United States to establish a stable government, which, when established, was to be turned over to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, was a tie vote in the senate, and was only defeated by the vote of the vice-president. As the treaty required a two-thirds vote for its ratification, it is

evident that one-fourth of those who voted to ratify did so with the understanding that the question remained an open one.

Senator Wellington of Maryland voted for the ratification of the treaty, and in a speech delivered last fall he stated that he so voted because the President promised him that the Philippine Islands would not be held permanently. If the ratification of the treaty had necessarily committed this country to an imperialistic policy, then all who opposed imperialism would have been justified in opposing it, aye, even compelled to oppose, the treaty. But as ratification did not commit the nation to an imperialistic policy, the only question the senate had to consider was how best to correct the errors in the treaty.

The payment of twenty millions of dollars to Spain did not obligate this country to enter upon a colonial policy. It could have been recovered from the Filipinos in return for independence, and if not recovered, it was a small contribution to the extension of liberty. We had by one act of Congress appropriated fifty millions of dollars to secure independence for the Cubans who numbered less than two millions, could we not spare two-fifths of the sum to bring liberty to five times as many in the Philippines?

The treaty should have provided for the independence of the Filipinos as it provided for the independence of the Cubans, but when the treaty, by an inexcusable error, provided for cession instead of independence it was easier to ratify the treaty, extinguish the title of Spain, and confer independence upon the Filipinos than to continue the war and risk international complications by an effort to compel Spain to do what we could do ourselves.

Our treaty with Spain, according to international law, imposed upon us no obligations to change our form of government or to abandon our ideals in order to enforce an imperialistic doctrine. It is still possible for this nation to return to American methods. All it has to do is to announce its purpose to deal with the Filipinos in accordance with the principles set forth in the declaration of independence and then keep its promise. Why does it not do this? Because the republicans think that oriental trade is more important than American principles.

VIII.

PLUTOCRACY IN EDUCATION.

Unfortunately the tendency of a principle to expand until it pervades every sphere of human thought and activity is not confined to good principles. The idea of liberty, based upon the doctrine that all men are created equal, has for more than a century been manifesting itself in government, in society and in church organizations, and it has tended to ennoble man and to exalt human rights. But the opposite doctrine has not been entirely dormant. Just now the plutocratic idea is very active. The tyranny of organized wealth in industry is sure to be followed by an increasing influence of money in government, society and the church. Everything will be colored to a greater or less extent by the theory that money is the one thing of overshadowing importance.

The commencement period, when schools are closing and graduating classes are occupying public attention, is a good time to consider the influence of plutocracy upon education. Fortunately Mr. Charles Schwab, the million-dollar-a-year president of the steel trust, has spoken so plainly on the subject that little room is left for conjecture or speculation. In speaking to a class at an evening school in New York a few nights ago, he said:

Let me advise you all to make an early start in life. The boy with the manual training and the common school education who can start in life at sixteen or seventeen can leave the boy who goes to college till he is twenty or more so far behind in the race that he can never catch up. This, however, does not apply to the professional life. The other day I was at a gathering of some forty business men—men in industrial and manufacturing business—and the question arose as to how many were college-bred men. Of the forty only two had been graduated from college, and the rest of the party, thirty-eight in number, had received only common school educations and had started in life as poor boys. So I say, as parting advice, start early.

This is the advice given by the best paid employe in the United States—the advice given by a man who receives a salary twenty times as great as that paid to the president of the United States,

one hundred times as great as the salary paid to a justice of the Supreme Court, two hundred times as great as the salary paid to senators and representatives and more than a thousand times as great as the average salary paid to ministers and school teachers. His advice shows that he misconceives the main purpose of education, and values going to school only as it enables the student to get ahead of some one in the business world.

The principal value of education lies in the fact that it disciplines the mind, enlarges the mental horizon and enables one to view men and things in their proper relations. Education is intended to make a citizen useful to his country as well as successful. It makes its possessor the heir of the ages and enables him to judge of the future by the experience of the past. If a boy is taken out of school at the age of sixteen or seventeen and put to work "making a fortune," he is never likely to have time to study history or political economy and will be apt to accept without question the opinions of those who are a little ahead of him in the race for wealth—opinions which are in turn received from those still farther ahead.

Plutocracy boasts that it is practical; it has no ideals, for an ideal is looked up to, while plutocracy has its face to the ground.

Mr. Schwab's advice will do infinite damage to the young men of the country, but it ought to awaken the thoughtful to the tendencies of commercialism. If we are to have the oppression of a trust system at home and the despotism of an imperial policy abroad, we must expect to see education dwarfed, social intercourse debased and religion materialized.

THE EFFECT OF DIET.

It is reported from Havana that the Cuban commissioners upon their return gave a detailed account of their trip to Washington, including the social attention shown them. Some objection was made to the recording of the entertainment part of the report, but the objection was very properly over-ruled.

The republican leaders have expert knowledge on the effect of diet. In the campaign of 1900 they addressed their arguments to the stomach rather than to the head or heart. They insisted that a full meal was the summit of human hope and their theory

exhibited some signs of popularity. History testifies to the mollifying effect of food distributed to the poor in the days when plutocracy was destroying the glory of the Roman empire. If the Cuban commissioners were won over to the Platt amendment at the banquet table, it is only fair that this new evidence of the potency of pleasant viands should be preserved in the Cuban archives. If they swallowed their objections to foreign interference and washed them down with wine the fact should be properly authenticated.

There are those who insist that the disposition can be changed by diet and much evidence can be adduced in support of the proposition. Many a man has visited Washington with a disposition to serve his constituents and has found that disposition gradually changed by a diet of champagne and terrapin.

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG SPEECH.

As the survivors of the Mexican, civil and other wars prepare for the solemn services of Memorial day they will find both pleasure and profit in re-reading Lincoln's Gettysburg speech. To the veteran it is an expression of lofty patriotism, to the student of oratory it is a model of brevity, beauty, simplicity and strength, and to all it is an inspiration:

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which

they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

At no time within the past quarter of a century has there been more necessity than there is now for the lovers of liberty to exert themselves to preserve "a government of the people by the people and for the people."

MR. WATTERSON'S CARTOON.

Editor Watterson of the *Courier-Journal* has devoted so much space to me that no apology is necessary for another comment upon his views.

Relying upon his age, experience and more extended observation, he has on several occasions outlined what he regards as the proper course for me to pursue. Without questioning his good intent or his wisdom on subjects in general, I find it impossible to follow his advice without abandoning all that I have been taught to hold sacred. In the first editorial on this subject Mr. Watterson's position was criticised as an immoral one. The editorials with which he has attempted to support his position have more and more clearly demonstrated the weakness of his argument.

No advocate of imperialism has placed his defense upon lower ground. No one who has attempted to defend the administration has shown more complete disregard for the principles and motives that should actuate men, parties and nations. He says:

In abandoning them (the Philippines) we yield our vantage ground in the far East, which is already become the center of the strife of the powers for commercial supremacy. We make what the world and the ages will hold an ignominious and a short-sighted surrender; for we are entering upon a cycle of pure commercialism, whose end will witness the survival of the fittest, and since when was any spirited people insensible either to money or empire? Wrong, morally wrong, says Mr. Bryan? Why, on that line, all effort, which has gain for its object is wrong. Out of line with American traditions, says Mr. Bryan? Why, every important movement from the Louisiana purchase to the abolition of slavery, might be so described. But, right or wrong, facts; and, as an organized body, what shall the democratic party do about them?

This is Mr. Watterson's argument. He first assumes that we are entering "upon a cycle of pure commercialism." Second, he assumes that it is impossible to combat this spirit and, third, he argues that (assuming his two prophecies to be true) it is better for the democratic party to do wrong and prosper than to do right and suffer. He attempts to disclose what is destiny, and then criticises those who refuse to accept him as an ordained prophet. All through Mr. Watterson's argument runs the theory that wrong is not wrong if it is successful, and that right is not right if it fails. His argument ignores entirely the fixed moral principles which should guide the individual, the party and the nation, and he also ignores the fact that retribution always follows wrongdoing.

He tells me how I can be a Warwick, if not a king. He does me scant honor when he assumes that I am willing to purchase either position at the expense of moral or political principles.

It is not my present purpose, however, to discuss his views, for when two men differ as to a moral question, argumentation is of little value. Morals are matters of heart rather than of head. If argument would keep men from stealing or from taking human life, there would be neither larceny nor murder, but when a man really wants to steal or to kill, or, to apply the principles to the present case, wants nothing but immediate victory, and cares not for the necessary but remote consequences, the case is almost hopeless.

The object of this editorial is to call attention to a picture which illustrates Mr. Watterson's views better than his pen or mine can do. *Judge*, the illustrated paper, asked Mr. Watterson to suggest an idea for a cartoon. In reply he wrote: "Draw a picture of baby Jonathan in his cradle asleep. About him are his playthings—a toy kettle drum, marked 'Independence,' a toy cannon marked 'Freedom,' and dangling by a string from his clutched hand a child's balloon, marked 'The Future.' Above him hover the spirits of Washington and Franklin. Beyond, in the clouds, a vision of domes and spires, spanned by a rainbow of red, white and blue. Beneath, the words out of the old song, 'Asleep, I Dream of Love.'

"Draw another picture of a richly furnished apartment and a party at a card table; England and Germany at the right and

left of Uncle Sam, who, with calm self-confidence sits in a rocker. Russia, France, China and Japan ranged about. Some exposed cards, marked 'Peace,' 'Order,' 'Religion,' 'Humanity.' Behind Uncle Sam on the wall appear portraits of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln, and on the floor a great mastiff, eager and alert and ready to spring, marked 'Popular sovereignty.' Beneath this portrait Uncle Sam is made to say 'Gentlemen, I bank this game.' Under the first picture write 1801, under the other 1901."

By the kind permission of *Judge* this cartoon was reproduced and the reader will note that *Judge's* artist has faithfully carried out Mr. Watterson's instructions. It would be difficult to illustrate more forcibly the change that has taken place within the last two years. It is hard to conceive of a more scathing condemnation of the innovation wrought by the republican administration. From the child dreaming of love to the successful gambler is a transition, indeed! The remarkable thing about it all is that men who, like Mr. Watterson, recognize the change, should attempt to defend it or should counsel democrats to accept it as final. The question that must occur to every reader is: Is this change necessary? And if not necessary, why should it be submitted to as a matter of destiny? Is freedom only a toy cannon, and independence a noisy drum? Is there no other future for baby Jonathan than the career of a fortunate gambler? Is it not possible to conceive of a republic developing and expanding without the abandonment of ideals or principles?

This doctrine, that virtue and morality are good enough for a child but out of place in a man is a monstrous one, and one unworthy of the great brain and big heart of the man who seems to have fallen into the advocacy of it. It is impossible to exaggerate the demoralizing influence of such a doctrine; it paralyzes all attempts to instruct or restrain youth. When you say to a young man that a nation when full grown must throw off restraint, ignore well-settled principles, and plunge into the exciting but uncertain career of a gamester, you cannot blame him if he tells you that the same doctrine applied to him would lead him to discard all the good advice given him in his boyhood.

The imperialistic doctrine lays the axe at the root of the tree and attacks every vital tenet of our government and of our religion,

and we already begin to see the evil effect of it. The embezzlement at Havana and the crookedness at Manila are only illustrations of what may be expected under a colonial system. If this nation adopts the principle that helpless races can be exploited because we are strong, carpet-bag officials will not be slow to adopt the same principle and appropriate everything within their reach. Mr. Watterson knows something of the corruption that developed under the carpet-bag reign which followed the civil war, and ought to be able to make some estimate of the malfeasance and misfeasance which can be expected when this nation denies self-evident truths and encourages infidelity to moral precepts.

As an individual can better afford to retain his character rather than grow rich by dishonorable means, so the democratic party can better afford to appeal to the conscience of the people, even though it remains out of power, than to enjoy power at the expense of its principles. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" What shall it profit the democratic party if it gain power and lose the spirit that has made it indestructible? What shall it profit a nation if its flag floats over every sea and its garrisons terrify every land if, in the language of Lincoln, it loses "the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all people in all lands everywhere?"

"WHAT ABOUT NEXT WEEK?"

When President McKinley was addressing the laboring men at San Francisco and congratulating them upon their "prosperity" and "contentment," one brawny wage-earner arose and asked, "What about next week?" Of course, he was guilty of some discourtesy in thus interrupting a meeting made notable by the presence of the chief executive, and his companions beckoned to him to be silent. But he could not have asked a more embarrassing question at a republican meeting. The administration is living in the present, with no thought or plan for the future. It might be well for the president to consider the simple question propounded by the California toiler.

The railroads are consolidating, shutting out competition, issuing

watered stock, and making worthless securities dividend-paying by the exercise of arbitrary power in the fixing of rates. They are having things all their own way now, but—"What about next week?"

The trusts are swallowing the industries, building up enormous fortunes, and levying tribute upon the entire country. They may be willing to contribute largely to the republican campaign fund to-day, but what will be the effect upon industry?—"What about next week?"

The money changers are in control of our finances, they can expand or contract the currency at will; they can make more out of the fluctuations of the market than they can in legitimate business; they rule with a rod of iron, but what is the end?—"What about next week?"

Imperialism is rampant, speculators are planning forays against distant lands; carpet baggers are growing fat and respect for political principles and moral precepts is being lost sight of; some people are making money out of it, but—"What about next week?" If the republicans are not too busy to think, if "prosperity" leaves them time for reflection, they will find it worth while to answer to their own satisfaction, if they can, that pertinent and perplexing question, "What about next week?"

BLACKLISTING.

Judge Frank Baker, of the Cook County (Ill.) Circuit Court, has rendered an important decision on the subject of blacklisting. The following is a statement of the facts, together with his reasoning:

Plaintiff alleges that she is an expert can labeler, able to earn \$15 per week at her trade. That defendants are canners at the Union Stock Yards and are all the persons engaged in that business at that place. That upon February 5, 1900, defendants maliciously, etc., agreed and conspired together not to employ any employe or any one of them who should go out on a strike or quit on account of a disagreement as to wages, except by consent of the former employer. That for two years before February 5, 1900, plaintiff was employed by defendants Libby, McNeil & Libby, and on that day quit because of disagreement as to wages. That she afterward applied to defendants, Armour & Co., and Fairbank Canning Company, for employment, and was denied such employ-

ment because of said agreement and conspiracy. All this, it is alleged, was done maliciously with the intent to injure plaintiff. Defendants demur to the declaration.

The case has been fully and most ably argued, both orally and in writing. I shall not review the numerous authorities cited nor attempt to do more than state my conclusions and the rules of law upon which they rest.

“When damage is sustained by one person from the wrongful act of another, an action for compensation is given to the injured party against the wrongdoer.” By wrongful act is to be understood not an act wrongful in morals only, but an act wrongful in law. An act is wrongful in law if it infringes upon the right of another, and not otherwise. An act which does not infringe upon any right of a person is not, as to such person, wrongful. One has a right to decline to enter the service of another, and several persons, acting jointly in pursuance of an agreement to that effect, have the right to so decline. So, one has the right to decline to employ another, and several persons, acting jointly in pursuance of an agreement to that effect, have the right to so decline.

The existence of malice, of a malicious intent to injure a person, will not convert an act which does not infringe any right of such person into a wrongful act or a civil wrong. It follows that, in my opinion, the facts and agreements of the defendants set forth in the declaration cannot be held to infringe upon any right of the plaintiff, and therefore are not as to her, in law, wrongful. The demurrer is sustained.”

Hon. W. J. Strong, who has been attorney in several similar cases, representing the plaintiffs and the case has attracted much attention.

The political question involved is even more important than the legal one; that is to say, whether the Judge is right from a legal standpoint in sustaining the demurrer is not nearly so important as the question, “should the law protect the employe from black-listing?”

If the court was in error, relief may be had by appeal to a higher court; if the law is not broad enough to protect employes it can be amended. The question of greatest importance is, therefore, whether a man discharged from one corporation should be prevented from obtaining employment elsewhere by agreement among the employers. This question is a political one to be decided by the law-makers.

The democratic national platform adopted in 1900 contained the following plank:

We are opposed to government by injunction; we denounce the blacklist and favor arbitration as a means of settling disputes between corporations and their employes."

Each one will decide the question according to his sympathies. Those who think that an employe ought to be thankful for the opportunity to work and should accept without complaint whatever the employer gives, will probably feel that the employers have a right to combine and blacklist any one who is lacking in gratitude or contentment. Those, on the other hand, who regard an employe as a man having the same rights as his fellow-man, and owing a duty to his family as well as to his employer, will feel that the employe should not be shut out of all remunerative employment because he and one employer differ upon wages, terms, or conditions.

The position taken by the democratic platform is eminently sound. If a man is skilled in a particular industry, and blacklisting is agreed upon by all the employers in that industry, the employe is to a large extent a slave, because if he is not satisfied with the terms fixed by his employer he cannot secure like employment elsewhere, and to go outside of the business in which he has skill would be to throw away all the benefits arising from experience and training.

A blacklist agreed upon among employers brings to the employer many of the advantages, and imposes upon the employe many of the hardships, arising from a complete monopoly. If Judge Baker's decision is sustained in the higher courts, blacklisting will become an issue in Illinois politics, and there is little doubt how it will be settled when the people have a chance to vote upon it. Lincoln said of the Dred Scott decision that courts could not settle political questions; that such questions must be settled by the people. But courts can center public attention upon a question and often a court decision is made the basis of a political movement.

The democratic party's platform utterance on this subject would have been more appreciated by laboring men if Judge Baker's decision had been rendered before the late election.

BEFORE AND AFTER.

During the campaign of 1900, the republican papers gave great prominence to those democrats who declared their intention of voting the republican ticket. On the morning of October 18, the *La Crosse Chronicle* printed an interview with Mr. Albert Hirshheimer in which that gentleman gave his reasons for voting for the re-election of Mr. McKinley.

A few days ago, Mr. Hirshheimer's company sold out to a trust and the *La Crosse Republican and Leader* of May 8 contained an interview with Mr. Hirshheimer in which he gave the reasons for selling. He began business in 1865—seven years before silver was demonetized—and the agitation of the money question never drove him out of business, but the trusts have forced him to sell. Below will be found extracts from his two interviews:

BEFORE—OCTOBER 18, 1900.

AFTER—MAY 8, 1901.

Said Mr. Hirshheimer: I voted once for Abraham Lincoln, and for William McKinley four years ago, and those are the only exceptions to my voting for the nominees of the democratic party on national candidates. I shall vote for the re-election of President McKinley.

My reasons, you ask; I don't court newspaper notoriety, but I will give my reasons for voting for President McKinley. They are purely business reasons. We want stability in our financial affairs, as well as stability in our tariff laws. I do not consider that a high tariff or a low tariff makes much difference. The trouble comes from anticipating changes every two or four years. I submit that the commercial interests of the country should not be made the football in the game of the politicians.

Said President A. Hirshheimer: The Packers Package Company was forced to sell out to the trust. They control the tin output and they have been hindering us so during the past month that we have not been able to run our factory only one-half its capacity. They have refused to deliver us the tin ordered, shipping only one or two cars a week. Thus we either had to sell out to them or fight them. We could not do the latter thing, for we could not get the tin with which to make our product, and carry on the fight. Therefore, we simply had to sell out to the trust. It was either that or lose our money.

THE RICHMOND TIMES' MISTAKE.

The Richmond (Virginia) *Times* has been one of the most violent opponents of democratic principles as enunciated in the Chicago platform. Its zeal in the support of a republicanized democracy has only been equalled by the ability with which it has misrepresented the position of the democratic party upon public questions. In a recent editorial it repeats what it has so often said about those who are opposed to monopolies and other republican methods of enriching a few at the expense of the many. It takes for its text an editorial which appeared in the *Atlanta Constitution*, and after charging the *Constitution* with inconsistency says:

Everybody knows that Mr. Bryan's crusade was against poverty. He has insisted that there ought to be no such thing as poverty. He has made war upon millionaires and plutocrats, and the whole tendency of his gospel has been to put all men on the same plane and to make every man as rich as his neighbor. He does not believe, if we understand him, that there should be plutocrats on the one hand and hewers of wood and drawers of water on the other. He does not believe that there should be master and man, but that every man should be his own master and serve nobody but himself.

As I have defended the principles set forth in the platforms adopted in 1896 and 1900, it is not necessary to regard the *Times'* editorial as a personal criticism. It is rather directed against all members of the party who have supported the platforms referred to. While the democrats believe that there should be no such thing as a "plutocrat" or a "master," it is not true that they expect to eliminate poverty, neither do they expect to make every man as rich as his neighbor. The *Times* discloses either great ignorance or great insincerity in the language quoted. In accepting the presidential nomination in 1896 I quoted with approval the words of Andrew Jackson, to wit:

"Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of heaven, and the fruits of superior industry, economy and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by law."

In commenting upon these words I said:

“We yield to none in our devotion to the doctrine just enunciated. Our campaign has not for its object the reconstruction of society. We cannot insure to the vicious the fruits of a virtuous life; we would not invade the home of the provident, in order to supply the wants of the spendthrift; we do not propose to transfer the rewards of industry to the lap of indolence. Property is and will remain the stimulus to endeavor and the compensation for toil.”

On that occasion I not only quoted as above from Jackson's veto message (with which the *Times* will doubtless agree), but also that part which draws the line between legitimate rewards and illegitimate wealth. If Jackson had stopped with the words above quoted he would be more popular to-day with the newspapers which construe as an attack upon property every effort to protect the people from injustice; but he added:

“But when the laws undertake to add to those natural and just advantages artificial distinctions—to grant titles, gratuitous and exclusive privileges—to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful—the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics, and laborers—who have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors for themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government.”

I have never been able to find in the writings of any statesman or philosopher, living or dead, a clearer definition of the democratic position. I have never found a democrat who dissented from Jackson's statement on this subject.

In accepting the democratic nomination in 1900 these views were reiterated, as will be seen by the following extract from my Indianapolis speech:

“The democratic party is not making war upon the honest acquisition of wealth; it has no desire to discourage economy, industry and thrift. On the contrary, it gives to every citizen the greatest possible stimulus to honest toil when it promises him protection in the enjoyment of the proceeds of his labor. Property rights are most secure when human rights are most respected. Democracy strives for a civilization in which every member of society will share according to his merits. No one has a right to expect from society more than a fair compensation for the

service which he renders to society. If he secures more it is at the expense of some one else. It is no injustice to him to prevent his doing injustice to another. To him who would, either through class legislation or in the absence of necessary legislation, trespass upon the rights of another the democratic party says, 'Thou shalt not.'

This speech was widely circulated during the campaign and no democrat has ever complained to me of the sentiment expressed.

The democratic party does not expect to destroy poverty, because poverty can never be destroyed until the members of the human race so nearly approach perfection in thought, and act, that they will not incur the penalties prescribed for the violation of natural laws. The democratic party is protesting against those things which interfere with the natural distribution of rewards and punishments. It is protesting against legislation which gathers from millions in order to give an undeserved advantage to hundreds, or at most, thousands. The principles of the party, whether applied to the tariff question, the money question, the trust question, the question of imperialism or to any other question, are intended to secure equal rights to all and to deny special privileges to any. Equality in rights does not mean equality in possessions or equality in enjoyment. A man may have a right to the proceeds of his toil, but if he does not toil there will be no proceeds, or if he toils without intelligence to direct his toil the proceeds will be less than if he toils with intelligence. Every man has a right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," but he can make his life worthless, he can be indifferent to his liberty, and he can so act as to secure misery instead of happiness. Human rights are equal before the law, but the rewards ought to be in proportion to virtue, to industry and to discretion.

The position of the democratic party has been so plainly stated that no one can give a valid excuse for not understanding it, and my own position has been stated so often that no one who cares to know it need be in doubt.

EMPEROR MCKINLEY.

By a vote of five to four the Supreme Court has declared President McKinley emperor of Porto Rico, and according to the press dispatches the emperor has gladly and gratefully accepted the title and authority thus conferred upon him by the highest judicial tribunal of the land.

As the last issue of *THE COMMONER* was going to press, Justice Brown began reading the opinion of the court in the De Lima case and as the decision was against the government in that case it was at first thought that the inhabitants of Porto Rico had been brought under the protection of the Constitution. But those who were encouraged to believe that the Constitution had caught up with the flag were doomed to disappointment. In the Downes case, decided immediately afterwards, a majority of the court, composed of Justices Brown, Gray, White, Shiras and McKenna, held that Congress could deal with Porto Rico (and the same logic applies to the Philippines) without regard to the limitations of the Constitution. Chief Justice Fuller and Associate Justices Harlan, Peckham and Brewer dissented in strong and vigorous language, but the opinion of the majority—even a majority of one—stands until it is reversed. This is one of the most important decisions, if not the most important, ever rendered by the court; it not only declares that Congress is greater than the Constitution which created it—the creature greater than the creator—but it denies the necessity for a written constitution. The position taken by the court is defended, or rather excused, by reasoning which, if followed out, will destroy constitutional liberty in the United States. Every reason given by Justice Brown could be used with even more force to support a decision nullifying all limitations placed by the Constitution on Congress when dealing with the citizens of the several states. If the Porto Ricans can trust the wisdom and justice of a congress which they DO NOT ELECT and CANNOT REMOVE, why do the people of the United States need a constitution to protect them from a congress which they DO ELECT and CAN REMOVE? The decision in effect declares that the people are not the source of power; it defends “taxation without representation” and denies that governments derive “their just powers from the consent of the governed.”

It assails the foundations of the Republic and does so on the ground of expediency.

The dissenting opinions bristle with precedents and burn with patriotism; they ought to awaken conscientious republicans to a realization of the meaning of imperialism.

This decision, like the Dred Scott decision, raises a political issue which must be settled by the people. The Supreme Court has joined with the President and Congress in an attempt to change the form of our government, but there yet remains an appeal to the people.

The election of 1900 did not decide this question, for the republicans denied that they favored imperialism, but they can deny it no longer. They must now admit their repudiation of the Constitution as well as the Declaration of Independence.

So much space is given to the majority and minority opinions (see pages five to eleven) that extended comment is impossible at this time, but the discussion of the subject will be continued in future issues.

A STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

The opinions delivered by the United States Supreme Court in the Porto Rican cases are so important, not only for the present but for the future, that it behooves every American citizen to thoroughly understand their purport. In these opinions, three separate periods were treated, and it will be well to consider them in proper order.

Between the time when General Miles took possession of Porto Rico and the time of the ratification of the peace treaty, the military authorities established certain military tariff duties. The court sustained these duties on the broad ground of military authority and necessity.

After the ratification of the peace treaty and prior to the enactment of the Foraker law, in which law the present Porto Rican tariff duties are set forth, tariff duties were levied on goods coming from Porto Rico to the United States under the terms and rates of the Dingley law. On this point the court held that the Dingley law contemplated the levying of duties on foreign goods from foreign countries; that after the ratification of the

peace treaty Porto Rico became "domestic" territory, and therefore the Dingley duties could not prevail.

In the Downes case the court took up that feature of the Foraker law which established tariff duties on goods coming from Porto Rico to the United States. The court held these duties to be lawful on the ground that Congress had full authority to make rules, regulations and laws for the government of "domestic" territory other than states.

In order to fully understand these opinions it must be known that in ruling that the Dingley tariff rates could not prevail against Porto Rico, the court did not act on the theory that the Constitution followed the flag during any of these periods under consideration. This ruling was made because, in the opinion of the court, a law enacted for the purpose of levying tariff duties against a foreign country could not be applied in levying tariff duties against a country that was not "foreign." In other words, if immediately after the ratification of the peace treaty, Congress had enacted a law levying the Dingley rates specially against Porto Rico, those rates would have prevailed. In the court's opinion, the legality of any tariff rate between Porto Rico and the United States simply waited upon a formal act of Congress establishing those rates as applying to Porto Rico.

The logic of this opinion as it applies to the right of Congress to levy tariff customs would make it possible for Congress to levy tariff duties on articles coming from any territory of the United States.

With respect to our new possessions, the decision is an unfair one because it denies to them equal trade privileges with other portions of the United States whose sovereignty has been established over them, and the purpose of the Constitution in providing for equal trade privileges was that no section subject to United States sovereignty should ever become the victim of discrimination. This principle is in line with the very foundation principles of this government, which contemplated that all the people of the United States should have equal privileges, should be exempt from discriminations, and should enjoy the immunities which the constitution makers conceived to be essential to the perpetuity of free institutions.

THE ATTITUDE OF ALIENS.

In the opinion delivered by Justice Brown in the Downes case, the Supreme Court went much farther than the consideration of the right to levy tariff duties. Justice Brown contended that power to acquire territory by treaty "implies not only the power to govern such territory, but to prescribe on what terms the United States will receive its inhabitants, and what their status shall be in what Chief Justice Marshall termed 'The American empire.'"

Justice Brown then distinctly declared that the annexation of territory did not make the inhabitants of that territory citizens of the United States. He admitted, however, that whatever may be finally decided as to the status of these islands and their inhabitants "it does not follow that in the meantime the people are in the matter of public rights unprotected by the provisions of our Constitution and subjected to the mere arbitrary control of Congress. Even if regarded as aliens, they are entitled, under the principles of the Constitution, to be protected in life, liberty and property."

Here we find the Supreme Court's declaration of the status of the people of these islands. Although the Constitution does not follow the flag, "under the principles of the Constitution" the people of our new possessions are entitled "to be protected in life, liberty and property." In other words, although cut away from all former allegiance, although taken away from former sovereigns and denied the right of building a sovereignty for themselves, and although required to render allegiance to this country, yet they are in the attitude of "aliens," they are to be taxed without representation, and to be governed without having a voice in the government. This is imperialism pure and simple.

DELEGATED POWERS.

Throughout the majority opinion delivered by Justice Brown runs the theory that the American Congress may do anything not forbidden in the Constitution. This is one of the most repugnant features of this opinion. Justice Brown seems to have searched the Constitution for prohibitions rather than for that grant of power which the American people have always conceived to be the true office of that instrument. In one place Justice Brown said:

“If in limiting the power which Congress was to exercise within the United States, it was also intended to limit it with regard to such territories as the people of the United States should thereafter acquire, such limitations should have been expressed.” In another place he refers to a constitutional clause as “suggestive of no limitations upon the power of Congress in dealing with territories.” In another place he says that “no construction of the Constitution should be adopted which would prevent Congress from considering each case upon its merits unless the language of the instrument imperatively demands it.” And in his conclusion Justice Brown, referring to the right or authority of Congress to do whatever it sees fit to do said: “We decline to hold that there is anything in the Constitution to forbid such action.”

The American system of government is not a complicated one. Indeed, its strength and success have depended, in a marked degree, upon its very simplicity. For years we have been taught to look in the Constitution for powers delegated to the United States and for powers prohibited by the Constitution to the states. For years we have been taught that the federal constitution was a grant of power, while the state constitution was a limitation of power; yet the opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Brown encourages the notion that our federal authorities may do whatever they think necessary to be done when the same is not specifically forbidden in the federal constitution.

The dangers arising from such an irrational un-American notion will depend entirely upon the character and disposition of men in authority. A written constitution has been the safeguard of American institutions, and once it shall be fully established that that Constitution is a limitation rather than a grant of power, this government and its people are completely at the mercy of the men who happen to be in authority.

The mischievous character of Justice Brown's decision on this point is indicated in one paragraph wherein he said—“The states could only delegate to Congress such powers as they themselves possess, and as they have no power to acquire new territory they have none to delegate in that connection.” This was Justice Brown's apology for the absence from the Constitution of a delegation of power to Congress to deal with newly acquired territory. He would then hold that Congress, the creature of the Constitution,

had greater powers than the body that created the Constitution itself. In order to avoid the well established theory that the Constitution is a grant of power, we have, according to Justice Brown's opinion, only to ascertain that the grantors of power were without authority in a certain respect in order to give to the creatures of the Constitution whatever authority and power those creatures see fit to exercise.

A RADICAL CHANGE.

Justice Harlan discusses this point at considerable length, and his words are quoted here that the reader may note the contrast between his views and those expressed by the majority of the court through Justice Brown. Justice Harlan says:

I take leave to say that if the principles now announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, the result will be a radical and mischievous change in our system of government. We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional liberty, guarded and protected by a written constitution, into an era of legislative absolutism, in respect of many rights that are dear to all peoples who love freedom.

In my opinion, Congress has no existence and can exercise no authority outside the Constitution. Still less is it true that Congress can deal with new territories just as other nations have done or may do with their new territories. This nation is under the control of a written constitution, which is the supreme law of the land, and the only source of the powers which our government, or any branch or officer of it, may exercise at any time or at any place. Monarchical and despotic governments, unrestrained in their powers by written constitutions, may do with newly acquired territories what this government may not do consistently with our fundamental law.

The idea that this country may acquire territories anywhere upon the earth, by conquest or treaty, and hold them as mere colonies or provinces, is wholly inconsistent with the spirit and genius as well as with the words of the Constitution. The glory of our American system of government is that it was created by a written constitution which protects the people against the exercise of arbitrary, unlimited power, and the limits of which may not be passed by the government it created, or by any branch of it, or even by the people who ordained it, except by amendment.

It will be an evil day for American liberty if the theory of a government outside of the supreme law of the land finds lodgment in our constitutional jurisprudence.

THE AMERICAN EMPIRE.

The court's decision was based upon expediency. In the opinion to which Justice Harlan referred as an effort to establish "two governments in this country—one resting on the Constitution for Americans—the other carried on in the national capitol by the same people, without the constitution for a subject people," Justice Brown said: "A false step at this time might be fatal to the development of what Chief Justice Marshall called 'The American Empire.'"

It would seem that this phrase was employed by way of apology or defense for the American empire which Justice Brown and his colleagues were seeking to erect upon the ruins of the American Constitution. When the great Marshall used the term "the American empire," he referred to an empire of love, an empire of perfect republicanism, an empire of hearts, an empire in which the people reigned supreme and the congress, the executive and the courts were the servants, rather than the masters, of the people. He referred to "the American empire" as expressing the perfect reign of American principles on every foot of American territory, and the enjoyment of American rights, privileges and immunities on every foot of soil within the American domain.

It was in 1820 that Chief Justice Marshall used this term. The court at that time had under consideration the constitutional provision that "all duties, imports and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." On this point Chief Justice Marshall said: "Does this term (The United States) designate the whole or any portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great republic which is composed of states and territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri river is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania and it is not less necessary on the principles of our Constitution that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties and excises should be observed in the one than in the other."

What a difference, then, between "the American empire" of the great Marshall and the American empire of Mr. Justice Brown!

Marshall's "American empire" was "our great republic which is composed of states and territories." The American empire of

Mr. Justice Brown contemplates "two governments in this country; one resting on the Constitution for Americans—the other carried on in the national capitol by the same people, without the constitution and for a subject people."

PERHAPS!

Justice Brown would be happier if he had contented himself with a decision without attempting to give any reasons for it. There are many vulnerable passages in the opinion which he delivered, but there is one passage which shows the uncertainty produced by the court's decision. Heretofore the people have regarded liberty as an inalienable right, and freedom of speech and freedom of the press have been considered absolutely necessary to its defense. Those who prize liberty and regard freedom of speech as above price will not take kindly to the word "perhaps," used by Justice Brown in discussing this subject. He said:

To sustain the judgment in the case under consideration it by no means becomes necessary to show that none of the articles of the Constitution applies to the island of Porto Rico. There is a clear distinction between such prohibitions as go to the very root of the power of Congress to act at all, irrespective of time or place, and such as are operative only 'throughout the United States' or among the several States.

Thus, when the Constitution declares that 'no bill of attainder or ex-post facto law shall be passed,' and that 'no title of nobility shall be granted by the United States,' it goes to the competency of Congress to pass a bill of that description. *Perhaps* the same remark may apply to the first amendment, that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people to peacefully assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.' We do not wish, however, to be understood as expressing an opinion how far the bill of rights contained in the first eight amendments is of general and how far of local application."

He is not willing to go at once to the full extent of his logic. He seems to have faith in Congress; he does not doubt that it will deal fairly with subject races, and yet he shrinks from the thought of annihilating, at one blow, the whole bill of rights. He boldly declares that "there is a clear distinction between such prohibitions as go to the very root of the power of Congress to act at all, irrespective of time or place, and such as are operative only 'throughout the United States,' or among the several states"—not

merely a distinction, but a "clear distinction." And yet he becomes perplexed as soon as he begins to draw the "clear distinction." He is quite sure that Congress is entirely prohibited from passing a "bill of attainder or ex-post facto law," or from granting "a title of nobility." He thinks that "perhaps, the same remark may apply" to laws respecting the establishment of religion to laws prohibiting free speech, to laws abridging the freedom of the press, and limiting the rights of the people to peaceably assemble and petition for redress. Perhaps! PERHAPS!! PERHAPS!!! How soon he becomes entangled in his own web! And this is constitutional law! Justice Brown wants it distinctly understood that the court is not at this time "expressing an opinion how far the bill of rights contained in the first eight amendments is of general and how far of local application." It will be interesting to American patriots to learn that rights for more than a century considered inalienable are now divided into "general" rights and "local" rights; that some belong to every one, while others belong only to some, and that the some who enjoy all rights are to decide what rights are safe in the keeping of others. The *Boston Herald* very properly says that imperialism "does not consist in having an emperor, but in governing a country on the well established basis that all men are not free and equal." It is not the form but the essence which controls; it is not the name, emperor, but the thing, emperor, that is hateful. The *Herald* adds:

It does not matter whether the form of rule is that of a czar, or that of an imperial parliament which rules over subject people in the name of a conquering and governing nation. The government of England is just as imperialistic as the government of Russia. The inhabitants of Somali Coast Protectorate, an English colony, have no more political rights accorded to them by the British parliament, representing the English people, than the czar accords to the inhabitants of the Crimea. The government of England is imperial, because, while arrogating to themselves the right to do what they please, the English people control the industrial and political existence of hundreds of millions of people, and settle these in such manner as they see fit. The government of the czar is imperialistic because, while arrogating to himself the right to do as he pleases, the czar dictates the political and industrial development of scores of millions of people. But in each instance there is a denial of the democratic theory of government, that the people of a country have a right to regulate their own affairs.

The decision of the Supreme Court in the *Downes* case places the inhabitants of Porto Rico at the mercy of Congress and the executive. There is not a vital right that they can claim as theirs. They must bow before the American flag; they must swear allegiance to it; they must follow where it leads; their property and their lives may be demanded for its maintenance and defense, and yet what is there in that flag which represents right or hope for them? Heretofore, a territory has looked forward to the time and condition of statehood; its embarrassments have been considered temporary and during its period of waiting its people have been protected in the enjoyment of all the rights guaranteed to citizens by the Constitution. If its delegate in Congress has had no vote its people have been reasonably safe from harm because the general laws made for the territories were also operative in the states. Now comes a new order of things; the nation has caught the spirit of conquest; it has stained its hands with the blood of subject races. The people of Porto Rico are notified that they are to be with us, but not of us. They are to have neither our government nor their own government, but such a government as we think good for them. We shall buy of them what we please upon our own terms; we shall make their laws for them; we shall tax them; we shall govern them, and if they dare to quote our Declaration of Independence against us we shall shoot them. "Perhaps," we may allow them freedom of religion—five Judges in a court of nine, speaking for us, say that we are not sure about this. "Perhaps," we may allow them freedom of speech—the question is not settled; "perhaps," their newspapers may be allowed to criticise carpet-bag officials—but it is not yet determined whether this is a general right to be enjoyed by the Porto Ricans or a local one to be enjoyed only by the people of the United States. "Perhaps," they may be allowed to peaceably assemble—this is a matter for future consideration; "perhaps," they will be permitted to petition for redress of grievances, we shall see about this later.

The Porto Ricans had heard of our revolutionary war; they had read our state papers; they had been inspired by our patriotic songs, and so, when General Miles landed upon the Island, the people of Porto Rico met him with music and spread flowers in his path. Theirs is a rude awakening! While they dreamed of American liberty the republican leaders were calculating the trade value of eight hundred thousand Porto Ricans.

“Perhaps,” Justice Brown’s opinion will convince the rank and file of the republican party that our institutions are in danger and that the republican party should be repudiated. If liberty becomes a “perhaps” in Porto Rico how long will it be a certainty in the United States?

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

As this is the last issue of THE COMMONER before the Fourth of July, the Declaration of Independence is reproduced in order that it may be re-read on the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of its adoption. One year ago, it was read and amid great enthusiasm endorsed as a part of the democratic national platform. This document, the most remarkable state paper ever penned, was written by Thomas Jefferson and to its maintenance he and his co-patriots pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor. And yet, in a higher and broader sense it was not the work of human hands. It was rather a bow of promise which the sunlight of truth, shining through tears, cast upon the clouds. It assured the world that the waters of despotism had reached their flood and were receding. God grant that they may never rise again!

THE SOUTH CAROLINA SITUATION.

In view of the action of Senator McLaurin in withdrawing his resignation, the reader may be interested in reviewing the dialogue which brought about the resignation.

At a meeting at Gaffney Senators Tillman and McLaurin met in joint debate and the former in the course of his speech said:

Let McLaurin resign and go before the democratic primary this year, and I’ll go home and keep my mouth shut and let the other fellows attend to him. If you elect him I will take it as notice that you don’t want me. If he is a democrat, then I’m not.

Senator McLaurin replied:

Oh, yes. Tillman says, “Why don’t I resign.” If I’m elected it will mean the people don’t want him. But he stopped there. He’s smart. You’ll never catch him committing himself too far.

He did not say if I'm elected he'd resign. Oh, no. You'll never hear of Benjamin, the Tillmanite, resigning.

And the dialogue continued as follows:

Tillman: I will say it, and do say it!

McLaurin: Agreed.

Tillman: I will resign right now, if you will, and we will go before the people.

McLaurin: Agreed.

Tillman: Draw up the paper and we will sign it right now.

McLaurin: That suits me.

In pursuance of this agreement the resignations were prepared, signed and delivered to the governor, who, after a few days' consideration, addressed communications to the senators advising them to recall their resignations and giving as the main reason therefor that a campaign this year would involve the people in an unnecessary and harmful political agitation. Senator Tillman promptly replied that great issues were at stake, that the next session of the senate would deal with questions of the highest importance and that South Carolina was entitled to a voice in the settlement of these questions. He renewed his assertion that Senator McLaurin was misrepresenting the wishes and interests of the people of the state and ought to be replaced by some one who would reflect the sentiment of the people. He insisted that he was willing to risk his own term in order to enable the people to get rid of Senator McLaurin.

Senator McLaurin, however, seized with alacrity upon the suggestion made by Governor McSweeney and withdrew his resignation. One paragraph of his letter to the governor is worth reproducing. He says:

I appreciate fully the force of the reasons given by you and the effect upon the people of the state of a heated and strife-producing contest for United States senator this year. For the sake of the peace, prosperity and happiness of the people of this state, I am willing to hold on to my commission as United States senator and to continue to serve the state as I have done in the past to the best of my ability.

His willingness "to hold on to" his commission "for the sake of the peace, prosperity and happiness of the people" of his state recalls a story told by John Allen, of Mississippi. A county treasurer, let us call him Mr. Smith, became a candidate for a third

term; his competitor, whom we will call Mr. Jones, made his fight against the incumbent on the ground that a third term ought not to be given to an official entrusted with the handling of the county money. He insisted that there ought to be a change so that the books could be examined. His arguments were effective and he beat Mr. Smith. At the end of the second term he began to long for a third term himself, but for awhile, remembering the issue upon which he won the office, he refrained from announcing his candidacy. Finally his desire to retain the office overcame his desire to be consistent and he entered the race for a third time. To quiet his conscience, however, he went around to apologize to Mr. Smith for the arguments he had formerly advanced and his apology ran like this:

“Mr. Smith, when you were a candidate for a third term I made the race against you on the theory that a third term was wrong. I had heard the arguments made against a third term and I really believed that they were sound, but I have been in the office two terms myself and I now see that there is no reason why a good county treasurer should not serve as many terms as he likes. I admit now that I was wrong and when I make a mistake I am just man enough to acknowledge it.”

Senator McLaurin sees now that he made a mistake in risking two years of senatorial salary and he is “just man enough to acknowledge it.”

The letters written by the two senators are entirely characteristic of the men. The honorable course pursued by Senator Tillman and the evasion resorted to by Senator McLaurin will increase the desire already very general among democrats to see some plan adopted which will give Senator Tillman a colleague in harmony with his constituents.

IX.

CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY.

The worst feature of the supreme court decision in the Downes case is that it strikes a blow at constitutional liberty. In attempting to defend the position taken by the majority of the court, Justice Brown used arguments which, if carried to their logical conclusion, would deny the necessity for a constitution anywhere. According to the decision of the court, Congress can govern Porto Rico as a colony, without constitutional limitations, so far as the taxing power is concerned, and enough is said in the majority opinion to show that no political right is absolutely secure.

The question naturally arises: If the Porto Ricans do not need the protection of a written constitution, why do the people of the United States need a written constitution? If we concede that the Porto Ricans are safe without a constitution we must also admit that the American people would be safe without a constitution. Justice Brown says: "Grave apprehensions of danger are felt by many eminent men—a fear lest an unrestrained possession of power on the part of Congress may lead to unjust and oppressive legislation, in which the natural rights of territories, or their inhabitants, may be engulfed in a centralized despotism. These fears, however, find no justification in the action of Congress, nor in the conduct of the British parliament toward its outlying possessions since the American revolution. * * * There are certain principles of natural justice inherent in the Anglo-Saxon character which need no expressions in constitutions or statutes to give them effect or to secure dependencies against legislation manifestly hostile to their real interests."

I shall at another time treat of his reference to the benevolence of the British Parliament, but my purpose at this time is to emphasize the fact that he repudiates the arguments which have always been given in support of a written constitution. It

was necessary to do so in order to justify the Porto Rican decision, and yet in doing so he surrenders one of the most vital principles of government. Some of the republican papers have violently assailed me because I pointed out the political heresy uttered by the court. Will any republican paper quote the language which I have quoted above, and then answer two questions?

FIRST.—IS A CONSTITUTION A GOOD THING FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES?

SECOND.—IF SO, DO NOT THE PORTO RICANS ALSO NEED A CONSTITUTION?

A special invitation is extended to the editor of Postmaster General Smith's paper to answer these questions, but any republican paper, great or small, conspicuous or obscure, is at liberty to try. The Porto Ricans do not elect the Congress; we do, and yet we have the protection of a constitution while the Porto Ricans have none. We can retire the members of Congress if we don't like their conduct; the Porto Ricans cannot, and yet we have a constitution and the Porto Ricans have none. The members of Congress are chosen from among us, and they must live under the laws which they make for us; the congressmen are not chosen from among the Porto Ricans, and do not live under the laws made for the Porto Ricans, and yet we have a constitution and the Porto Ricans have none. If "there are certain principles of natural justice inherent in the Anglo-Saxon character which need no expression in constitutions or statutes to give them effect or to secure dependencies against legislation manifestly hostile to their real interests," why were the people of revolutionary days unwilling to rely upon that "natural justice"? If there is no danger in "an unrestrained possession of power on the part of congress" why were our forefathers so careful to restrain that power? Has human nature so changed as to make unnecessary now the constitutional limitations which were thought necessary a century ago?

Constitutional liberty has been attacked and the attack must be met at once. The doctrine laid down by Justice Brown is antagonistic to all that the American people have been taught to believe sacred. If we admit his argument when applied to Porto Ricans, upon what ground can we stand when we claim for ourselves the protection of the Constitution or the bill of rights? If the principle contended for by Justice Brown is established for the government of colonies, it will by irresistible logic become

operative in the United States. That the readers of *THE COMMONER* may fortify their own views by the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson, the following extracts are made from his writings as collected in that invaluable volume "The Jeffersonian Cyclopaedia."

In 1803 Mr. Jefferson said: "Our peculiar security is in the possession of a written constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction."

In 1802 he wrote: "Though written constitutions may be violated in moments of passion or delusion, yet they furnish a text to which those who are watchful may again rally and recall the people. They fix, too, for the people the principles of their political creed."

At another time he described our Constitution as "the ark of our safety, and grand palladium of our peace and happiness."

It will be remembered that the federal constitution was opposed by some because it did not contain a bill of rights, and the first ten amendments were immediately adopted to remedy this defect and provide additional guarantees to life, liberty and property. Jefferson was a firm believer in the doctrine which led to the adoption of the bill of rights. In a letter written in 1789 he said: "I disapproved from the first moment the want of a bill of rights (in the constitution) to guard liberty against the legislative as well as the executive branches of the government; that is to say, to secure freedom in religion, freedom of the press, freedom from monopolies, freedom from unlawful imprisonment, freedom from a permanent military and a trial by jury in all cases determinable by the laws of the land."

In a letter to James Madison, written in 1787, Jefferson said: "A bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular; and what no just government should refuse, or rest on inferences."

At another time he defined his position as follows: "By a declaration of rights I mean one which shall stipulate freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of commerce against monopolies, trial by juries in all cases, no suspension of the habeas corpus, no standing armies. These are fetters against doing evil which no honest government should decline."

Jefferson was a believer in popular government, but he also believed in the inalienable rights of individuals—rights which the

government does not give and ought not to take away—rights which cannot be safely intrusted to the keeping of any legislative body. Until recently Jefferson's position on this subject was unanimously endorsed.

Every state has adopted a constitution placing restrictions upon the legislative branch as well as upon the other branches of the government. The state of Ohio has a constitution and a bill of rights; how can Senator Hanna and President McKinley favor a constitution and a bill of rights for Ohio and then declare that the people of Porto Rico need no such protection? If the farmers, laborers and business men of Ohio are not willing to trust the wisdom and justice of an unrestrained state legislature, by what process of reasoning do they reach the conclusion that the people of Porto Rico can entrust their rights to the protection of an unrestrained congress?

Justice Brown is a citizen of the state of Michigan, and Michigan also has a constitution and a bill of rights. Is Justice Brown willing to go before the people of his own state and tell them that their legislature should be vested with full and unrestrained power to act on all questions affecting the rights and property of the citizens? If not, why not? Is a congress more reliable than a state legislature? Is a representative body more trustworthy as it gets farther away from the people? Is delegated authority more carefully exercised in proportion as the seat of government is farther removed from the voters?

The position taken by Judge Brown would be ludicrous if it were not so serious. It is strange that his language is not challenged by republicans. Two republican judges out of six dissented from this position; have the republican newspapers less independence than the judges? Have the rank and file of the republican party, who are under no obligation to the party, less independence of thought and action than the justices who hold their commissions from republican presidents? Unless the people are wholly absorbed in money-making and entirely indifferent to that constitutional liberty so highly prized and so dearly bought by our ancestors there will be so emphatic a protest against the imperialistic utterances of a court that no body of officials on the bench or elsewhere will soon again disregard the spirit of American institutions.

HERRON ATTACKS MARRIAGE SYSTEM.

Prof. Herron has committed an unpardonable sin—he has attacked the marriage system. So long as he confined his efforts to the amelioration of social conditions his motives were respected whatever criticism may have been directed against his methods or his theories. But when he rebels against a marriage system which requires a husband to care for his wife and perform a father's duty, he forfeits public esteem. In his letter to the Congregational church, replying to an invitation which had been extended to him to join in calling a council to inquire into his ministerial standing and church membership, he took occasion to condemn the entire system of marriage as immoral and blasphemous. The following extract is sufficient to set forth his views on the subject:

I do not believe that the present marriage system is sacred or good. It rather seems to me the destruction of the liberty and love and truth which make sacred and worth while. If love and truth are the basis of morality, then a marriage system which makes one human being the property of another, without regard to the well-being of either the owned or the owner, seems to me to be the very soul of blasphemy and immorality.

The family founded on force is a survival of slavery and one of the expressions of the slave principles on which our whole slave civilization is built. It is made of the superstition which thinks it good for human beings to own each other and good for the race to have all the sources and tools of life owned by the few who are strong and cunning and unscrupulous to possess them.

Mr. Herron made no defense to the suit for divorce instituted by his wife, and in his letter he announced his purpose to marry a Miss Rand (whom he has since married). He is not the first man to become alienated from his wife by falling in love with another woman, but he differs from others in attempting to exonerate himself by assailing the most sacred human institution. He endeavors to spiritualize and idealize a new attachment which is neither spiritual nor ideal. It is only charitable to suppose that he loved his first wife when he promised to love and care for her; it is only charitable to assume that this love was present when his home was blessed with the children whom he now abandons. But he allowed his heart to stray away from his own home to the home of another; he allowed an acquaintance to

usurp his wife's place in his affections. He calls the new attachment "comradeship," but that does not sanctify or excuse his conduct. So far as the evidence shows his wife was a comrade before his affections were withdrawn and did what she could to continue the comradeship. He deliberately chose to repudiate his marriage vows, and now, rather than admit that he has fallen from the path of honor and uprightness, he cries out against domestic virtue and conjugal happiness.

Marriage is not slavery; neither the husband nor the wife owns the other. They are joint occupants of earth's holiest tenement. One may so act as to forfeit the confidence of the other and it may be even wise, under some circumstances, for them to separate, but such exceptions do not justify a wholesale condemnation of the marriage system. The Christian home is not a prison; there is room enough and freedom enough in it for the development of all that is pure and noble. Its character would not be improved by a free and frequent change of partners. Children should be protected from the results of a "freedom" which would lead to the disruption of the family every time a person appeared who seemed to husband or wife more congenial than the other.

According to Prof. Herron's theory, the highest virtue is to live the truth—to be one's self. He says:

Civilization, with its network of falsehood and suspicion, of retribution and revenge, is a sort of world conspiracy against the soul's integrity and individuality. Yet the right of a single **oul** to fully and freely express itself, to live out and show forth all the truth about itself, so that it need have within itself no hidden things, but be naked before the universe and not be ashamed, is infinitely more important than the whole fabric of civilization.

There are times when to be without a sense of shame indicates an absence of conscience.

It is not sufficient that one should reveal his inmost self to the world; if that were all the vilest sinner could become a saint by confessing his wickedness. Something more is necessary; there should be repentance and works meet for repentance. It is more important that one improve himself than that he exhibit himself; it is more virtuous to resist temptation than to boldly admit having yielded to it. The marriage system will survive this attack, as it has survived others, but Mr. Herron will not add to his usefulness by the position which he has taken.

THE DOCTRINE OF THRONES.

The opponents of imperialism assert that "it is the doctrine of thrones that man is too ignorant to govern himself." To-day the republican party is thoroughly committed to this doctrine of thrones.

In a speech delivered in the House of Representatives in 1818, Henry Clay pleaded for South American independence from Spanish rule. "It is the doctrine of thrones," said Mr. Clay, "that man is too ignorant to govern himself. Their partisans assert his incapacity in reference to all nations; if they cannot command universal assent to the proposition it is then demanded as to particular nations; and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us. I contend that it is to arraign the disposition of Providence himself to suppose that he created beings incapable of governing themselves and to be trampled on by kings. Self-government is the natural government of man, and for proof I refer to the aborigines of our own land. Were I to speculate in hypothesis unfavorable to human liberty, my speculations should be founded rather upon the vice, refinement or density of population. Crowded together in compact masses, even if they were philosophers, the contagion of the passions is communicated and caught, and the effect too often, I admit, is the overthrow of liberty. Dispersed over such an immense space as that on which the people of Spanish America are spread, their physical, and I believe their moral condition, both favor their liberty."

"THE BEST FORM OF GIVING."

In addressing a Sunday school class recently, Mr. Rockefeller of the Standard Oil Trust, said that his organization paid twenty-two millions a year in wages, and that in thirty years it had paid out between six hundred and seven hundred millions to laboring men. "This," he added, "I regard as the best form of giving."

There is no doubt that remunerative employment is more helpful than charity, but Mr. Rockefeller can hardly credit his charity account with the amount paid out in wages. During the past seven years the dividends declared by the Standard Oil Trust

have amounted to \$252,000,000. Thus it will be seen that the dividends for seven years amount to more than one-third of the wages paid during a period of thirty years. Mr. Rockefeller's share of the dividends for the past five months are said to amount to ten millions—this is at the rate of twenty-four millions a year. If Mr. Rockefeller can make twenty-four millions (not to speak of the dividends paid to other stockholders) by paying twenty-two millions in wages he has found a very profitable investment, even though it cannot properly be described as the "best form of giving." As Mr. Rockefeller gets more out of it than the thousands of men who do the work, and as he could get nothing out of the business but for the work done by the wage earners, it is evident that the day laborers are doing some "giving" themselves. Mr. Rockefeller has the reputation of being a very liberal man, but it is quite evident that he is giving away some one else's money. If the employes are not receiving wages enough he is giving away their money or money which should be paid to them, and they should be credited with his donations. If the employes are receiving wages enough, it must be apparent that the consumers of oil are paying too much, and therefore they should be credited with Mr. Rockefeller's donations. Some one has described the Chicago University as a national university, because it is supported by money collected from all the people, by that most successful taxgatherer, the Standard Oil Trust.

As a matter of fact, the payment of wages is not "a form of giving." You do not speak of giving a man a horse when you receive for the horse as much as it is worth. There is much less reason for describing wages as a gift because the wage-earner not only earns all he receives, but he earns for his employer a profit besides. But even if the ordinary wage-earner could count his wages as a gift, it would be a perversion of language to say that Mr. Rockefeller was giving to his employes when the employes give back to Mr. Rockefeller all that he pays for wages and more than one hundred per cent. profit on the wages besides.

When Mr. Rockefeller is ready to render an account of his stewardship, he will not find the amount paid by him in wages standing to his credit, but he will find some charges made against the amount which he has received. A part of his enormous income represents money which his employes ought to have received, and a part represents money taken from the public in violation of

human as well as divine laws. Not only will he find it impossible to obtain credit for wages paid to employes, but he will find that much that he has given to religion, to education and to charity has been set down in the "incidental expense" column and not under the head of benevolence. The money which he has paid to subsidize the press—not money paid to proprietors of papers, but money expended in such a way as to silence criticism and to provoke eulogy, money paid to prevent ministerial denunciation of trust methods—not money paid to the ministers themselves, but money given to religious enterprises, and money used to corrupt colleges and to support professors who will defend, or at least deal gently with, monopolies—all these expenditures are not given to charity but are a part of the business. Mr. Rockefeller has given so small a part of his income that he has become fabulously rich in a short time. Measured by the rule laid down by the Master in the case of the widow who gave in two mites, Mr. Rockefeller is a miser. Thousands have given more liberally in proportion to their income, although their gifts have not amounted to so much in dollars. If Mr. Rockefeller had given, not a small per cent., but all of his income to church and charity, he could not have compensated for the harm he has done, nor could he have justified the criminal methods which he has employed. Mr. Rockefeller cannot boast of his giving, least of all can he boast of giving to his employes.

WHO WROTE IT?

"These are words of weighty import. They involve consequences of the most momentous character. I take leave to say that if the principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system of government will be the result. We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional liberty guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era of legislative absolutism."

Here is a serious charge brought against the majority of the Supreme Court of the United States. The court is accused of bringing about a "change in our system of government"—not only a change but "radical and mischievous" change. It is charged that in the event of that decision—and the decision was made—

“constitutional liberty” would be lost and “an era of legislative absolutism” ushered in.

What graver indictment could be brought against our highest judicial tribunal? Who wrote it? Who is guilty of thus reflecting upon the patriotism and purpose of the court? Let the republican papers ferret out the culprit and visit condign punishment upon him. Let him feel the righteous wrath of those pure and immaculate souls who always bow to a court decision (when it is on their side), and never utter a reflection against a judge (unless he decides against them).

Who wrote the words above quoted? Did they emanate from a demagogue; was this the wail of a defeated candidate; was it the speech of some disturber of the peace—some stirrer up of discontent?

No, the words will be found in a dissenting opinion of a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America. A democratic justice? No. A populist justice? No. A silver republican justice? No.

What then? They are the words of a republican justice of the supreme court—Justice Harlan—appointed by a republican president.

Hereafter, when republican papers desire to condemn those who criticise a supreme court decision, let them begin at the top and assail Justice Harlan first. After they have administered to him the rebuke which he, from their standpoint, deserves, they will be too much exhausted to attack those who quote Justice Harlan against the court.

“LARGE CONCESSIONS.”

Justice Brown, in delivering the majority opinion in the Downes case, clearly shows that he was willing to make “large concessions” in order to sustain the administration. He concludes his argument, or rather his explanation, by presenting the expediency excuse in all its baldness. He says:

A false step at this time might be fatal to the development of what Chief Justice Marshall called the American empire. Choice in some cases, the natural gravitation of small bodies toward large ones in others, the result of a successful war in still

others, may bring about conditions which would render the annexation of distant possessions desirable. If those possessions are inhabited by alien races, differing from us in religion, customs, laws, methods of taxation and modes of thought, the administration of government and justice, according to Anglo-Saxon principles, may for a time be impossible; and the question at once arises whether large concessions ought not to be made for a time, that, ultimately our own theories may be carried out and the blessings of a free government under the Constitution extended to them. We decline to hold that there is anything in the Constitution to forbid such action.

The inference is clear that he would have joined the minority but for the fear that "a false step," as he called it, "might be fatal to the development" of the administration's plan. He assumes that conditions might make "the annexation of distant possessions desirable," and recognizing that such lands might be "inhabited by alien races, differing from us in religion, customs, laws, methods of taxation and modes of thought," he surrenders the principles of constitutional government in order to vest in Congress power to administer a different kind of government from that contemplated by our forefathers. Of course, he does not expect to suspend the Constitution forever, but in order to justify a temporary suspension of the Constitution he employs arguments which destroy the foundations of constitutional liberty. It is the old story—as old as history. It is yielding to temptation; it is the conscious departure from the right path with lame and halting apologies therefor. It is the ancient argument that the end justifies the means—an argument that has been used to bolster up every thing bad and to excuse all villainy. When a person starts to "making concessions" whether from moral principles or from constitutional provisions, he always increases the concessions until they become as large as the case requires. Justice Brown makes the mistake of weighing desire against duty. Nothing can be desirable which requires a surrender of our ideas of government. That ought to be a starting point. If the truths set forth in the Declaration of Independence are self-evident truths; if the rights enumerated are inalienable rights; if the people are the only source from which a just government can derive its powers—if these things are true, then nothing can be desirable which requires a repudiation of them. The very fact that Justice

Brown discusses the question, or entertains the thought of comparing the desirableness of distant possessions with the duty of maintaining the principles of free government shows that his heart has wandered from the paths trod by the revolutionary patriots. He may delude himself with the idea that he can ultimately extend the blessings of "free government" by denying the principles of free government now. But it is a vain hope. To justify a temporary surrender we must relax our hold upon American doctrines and when that hold is once relaxed it is not apt to be regained. Power is fascinating. It flatters our vanity to be told that we are "a superior people" and owe it to "inferior people" to take care of them. As we never can convince them that we are disinterested or make them satisfied with our sovereignty, it is not safe to give them a voice in their own government.

If our subjects protest against carpet-bag officials, it is proof positive that they lack the intelligence to govern themselves. When a superior race is dealing with an inferior one, lack of appreciation is a heinous offense; and when did the subject ever appreciate an effort to deprive him of his liberty?

Progress, civilization, capacity for self-government—all these are relative terms. Individuals differ from each other, races differ, nations differ. Let us suppose that ten represents the capacity of the Filipinos for self-government while one hundred represents the capacity of the American people; how can they come nearer together unless the Filipinos make more rapid progress than the American? Is it probable or even possible that the Filipinos, denied the experience which self-government gives, would improve as fast as we so long as we are in the full enjoyment of self-government?

Justice Brown referred with evident pride to England's methods of dealing with her colonies, and yet England is making no progress toward self-government. The Indian people are complaining that Englishmen are sent out to fill the important offices at high salaries; the native papers of influence do not attempt to defend the policy of the English government and the educated classes are especially hostile to British rule.

Japan has made more progress in the last forty years than India has made in a hundred and fifty. Mexico, half Spanish and half Indian, has made greater strides in the last quarter of a

century than India has made in a century and a half. When the Mexican war was ended our flag was hauled down from the heights of Chapultepec, and both the United States and Mexico have prospered more as sister republics than either would have prospered had we adopted an imperialistic policy.

The "destiny" argument obliterates all distinction between right and wrong; it assumes that there is somewhere an irresistible force which impels the American people to do what they do not want to do and ought not to do, whereas the only force behind imperialism is the commercial argument that the Constitution and all moral principles must give way to the almighty dollar. The "destiny" argument justifies grand larceny and wholesale slaughter, provided that they will pay, and then imperialists, conscious that the means employed cannot be defended by argument, throw the blame upon Providence. There is no more reason to believe that God commands a big nation to destroy, subjugate or rob a weaker nation than there is to believe that God commands a strong man to kill or rob a cripple, and yet the imperialists invoke the law to punish the individual as a criminal while they extol a war of conquest as patriotic.

If concessions are made they ought to be made for the support and maintenance of republican government, not for its overthrow, but Justice Brown made all the concession away from liberty rather than toward it. His policy would send this nation out upon the highways of the world as a bully and a braggart. Unless he knows that moral principles will be suspended for the protection of our nation, he must know that this nation cannot exercise the powers conferred by the supreme court without destroying its moral prestige among the nations and inviting a terrible retribution. The victims of arbitrary power may survive, but those who exercise arbitrary power become hardened and calloused until they lose respect for liberty and then lose liberty itself.

The concessions made by the court are so large that no material advantage however great could compensate the nation for them. What shall we say, then, when these concessions are made to secure advantages which are seeming rather than real—advantages which but a few can enjoy?

UNSAFE BANKING.

The failure of the Seventh National Bank of New York city calls attention to the fact that many banks are doing business upon an unsafe basis. This particular bank made a report to the clearing house on June 21st showing that its capital was only \$376,340 while its deposits were over \$5,700,000; its loans over \$4,400,000. A shrinkage of ten per cent. in the value of its loans would have more than wiped out its capital. According to the report referred to the net profits were \$234,000 but even this sum added to the capital would not give a sufficient margin to make the business safe.

Some ratio should be fixed between the bank's capital and its deposits, for while it may be very profitable to divide among a few stockholders the profits secured upon large deposits it invites collapse. A banker would not loan to a merchant whose liabilities equalled 90 per cent. of his assets. Why should he ask depositors to trust him under the same circumstances?

ETERNAL VIGILANCE.

There are some people who appear indifferent to the encroachments upon liberty, if the encroachments appear at the time to be small. There are some who fail to see in the Porto Rican tariff duty, in the government of Porto Rico by executive power, and in the denial to the Filipinos of the right of self-government, any evil serious enough to warrant consideration.

Daniel Webster, in a speech delivered in the senate May 7, 1834, had something to say on this subject. This is what Webster said: "Every encroachment, great or small, is important enough to awaken the attention of those who are entrusted with the preservation of a constitutional government. We are not to wait till great public mischiefs come, till the government is overthrown, or liberty itself put into extreme jeopardy. We should not be worthy sons of our fathers were we so to regard great questions affecting the general freedom. Those fathers accomplished the revolution on a strict question of principle. The Parliament of Great Britain asserted a right to tax the colonies in all cases whatsoever; and it was precisely on this question that they made the revolution

turn. The amount of taxation was trifling, but the claim itself was inconsistent with liberty; and that was in their eyes enough. It was against the recital of an act of Parliament, rather than against any suffering under its enactments, that they took up arms. They went to war against a preamble. They fought seven years against a declaration. They poured out their treasures and their blood like water, in a contest against an assertion which those less sagacious and not so well schooled in the principles of civil liberty would have regarded as barren phraseology, or mere parade of words. They saw in the claim of the British Parliament a seminal principle of mischief, the germ of unjust power; they detected it, dragged it forth from underneath its plausible disguise, struck at it; nor did it elude either their steady or well directed blow till they had extirpated and destroyed it, to the smallest fibre. On this question of principle, while actual suffering was yet far off, they raised their flag against a power, to which for purposes of foreign conquest and subjugation, Rome, in the height of her glory, is not to be compared; a power which has dotted over the surface of the whole globe with her possessions and military posts; whose morning drum-beat, following the sun and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous unbroken strain of the martial airs of England."

AGUINALDO'S OFFER.

In another column will be found a dispatch which recently appeared in the *New York World* and the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, describing an offer made by some Filipinos claiming to represent Aguinaldo.

When Mr. Bryan was in New York he received a letter from a gentleman saying that two Filipinos were in the city and desired to call, but the letter was not read in time to be answered before the Filipinos arrived. They were refused admittance, and a friend was sent with a verbal answer to the letter explaining that Mr. Bryan did not think it proper to confer with them, and stating that the democratic party was not opposing imperialism because of friendliness to the Filipinos but because imperialism was dangerous to American institution. The Filipinos said that Aguinaldo was willing to issue a proclamation promising to lay down arms in

case of Mr. Bryan's election, and also willing to contribute to the democratic campaign fund, but Mr. Bryan refused to consider either proposition, and did not require them to furnish any evidence of their right to represent Aginaldo or speak for him. As the matter has been discussed in other papers, the story and this explanation are given to readers of *THE COMMONER*.

THE SULU TREATY.

At the request of a reader of *THE COMMONER* the Sulu treaty is given below. It is now about two years since the treaty was signed, but our flag is still flying over the Sultan's palace and both slavery and polygamy remain undisturbed. The treaty reads:

ARTICLE I. The sovereignty of the United States over the whole archipelago of Sulu and its dependencies is declared and acknowledged.

ARTICLE II. The United States flag will be used in the archipelago of Sulu and its dependencies on land and sea.

ARTICLE III. The rights and dignities of his highness, the sultan, and his datos shall be fully respected, and Moros shall not be interfered with on account of their religion; all their religious customs shall be respected and no one shall be persecuted on account of his religion.

ARTICLE IV. While the United States may occupy and control such points in the archipelago of Sulu as public interest seem to demand, encroachment will not be made upon the lands immediately about the residence of his highness, the sultan, unless military necessity requires such occupation in case of war with a foreign power, and where the property of individuals is taken, due compensation will be made in each case.

Any person can purchase land in the archipelago of Sulu and hold the same by obtaining the consent of the sultan and coming to a satisfactory agreement with the owner of the land, and such purchase shall be immediately registered in the proper office of the United States government.

ARTICLE V. All trade in the domestic products of the archipelago of Sulu, when carried on by the sultan and his people with any part of the Philippine Islands, and when conducted under the American flag, shall be free, unlimited and undutiable.

ARTICLE VI. The sultan of Sulu shall be allowed to communicate direct with the governor-general of the Philippine islands in making complaint against the commanding officer of Sulu or against any naval commander.

ARTICLE VII. The introduction of firearms and war materials is forbidden except under specific authority of the governor-general of the Philippines.

ARTICLE VIII. Piracy must be suppressed and the sultan and his datos agree to heartily co-operate with the United States authorities to that end and to make every possible effort to arrest and bring to justice all persons engaged in piracy.

ARTICLE IX. Where crimes are committed by Moros against Moros the government of the sultan will bring to trial and punishment the criminals and offenders who will be delivered to the government of the sultan by the United States authorities if in their possession. In all other cases persons charged with crimes or offenses will be delivered to the United States authorities for trial and punishment.

ARTICLE X. Any slave in the archipelago of Sulu shall have the right to purchase freedom by paying to the master the usual market value.

ARTICLE XI. At present Americans or foreigners wishing to go into the country should state their wishes to the Moro authorities and ask for an escort, but it is hoped this will become unnecessary as we know each other better.

ARTICLE XII. The United States will give full protection to the sultan and his subjects in case any foreign nation should attempt to impose upon them.

ARTICLE XIII. The United States will not sell the island of Sulu or any other island of the Sulu archipelago to any foreign nation without the consent of the sultan of Sulu.

ARTICLE XIV. The United States government will pay the following monthly salaries:

To the sultan	\$250
To Dato Rajah Muda	75
To Dato Attik	60
To Dato Calbe	75
To Dato Joakanian	75
To Dato Puyo	60
To Dato Amir Haissin	60
To Hadji Buter	60
To Habib Mura	40
To Serif Saguin	15

Signed in triplicate, in English and Sulu, at Jolo, this 20th day of August, A. D., 1899, (13th Arakuil Akil, 1397).

THE SULTAN OF SULU.

DATO RAJAH.

DATO ATTIK.

DATO CALBE.

DATO JOAKANIAN.

Signed J. C. BATES, Brig.-Gen., U. S. V.

X.

THE OHIO PLATFORM.

The Ohio democratic convention was the political event of last week. The platform adopted, and reproduced on page five of this issue, made a strong presentation of some of the issues but failed to reaffirm the Kansas City platform.

It began with municipal and state issues and the handiwork of Mayor Tom L. Johnson was evident in the terse and emphatic declaration of democratic principles so far as they apply to local questions. The necessity for municipal reform is an urgent one and there is sound democracy in the plank demanding that the people be given an opportunity to vote on questions involving the granting or extending of a franchise.

The plank which declares that "steam and electric railroads and other corporations possessing public franchises shall be assessed in the same proportion to their salable value as are farms and city real estate" is both logical and just, but it is likely to offend the very people who were to be conciliated by an evasion of the silver question.

The plank against passes is all right, but will not make votes among the so-called conservatives. The platform urges tariff reform.

The anti-trust plank would have been stronger if it had reiterated the Kansas City platform on the subject. The free list and the prevention of railroad discriminations are good so far as they go, but they do not go far enough. Whenever a trust can export its goods to other countries, it can live here without any tariff. Something more than free trade is necessary to such a case. Absolute fairness in railroad rates is desirable, but even this will not make private monopolies impossible. The Kansas City platform suggested a complete remedy—the only one yet proposed—and it is to be regretted that the Ohio convention was so prejudiced against the last national platform of the party that it ignored a remedy endorsed by more than six million voters.

The plank condemning imperialism criticises the republican

policy without pointing out a remedy. Here again the failure to reaffirm the Kansas City platform has weakened the Ohio democracy.

The convention endorsed the proposition to elect senators by the people. The labor plank is excellent, but those who wrote the platform failed, either intentionally or unintentionally, to mention government by injunction, the black list and arbitration. A reaffirmation of the Kansas City platform would have covered these points also, but having failed to reaffirm, the convention should have been careful to touch on all the important questions.

The convention not only failed, but refused to endorse or reaffirm the Kansas City platform, and, from the manner in which the gold element has rejoiced over this feature of the convention, one would suppose that the main object of the convention was not to write a new platform, but to repudiate the one upon which the last national campaign was fought.

Mr. Finley was right in insisting upon a vote on his resolution endorsing the Kansas City platform, but he made a mistake in including in his resolution a complimentary reference to Mr. Bryan. Mr. Bryan is not a candidate for any office, and a mention of him might have been construed by some as an endorsement of him for office. The vote should have been upon the naked proposition to endorse the platform of last year, and then no one could have excused his abandonment of democratic principles by pleading his dislike for Mr. Bryan. The cause ought not to be made to bear the sins of an individual. Mr. Bryan will endure without complaint any punishment which the democracy of Ohio may see fit to administer to him, but he does not want his name used to the injury of a good platform.

The gold papers assume that the convention refused to adopt the Kansas City platform because it contained a silver plank. If so, it would have been more courageous to have declared openly for the gold standard. If the gold standard is good, it ought to have been endorsed—if bad, it ought to have been denounced. To ignore the subject entirely was inexcusable.

The money question is not yet out of politics. Every session of Congress will have to deal with it. Republicans declare that it is dead but they keep working at it. At the last session of Congress they tried to make the silver dollar redeemable in gold and when that is accomplished they will try to limit the legal tender

qualities of the dollar. The gold standard will not be complete until gold is the only legal tender money and bank notes the only paper money. Then our supply of primary money will be controlled by foreign financiers, and our supply of credit money by domestic financiers.

This plan has been developed gradually and every step has been taken secretly and stealthily. The republican leaders have been in this movement for years; as soon as the democratic party found that some of its leaders had joined the conspiracy those leaders were deposed. It looks now as if the reactionary influences were once more trying to secure control. If they succeed in Ohio or elsewhere it simply means another gigantic struggle such as was witnessed in 1896. The democratic party cannot be made a plutocratic party even if there was room in this country for two such parties. There was a time, under the Cleveland régime, when the party leaders used general and ambiguous phrases to deceive the voters, but that scheme cannot be worked again. We cannot expect the voters to have confidence in the party unless the party has confidence in the voters and if the party has confidence in the voters it will state its position on all the important questions before the country and invite judgment.

The present campaign involves a senator, as well as a state ticket, and as the convention dealt with other national questions, it should have dealt candidly and honestly with the money question. Mr. McLean is supposed to be a candidate for the United States Senate, and is also supposed to have dictated that portion of the platform which has to do with national issues. The senator elected by the next Ohio legislature will have to vote on the money question. The democratic party of the nation is opposed to making the silver dollar a promise to pay gold, and is also opposed to substituting national bank notes for government paper, but the democratic party in Ohio was silent upon these important subjects. Why? Did the leaders ignore the money question in order to please those who bolted? Or does Mr. McLean want to be left free to affiliate with the republicans on financial questions in case of his election?

Mr. Kilbourne, the nominee for governor, is an excellent man, a life-long democrat and an active supporter of the national ticket in both 1896 and 1900. He is better than his platform. He deserves and should receive the vote of every democrat in Ohio.

If any of the Ohio democrats feel aggrieved because the reorganizing element of the party triumphed at the convention let them not visit their disappointment upon the state ticket but rather see to the nomination of senators and representatives who will select a trustworthy senator. Let them see to it also that the state platform is made at the primaries next time rather than at the convention. If the voters at the primaries had instructed their delegates to insist upon the reaffirmation of the Kansas City platform the result would have been different.

THE SOUTH NOT EXCLUDED.

In the discussion of possible presidential candidates some are prone to regard the sectional question as of overshadowing importance. Those who live in what are known as the doubtful states are especially liable to this error, because they are naturally willing to furnish the candidates. It is not only customary to look to a few doubtful states to furnish the candidates, but it is not uncommon to have some portions of the country excluded from consideration entirely. For years it has been assumed that a southern man was unavailable, and a western man almost as much so. New York, Ohio, Illinois and Indiana have furnished to the two leading parties nearly all the candidates nominated since the civil war. New York furnished the democratic presidential candidate in 1868, 1872, 1876, 1880, 1884, 1888, and 1892, and in those campaigns the candidate for vice-president came from Indiana three times, from Ohio once, and from Illinois once. From 1868 to 1900 the republican party took its presidential candidate from Ohio four times, from Illinois twice, from Indiana twice, and from Maine once. During that time New York has furnished the republican candidate for vice-president in five campaigns, Indiana once, and New Jersey once. Thus it will be seen that a comparatively small section of the country has enjoyed a practical monopoly on candidates. This is an unfortunate condition, and one that cannot be defended by reason. Candidates should be chosen because they represent principles and because they are deemed fit to serve the people in the executive office. Each party should be at liberty to select its best man, no matter in what state or section he lives. The race should be free for all, and then public men everywhere would be stimulated

to offer themselves. Neither the Atlantic coast nor the Pacific coast should be barred out; neither the extreme north nor the extreme south should be forbidden to offer its favorite son. The local influence of a nomination is generally overestimated. State pride is a nice thing to talk about, but it does not count for much in votes. If a man has qualities which make him popular at home, those same qualities will make him popular elsewhere, but very few men will vote for a political opponent merely because he lives in their state, and what little support he wins in that way is offset by the partisan fear that his success may strengthen his party locally. A candidate's strength comes from the principles and policies for which he stands—the only personal element being the confidence that the people have that he is honest and will faithfully carry out his platform.

For a quarter of a century the southern states have been ignored in the selection of candidates. The republicans have had but few white republicans in the South to choose from, and the democrats of the South have voluntarily renounced their claims out of fear that they might embarrass the ticket. Certainly we are far enough away from the civil war—certainly the passions aroused by that conflict are sufficiently cooled, to permit a southern man to aspire to either the presidency or the vice-presidency. Even before the Spanish war called into the volunteer army both federal and confederate, the South had earned its right to be considered a part of the Union, but surely the commingling of the sons of those who wore the blue, and the sons of those who wore the gray, and their service side by side at Santiago and at Manila, ought to silence those who have thought it unwise to place a southern man on the ticket. Slavery has gone never to be restored, and the democracy now dominant both North and South comes nearer to the ideals of Jefferson and Lincoln than does the commercialism of Hanna or the imperialism of Roosevelt.

It is not time yet to select candidates for 1904, but when the time arrives, the democratic voters should see to it that the platform represents their wishes and that the candidates fit the platform.

If some one living south of the Mason-Dixon line is chosen for either the first or second position on the ticket, his place of residence will not weaken him—not though he be an ex-confederate soldier. We are engaged in a mighty struggle against plutocracy,

and we need the whole nation to pick from when we select our standard bearers. Merit, not section, should determine the nomination; fidelity to principle, not locality, should control.

A FALSE CHARGE.

The editor of *THE COMMONER* has received a clipping containing the following charge against Senator James K. Jones, of Arkansas:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 24.

EDITOR *GLOBE*:—I see by last Wednesday's New York papers that the great Cotton trust held a meeting in New York city, and among the directors elected was Jas. K. Jones, of Arkansas, who is the chairman of the national democratic committee. Now, then, as our great standard-bearer, William Jennings Bryan, fought out his campaign against trusts and tyranny, which was one of our principal issues, I move that Jones step down and out, as we want no schemers or trust officials in our ranks. Very truly,
JAMES PETIT.

This charge was made during the late campaign, and the editor of *THE COMMONER* investigated it. On another page will be found a letter written by Senator Jones to Mr. Lesueur, then editor of the *Kansas City Times*, setting forth the facts.

Senator Jones owns some of the common stock of the American Cotton Company. His letter explains that he became interested in the Graves patent for making a round cotton bale. A question of infringement arose, and the parties interested, instead of settling it by a lawsuit, compromised, each claimant taking an interest in the patent. As the development of the patent required a large amount of money, a corporation was formed. Senator Jones as a part owner of the patent received stock in the company and was made one of the directors. This company has been called a trust, but it has none of the characteristics of a trust. In the first place, it operates under a patent, and the opponents of trusts make no war on patents. A patent is granted for a limited period as a reward to one who gives to the world a new idea. A patent is an act of justice to the inventor and an incentive to further invention. The democratic party has never condemned the patent system, nor has it condemned those who by means of patents en-

joy a temporary monopoly of their inventions. But the democratic party does condemn those who, without giving to the public any new or useful idea, endeavor to secure a permanent monopoly of the production of some necessary of life. The difference between a patent and an industrial monopoly is so great and so plain that no one need confuse them.

It has been alleged that the company with which Senator Jones is connected has a monopoly of the business of compressing cotton. If this were true and the monopoly rested upon a patent, it would not be a trust within the ordinary meaning of the word, but as a matter of fact, Mr. Jones' company does not handle ten per cent. of the cotton compressed in the United States—it is nearer five per cent. The republicans say nothing about a salt trust that controls ninety-five per cent. of the output of salt, but make a great ado about a patent which is used in compressing but a small portion of the cotton crop.

The company has been criticised for renting its machines instead of selling them outright, but as the patent law does not prohibit the leasing of a patented article and as this method of realizing on a patent is quite common, it does not furnish valid ground for complaint. Senator Jones explains in his letter that while the company, when desired, buys cotton from those who use the round bale process, it does not require them to sell to the company.

In this connection the editor calls attention to a suggestion which he has made on a former occasion, namely, that there should be a value limit as well as a time limit to a patent. In other words, that the patent should expire whenever a reasonable sum (the amount to be fixed by law) has been realized from it. But even if such a law were now in force, it would not affect the cotton company, for the owners of the patent have not yet realized any considerable profit on the money invested in the patent.

This matter has been considered at some length because the republicans, unable to defend the attitude of their party on the trust question, have sought to dodge the issue by bringing accusation against Senator Jones, the chairman of the democratic national committee.

During the campaign the only reply made by republicans, when charged with friendliness to trusts, was that Tammany leaders were interested in an ice trust and that Senator Jones was interested

in a cotton trust. As soon as the campaign was over it was found that Governor Roosevelt had, for political reasons, suppressed Mayor Van Wyck's answer, and it also developed that the republican senate refused to consider the house anti-trust bill when Senator Jones tried to call it up.

THE STEEL STRIKE.

A strike is on between organized labor and the Steel Company, and it seems to involve the right of labor to organize for its own protection. President Shaffer who represents the men is confident of success, while the officers of the Steel Trust as yet show no sign of weakening. Mr. Shaffer says that the men will not resort to force and that there will be no destruction of property. As long as this promise is kept public sympathy will be with the laboring men.

The right of labor to organize ought not to be questioned, and yet the growth of trusts is directly opposed to the interests of the laboring men, and, as every trust is a menace to the labor organizations, it is strange that any laboring man votes with the trusts. When the head of a great corporation controls all the factories which employ skilled labor in any particular line he is very likely to dictate terms. Capital does not need food or clothing. If it remains idle for a month or a year its owner simply loses his income for the period of its idleness, but with the laboring man it is different. His hunger cannot be suspended, his need for clothing and shelter knows no cessation; the children must be cared for, and with all of the nation's boasted prosperity the average wage-earner is not able to live long without work. Heretofore the laborer has found his protection in the fact that the employer could not close down his factory for a great length of time without loss of trade and loss of employes. In case of a strike his business was in danger of being absorbed by other firms, and his employes were apt to be scattered. When, however, the monopoly of an industry is complete the employe cannot seek work of a rival firm because there is no rival firm and he cannot engage in other business without losing the advantage of his skill and experience. It is to be hoped that the laboring men will win in the present conflict, but if they were as unanimous on election day

as they are when a strike is ordered they could remedy their grievances without a strike or loss of employment.

The steel trust may prove a blessing in disguise if it convinces the wage-earners of the country that "a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable."

NOT A NEW CONVERT.

The New York *Journal* is in error in assuming that Bryan is a new convert to municipal ownership. In a recent issue the *Journal* said:

The Philadelphia franchise steal has brought out a welcome declaration from William J. Bryan. Mr. Bryan took advantage of a visit to Philadelphia on Saturday to say:

"If franchises are to be turned over to private individuals or corporations, the transfer should be arranged upon the best terms possible for the city. But I believe that municipal ownership of water plants, lighting plants and street car lines is the best solution of the problem."

The time was when the democratic leader in the last two national campaigns did not appreciate the idea of public ownership. He distrusted it as a little too much like paternalism for an old-fashioned Jeffersonian democrat.

But men like Quay and Ashbridge are rapidly extinguishing that type of democracy. They are making it evident that the issue is no longer between one economic theory and another, but between honesty and theft. And on such an issue nobody could doubt Mr. Bryan's position.

Mr. Bryan has always favored the municipal ownership of water and lighting plants and for several years has believed in the municipal ownership of street car lines. **THE COMMONER** in its issue of March 1st said:

Some of our contemporaries are discussing the relative merits of an inheritance tax and a tax on franchises. Why not have both? One does not interfere with the other and both are meritorious. In the course of time the cities will own and operate their water systems, their lighting plants and their street car lines, but until that time comes municipal and other franchises ought to be made to contribute to the expenses of government.

This is sufficient proof that Mr. Quay's Philadelphia grab is not responsible for Mr. Bryan's views on this subject.

Mr. Bryan has been dealing with national questions and, while he was his party's candidate, did not feel justified in adding to the reforms enumerated in the platform, but as a citizen he is interested in all questions affecting the government and as an editor he will discuss all questions upon which the people are called to act.

ADMIRAL SCHLEY.

When the first news reached the American people concerning the Santiago naval battle the impression was that Admiral Sampson was the real hero of the occasion. This was due to the fact that Admiral Sampson sent to the president a message in which he said that "the fleet under my command" offered the American nation the Santiago victory as a Fourth of July present. But as soon as the newspaper reports and the statements of eye witnesses came in, it developed that Admiral Sampson, while theoretically in command of the American fleet, was at least twelve miles from the scene of battle, and that it was Admiral Schley who commanded and led the splendid fight. Immediately a systematic attack was opened upon Schley, although that great sailor did not indulge in boasting of any character. In reply to a question he said "there is glory enough in this victory for all of us." Since then the adherents of Sampson and the administration politicians have kept the newspapers filled with things intended to discredit Schley, but that officer has maintained a dignified silence.

Finally, because of formal and serious attacks made upon him, Admiral Schley has been forced, in defense of his manhood, to demand a court of inquiry. His statements to the newspapers after, having demanded this court of inquiry are characteristic of the man. He said, "It is a very great pity that there should be a controversy over matters wherein everybody did his best." How different this is from the attitude assumed by the enemies of Admiral Schley.

It is indeed a very great pity that there should be any controversy over a matter wherein the world has given credit where credit belongs. It is indeed a pity that there should be any controversy that seeks to discredit a brave, honorable and modest seafighter, who successfully led the American forces in one of the greatest, if not the greatest, naval battles in the history of the

world. It is indeed a very great pity that the politicians and the bureaucrats having the favor of this administration should insist upon discrediting and abusing a man who has served his country so faithfully as Winfield Scott Schley has served the United States of America.

Admiral Sampson's friends should be satisfied with the fact that their favorite obtained the prize money won in a battle in which he did not participate, and that his face is to grace a medal that is to commemorate a fight in which he did not take part. It should be sufficient for them that Admiral Schley has never made any claim as to his part in the great battle in Santiago Bay; that he has been content for the newspaper correspondents and other witnesses to give the facts to the American people. The difficulty is that these statements have convinced the American people that Schley was the real hero of the day and entitled to all the honors at the hands of a grateful people, even though he is denied the emoluments in the way of prize money and medals.

NO MIDDLE GROUND.

If any one thinks that plutocracy can be placated by an abandonment of silver, let him read the *New York Sun*. That paper has earned the right to be considered the chief exponent of the money worshipping element in American politics. Instead of thanking the Ohio democrats for ignoring the money question, it warns them that anti-trust legislation would be more dangerous to the country and free silver. It says:

"We demand the suppression of all trusts." There is a monstrous proposition. Were there any way of carrying it into effect industrial disaster more widespread and ruinous than has ever fallen upon the country would be the result. There would be a commercial cataclysm. The amount of capital and of labor dependent upon these combinations is so vast that to crush them would be to bring on unparalleled economic calamity compared with which the free coinage of silver would have been a fly bite."

So, we are to have a panic and all sorts of calamity if we destroy the trusts? Well, this is discouraging. But it only shows that there is running through all the republican policies, the same vicious principle and every policy is defended by the same brutal

argument: "Accept our policies; submit to our demands, or we will bring on a panic!" Some think that they can make peace with the money trust and then fight the other trusts, but it is a vain hope. There is no middle ground. The democratic party must be with the people entirely or against them entirely. The moment it begins to compromise it loses more than it can possibly gain.

EQUALITY IN TAXATION.

The Ohio democratic platform demands that railroad and street car lines shall bear their fair share of taxation. The plank reads as follows:

Steam and electric railroads and other corporations possessing public franchises shall be assessed in the same proportion to their salable value as are farms and city real estate.

Who will deny the proposition therein stated? Who will assume to suggest a different basis of assessment? The railroad enjoys the right of eminent domain; it can take any property it wants for railroad purposes. The state surrenders to it enough of sovereignty to enable it to demand any man's land, even his homestead, upon the tender of its salable value. The street car line enjoys a valuable franchise, usually secured from the people's representatives without the knowledge of the people themselves. Why should the ordinary individual, who receives from his government no franchises, bonuses, subsidies, or special privileges, pay taxes upon the full value of his land, while the railroads and the street car lines pay taxes on but a small per cent. of the value of their property? Why should the farmer be compelled to pay taxes on the full value upon his horses, cattle, hogs, and other walking stock, while railroads and street car lines pay on but a small per cent. of the value of their rolling stock? Mayor Johnson is responsible for the insertion of this plank, and it is eminently just. The candidates upon the state ticket can afford to challenge their opponents to discuss this proposition before the people of their state. Equality before the law is a maxim that is being more and more ignored. The democrats of Ohio are to be congratulated upon their attempts to revive this principle in state affairs. They would have been wiser if they had applied it to national affairs as well.

DEMOCRATIC REMEDY FOR TRUSTS.

Mr. Louis F. Post, one of the best of men, editor of the *Public*, one of the most valuable of our weekly papers, takes the editor of THE COMMONER to task for suggesting again the trust remedy proposed by him more than a year ago, and endorsed by the Kansas City convention. Mr. Post is so conscientious in his criticism that he deserves more attention than those who find fault merely for the pleasure it gives them to do so.

The remedy proposed by Mr. Bryan is, briefly, that, in addition to state legislation, there should be a federal law, shutting the corporation up in the state of its origin, or prohibiting it from engaging in interstate commerce, until it shows that there is no water in its stock, and that it is not trying to monopolize any branch of business or the production of any article of merchandise. After enumerating the remedies above suggested, Mr. Post says:

These propositions, coming from a democrat to the democracy—though Mr. Bryan has proposed them before, and thereby smoothed the way for them—must be at least disturbing to men who shrink from the republican tendency, already alarmingly strong, to centralize all power in the national government; while those who dread the advances of socialism, must be aghast at this democratic proposition to strengthen enormously the foundations already laid for making of the American government a great socialistic state. All these proposals for federal action are centralizing, federalistic, and in an objectionable sense socialistic, save only one—that with reference to the abolition of protection for trust-made goods. Judged only by his remedy, Mr. Bryan might fairly be supposed to have decided the issue of competition versus socialism against competition. Yet that is not what he intends to do. He believes that this complex machinery in restraint of free trade would extinguish private monopoly.

Laws must deal with conditions, and under present conditions it is impossible to deal with the trust question completely by means of state laws. A state can prevent the organization of a monopoly within its borders, and it can prohibit, or should be able to, a monopoly organized outside from doing business within the state, but this power is not sufficient. If a trust has absolute control of the production of the necessaries of life, a law preventing the monopoly from doing business within a given state might bring

great hardship upon the people by depriving them of the article controlled by the trust. Under the Constitution, Congress has power to regulate interstate commerce, and it does not tend towards centralization for Congress to exercise that power in behalf of the people. The law proposed would not take from the state any right that it now has; it would not encroach upon the domain of the state, it would simply provide that the state, while at liberty to create corporations for domestic purposes, could not create corporations to prey upon the people of other states. No state ought to permit a corporation to water its stock, but if it does what harm can come from requiring such corporations to confine their business to the state of their origin? If the people of a state are willing to create a corporation and give it control of an industry in the state, that is a matter for the people of that state, but when that corporation attempts to secure a monopoly of the industries of other states, then the people of other states become interested parties and, as they cannot effectively act singly, they must act together through the power conferred upon Congress by the Constitution. Congress cannot refuse to regulate interstate railroad rates on the ground that the federal government would be exercising too much power, neither can Congress refuse to protect the people against trusts on the ground that the federal government will be strengthened. The federal government was organized to give to the people of the nation that protection which must be secured by the joint action of the people of the several states, and such joint action is imperatively demanded at this time.

Mr. Post assumes that the only anti-trust legislation necessary is to withdraw all special privileges granted by law.

Every trust or monopoly rests upon a corporation, and the entire abolition of corporations would destroy trusts, but Mr. Bryan has not believed it necessary to apply so radical a remedy. He has sought to eliminate the evils of corporations without destroying their advantages. He has sought to draw the line at the point where they become injurious.

Mr. Post asserts that a monopoly would be impossible without the possession of "some legal advantage—transportation, tariff, location, patents or sources of natural supply." It has been pointed out in a previous editorial that a corporation which can export its products can have a monopoly, even under free trade. It is also true that a monopoly can exist without any reliance upon dis-

criminating freight rates. Tariffs have benefitted monopolies, and railroad discriminations have aided them, but a monopoly could exist without either. Patents have been the foundation of monopoly, but such a monopoly is only temporary, and the benefits of such a monopoly have been given to the owner of the patent as a reward for his genius. It would be possible for a monopoly to exist without owning any of the "sources of natural supply." We have, for instance, woollen mills enough in the country now to manufacture all the woollen goods needed by our people. Let us suppose that they join together under one corporation. Being the only purchaser of wool, that corporation could fix the price of wool; it could fix the price of the manufactured article, and unless organized labor could protect itself against such a corporation, it could fix the price of labor. It would be very difficult if not impossible, for a corporation having a less capital to compete with it, for it would be possible for the monopoly to reduce prices in the neighborhood of the competing factory and, by keeping up prices elsewhere, bankrupt its small rival without serious loss to itself. This has been the experience of many small factories. Why permit the creation or the continuance of a monopoly? Why allow a corporation to engage in interstate commerce for such a purpose? The private monopoly is to the industries of a nation what the highwayman is to an honest citizen; the industrial life of the nation needs protection from the monopoly as much as human life needs protection from the highwayman.

Mr. Post suggests no remedy for the trusts, that is, no specific remedy, he says: "Take away their underlying privileges of transportation, patents and land, and competition, actual or possible, would make quick work of their oppressive power. That is the key to the trust question."

Is it possible that Mr. Post believes that private ownership in land is the foundation of trusts? If so, must we calmly submit to monopolies until the people are willing to accept Mr. Post's views on the land question? Is it not the part of wisdom to apply such remedies as are within our reach? There are many very earnest and very intelligent men who believe that the private ownership of lands is the greatest of all evils; they believe that the ultimate solution of the social problem is to be found in public ownership of land, but will they refuse to assist in securing other methods of relief until they can try their own method? Certainly not. The

single taxers, as the followers of Henry George call themselves, have helped the democratic party in recent campaigns (and no one was more active than Mr. Post), not because the democratic party endorsed the single tax idea, but because the single taxers were willing to put the government in the hands of those who believe in Jeffersonian principles, and permit a trial of the remedies which the democratic party proposed.

Speaking of competition, it is only fair to say that competition, like any other useful thing, may be carried to excess or, to speak more correctly, there can be fair competition only where there is measurably fair equality between competitors. Competition between the standard oil company or the steel trust and an ordinary individual is as one-sided as a combat between two individuals, one armed with bow and arrow and the other with a repeating rifle. Society may protect the principle of competition and yet place limits upon it, just as society permits the collection of interest and yet limits the rate. Fire is necessary to human life, and yet fire uncontrolled becomes a destructive force; water is required for man's existence and yet the devastating flood may do immeasurable damage; the air which we breathe is indispensable, and yet when that air is put into violent motion it becomes the cyclone or the tornado. Competition is necessary; it is the law of trade; it is a controlling force in human affairs, and yet it may become destructive. If competition leads parents to put their children into factories at an early age, we pass laws fixing the age at which children may be employed; if competition unreasonably prolongs the day's work we fix maximum limits, and so competition with the man-made giant called a corporation becomes destructive of the rights and interests of the God-made man we can place restrictions upon the corporation, prescribe conditions upon which it can engage in interstate commerce, and if necessary arbitrarily fix the amount of capital that may be associated together in one corporation, say what proportion of the total product one corporation may control, or prohibit entirely the co-operation of distinct and separate corporations. All the corporations ask is to be let alone but the people need relief now, and we should secure such relief as is possible now. If, in the years to come, some better remedy is found it will be welcomed when it arrives, but those who object to the remedy suggested in the Kansas City platform do not propose any remedy which is complete or which has a prospect of speedy trial.

A CRITICISM ANSWERED.

My attention has been called to a communication published in the *Washington Post* of July 15, from which the following is an extract:

It is a well-known fact, and susceptible of ample proof, that Mr. Bryan, while conducting his campaign for election to the office of chief magistrate of this great republic, required his admiring friends at each point where he addressed them throughout the western states to hand up to him or his financial representatives an envelope containing money in proportion to the size of the town.

In one small town in Indiana, not very far from Brazil, the democrats of the region had expended the full amount of the collection upon the grandstand from which Mr. Bryan was expected to speak. It was decorated and presented a very bright appearance. Upon the arrival of Mr. Bryan's train and the meeting by him of the committee of beaming admirers, Mr. Bryan asked if any person had handed up the envelope, and upon being informed that there had been none "handed up," he declined to leave the train, and remarked that he would say from the car platform that which he intended to utter, and declined to go to the near-by platform. This decision was made because the quantum sufficit was not forthcoming. This was commercialism with a vengeance. If men—democrats—did not pay him for appealing to them for their votes for him, he cared not to leave his sumptuous railway train.

Similar charges have appeared from time to time during the last five years and I have answered them. Every person has had an opportunity to know of the falsity of these charges, but as the *Washington Post* is usually careful in its statements I make this denial for its benefit. I never received any compensation of any kind from the National Committee, from any State Committee, County Committee, or other committee, or from any individual for any speech which I made during the campaigns of 1896 and 1900. Neither did I ever have any negotiations with any person or committee in regard to compensation for any speech. I have been informed that in some instances the expense of the special train which carried the members of the Committee, the newspaper men and myself was borne by the towns visited, but I never knew of the details of such arrangements and never received any of the proceeds therefrom; neither was it ever suggested to me that I should refuse to speak on any platform or at a place because the money had not

been raised. It often happened that because of the shortness of the time, the lateness of the train, or the density of the crowd I spoke from the rear of the train rather than from the platform erected, but the change in the program was never due, at the town mentioned or anywhere else, to the failure of a local committee to pay money to the committee in charge of the train or to me.

Republicans who are both able and willing to accept transportation from the railroads, have frequently criticised the democratic committees for raising money by subscription to pay for the hiring of trains, but I believe it much better for our committees to raise the money necessary for excursion trains, and thus be free from obligation to the railroad companies. I may add that when I travelled alone I paid my own travelling expenses.

The same correspondent is responsible for another criticism, which reads as follows:

We are treated to another sample of Bryan commercialism just at this moment, in which Mr. Bryan refuses to give utterance to his opinions on the Ohio democratic convention platform except through THE COMMONER; hence "buy a COMMONER if you want to know what I think of McLean and his crowd of Ohio democrats." It is only 5 cents, but it counts in the annual income of the redoubtable commercialist.

THE COMMONER is not copyrighted. Any newspaper is at liberty to reproduce anything which appears in THE COMMONER. The paper is sent out so as to reach subscribers on Friday, but on Thursday afternoon advance copies of the paper are furnished to the Associated Press and to all newspaper men desiring copies. In this way any paper in the United States can give its readers anything published in THE COMMONER, and can do so on the same day that THE COMMONER reaches its subscribers. When I comment upon some event of special importance the proof is given to the newspapers at an earlier date. For instance, the comments on the Supreme Court decision were given on Monday afternoon, four days before the paper reached its subscribers. The editorial on the Ohio platform was given to the newspapers on Monday afternoon and published all over the country Tuesday morning, three days before THE COMMONER reached its subscribers. Newspaper men have criticised me for giving other papers a "scoop," as they call it, on my own paper, but I have no objection to doing this when the

matter discussed is of importance. It is only mentioned here in answer to the criticism that the readers of the *Post* and THE COMMONER may know how partisan and malicious some republican politicians are.

A WORD TO THE DISAPPOINTED.

In accordance with a call issued immediately after the Ohio convention, a number of democrats met at Columbus last week and registered a protest against the action of the Ohio democrats in refusing to endorse the Kansas City platform. A platform was adopted and a ticket headed by Dr. Reemelin of Cincinnati, was placed in the field. As the gentlemen who attended this meeting are political friends and supporters, the editor of THE COMMONER feels that he should submit some observations with regard to the action taken.

They have ample reason to feel disappointed at the course pursued by the regular convention. If it had been necessary to fight the campaign entirely on state issues, no reference would have been made to national questions. The fact that the platform devoted more space to national than to local subjects was proof that the excuse given for a refusal to endorse the Kansas City platform was shallow and insincere. The fact that the convention avoided other subjects of present and great importance showed that the silver plank was not the only plank in the Kansas City platform which was objectionable to the men who dominated the resolutions committee. The friends of the Reemelin ticket can be excused for entertaining a suspicion that the men who objected so strenuously to the Kansas City platform would object as strenuously to any definite and positive political remedy. But the question which confronts the loyal democrats of Ohio is how best to correct the mistakes made by the convention and thus rescue the democratic party from the control of those who would republicanize it. The fact that the platform contains much that is good, together with the further fact that the candidates nominated, from Mr. Kilbourne down through the entire list, have been supporters of the party ticket in recent campaigns, would make it impossible to organize a bolt with any promise of success. The first effect of a bolting ticket would be, therefore, to augment the chances of republican success this fall. The second effect

would be to lessen the influence of the bolting democrats in future party contests. It is not fair to assume that the convention spoke for the rank and file in repudiating the Kansas City platform and those who leave the party at this time weaken the reform element of the party and give to the gold and corporation element greater proportionate influence in the party management.

Whether the Ohio democracy is to take its position on the Grover Cleveland side of public issues is a question yet to be determined—a question to be determined at the primaries after the people understand the issues presented. To leave the party at this time is to assume the battle lost and, by assuming it lost, help the enemy. When the fight was made between 1895 and 1896, we had an administration to fight as well as all the banks and railroads; now, many who were against us then act openly with the enemy and those who have returned after a temporary sojourn in the camp of the enemy are handicapped by the record they have made.

There is no evidence that the democratic voters in Ohio favor a non-committal, evasive and ambiguous platform, such as the democratic party promulgated when the Wall Street influences were in control, and no one should assume the existence of such sentiment without positive proof.

Let the democrats of Ohio commend the good parts of the Ohio platform and condemn the weak parts, but let them support the ticket. Then they should begin on the day after the election to so organize the democratic party of that state as to make it impossible for another convention to give as much encouragement to the republicans as the last convention did.

FAKE INTERVIEWS.

Just now the republican papers and those so-called democratic papers which spend their time in defending republican policies, are publishing fake interviews with democrats, populists and silver-republicans, calculated to stir up dissensions among those who are opposing the administration.

The meanest and most malicious of the false reports recently put into circulation was the statement attributed to ex-Senator Towne just after the Ohio convention. In this purported interview

Mr. Towne was made to predict the success of the re-organizers, the nomination of Mr. Hill and the breaking up of the democratic party. All of the gold standard, trust and imperialistic papers seized upon this as a sweet morsel, and presented it as conclusive proof of the death of the Kansas City platform.

As soon as this falsehood had time to get over the whole country another enterprising prevaricator came forward with a statement attributed to Mr. J. G. Johnson, the Kansas member of the democratic national committee, in which he was reported as saying unkind things of Mr. Towne and Mr. Webster Davis. The editor of THE COMMONER has become so accustomed to misrepresentation that he puts no faith in these alleged interviews, but he refers to them for the benefit of readers who having had less experience in the political methods of republican and gold papers have been disturbed by them. THE COMMONER is authorized to state that both of these pretended interviews were absolutely false. Mr. Towne says that he has not been interviewed on politics within three months, and that the report sent out from New York was "a pure fake."

Mr. Johnson is equally explicit in his denial of the interview attributed to him.

The democrats, populists and silver republicans are unfortunate in that they have so few democratic dailies of large circulation. There seems to be a concerted effort on the part of the republican and gold standard papers to mislead the people as to public sentiment, and those who believe in democratic principles and desire genuine reform must rely almost wholly upon the weekly papers or upon the smaller dailies. For this reason it is the more important that the faithful and loyal papers should receive the earnest and cordial support of the democrats.

A MINISTER'S LAMENT.

The editor of THE COMMONER receives many letters, so many, in fact, that he finds it impossible to give a personal reply to all of them, but he receives much information from these letters. Some of them furnish texts for editorials, and these texts are utilized whenever possible. He has recently received a letter which reflects the fear that many entertain that the nation

has already gone so far on the road to commercialism that its course cannot now be changed. The letter was written by a minister, and a few quotations from it will be interesting. "As for myself—an old soldier and color bearer in the civil war—I feel like one whose house is on fire, and who has fought the flame with every means at command, until it seems evident that the house and all its sacred store is doomed to destruction.

"For a long time I have foreseen the impending danger and have on every occasion done what I could to avert it. The preliminary utterance of the highest court is now public, and the actual dissolution of the republic is begun, and as I estimate the case, there is no human power that can resist its progress. * * *

"The capitalistic powers of this country and of the world are in the plot and they have found a party that faithfully does their bidding. They essentially control the directing forces of thought—the press, the pulpit, the forum and the market. They calculate that they can buy majorities at the ballot-box—in the halls of legislation, in the judiciary, everywhere—and it is only too evident that they can. They can bribe or send an ultimatum with the army and navy, as the case may require, to achieve their ends; and really there is no possible way to arouse and unify the people for a successful resistance.

"You still loyally prefer to believe in the people. I would like to do so, but if the things which have transpired during the last four years will not awaken the people, I have no hope that they will be aroused though the last remnant of our republican institutions were removed. Absolutism is already here, and unless the Lord of Hosts stretches forth His hand rebuking and bringing to naught the devices of scheming men, this government of the people, by the people, and for the people has already completed its career and the world's hope of liberty and justice is blighted."

He then proceeds to say that while he is discouraged as to the ultimate outcome, he will continue to do what he can, but is embarrassed by the restraints that are placed upon one in his position.

His letter suggests two questions: first, is the situation hopeless? and, second, is it proper for a minister to take part in the work that must be done?

The case is not hopeless. No one who has observed the tendency of republican policies can deny that that party is completely under the domination of organized wealth. It sprang into existence to

combat the extension of slavery; in its earlier days it invoked the name and principles of Jefferson; it quoted the declaration of independence in its early platforms, and proclaimed its devotion to human rights. Lincoln was the typical representative of the party. Others were more scholarly and more rhetorical, but Lincoln in homely, yet eloquent way, gave expression to the moral sentiments which ran through the party creed. He condensed the tenets of republican faith into a sentence when he said that the republican party believed in the man and the dollar, but that in case of conflict it believed in the man before the dollar.

To-day the republican party openly, notoriously, and shamelessly places the dollar far above the man. It is establishing in society, in politics and in the church a standard whereby money is made to answer all things. As in the declining days of the Roman Empire, men are measured, not by what they are, but by what they have, and success—pecuniary success—is the one thing sought for. When the republican party legislates on the subject of taxation it lays the burden upon the poor and allows the rich to escape a large portion of the burden which they ought in justice to bear. When it legislates on the money question it tries to make the dollar dearer in the interest of the money changers and the holders of fixed investments, and it tries to give to bankers complete control over the issue of paper money. When it legislates on the trust question—well it does not legislate at all, it simply allows private monopolies to do whatever they please and then draws its campaign funds from great trusts which could not exist if the party did its duty to the people.

When it legislates on the subject of imperialism it tramples upon the most sacred traditions of the nation, and violates self-evident truths in the hope of securing rich commercial reward by the subjugation of distant people. It does not hesitate to buy every one who can be bought, to deceive every one who can be deceived, and to intimidate every one who can be intimidated. Now, this is the condition which has been developing during the last few years, but, bad as it is it can be remedied. The democratic party has tried to remedy it. Prior to 1896 Wall Street influences had secured control of our party organization and had made it impotent to accomplish any reforms. As soon as the democratic party raised the standard of real democracy in 1896, it inspired hope and the party ticket polled a million more votes than had ever been cast for a

democratic candidate before. Less than a million democrats went over to the enemy; less than twenty per cent. of the voting strength of the party deserted and gave victory to the republicans, but these deserters became responsible for what has happened since. Between 1896 and 1900 the republican party was aided by the natural reaction from the panic of 1893, by the increased production of gold, by the expenditure of money in the prosecution of wars on three continents and by the enthusiasm which a successful war usually arouses. And yet, in spite of these facts the republican candidate increased his vote less than three per cent. and the democratic candidate lost less than three per cent. of his vote. What would have been the result if the billion dollar steel trust had been formed before the election instead of after? Senator Depew said recently that it might have changed the result of the election. What would have been the result if the recent supreme court decision had been rendered during the campaign, with a third of the republican judges dissenting? During the campaign the republican party denied that it had any imperialistic intentions or that it desired to establish militarism in the United States. What would have been the result if it had openly avowed before the election the purposes which it has disclosed since?

The patriotism of the people has been sufficient in times past, and we should not despair even now. We must appeal to the conscience of the people, not only because it is a duty to do so, but because we have reason to expect a response. Republicans are not satisfied with the record which their party is making; they have voted their ticket under protest, and it is only a question of time when this protest will manifest itself in revolt. The acts of the republican party have belied its words, and its betrayal of all that is high and holy in governmental principles must sooner or later bring defeat to its leaders and redemption to the country.

But what of the duty of ministers?

Ordinarily, the minister does not feel justified in taking an active part in politics. His congregation is usually divided and he would create friction in his church by entering into politics, and yet who will deny that it is the duty of the minister to apply his moral principles in every word and act? Whenever a moral question—a question involving right and wrong—arises, the influence of the minister must be cast upon the right side, or upon the side which, after careful and conscientious investigation, he

thinks right. The more important the question, the more imperative is it that the influence of the minister, be it great or small, be cast on the right side. When the colonists were fighting against taxation without representation, the ministers were quick to add their voice and influence to the side of the revolutionary patriots. The speech of one has been preserved in poetry:

When God is with our righteous cause,
His holiest temples then are ours;
His churches are our forts and towers,
That frown upon a tyrant foe.

The same principle is involved now. It is difficult to understand how a layman, or even a non-christian, can fail to see the wrongfulness of taxation without representation, even though we do the taxing and the Porto Ricans or the Filipinos are the victims. How, then, can a minister with a quickened conscience fail to see the error of our position? It is surprising that any one can regard stealing from others as less reprehensible, viewed from a moral standpoint, than being stolen from. And yet there are ministers who defend a government based upon force, merely because we administer the government and use the force against others.

But imperialism attacks the foundations of our religion as well as the foundations of our government; it substitutes arbitrary authority for persuasion and love. It makes our nation an exponent of the doctrine of war, conquest, and subjugation, rather than a high and noble example. The Christian religion rests upon the doctrine of human brotherhood, just as our government rests upon the kindred doctrine that all men are created equal, and the two doctrines will disappear together when we attempt to build a republic upon the bloody foundation upon which empires rest.

It requires moral courage and often sacrifice to do one's duty, and yet duty cannot be shirked with impunity. The minister believes that moral principles apply to nations as well as to individuals, and that nations cannot violate those principles with impunity. Ministers believe that the punishment meted out to nations is more terrible than the punishment meted out to individuals, because the sin is greater. Let them beware, then, of giving their endorsement, or even silent acquiescence, to national

wrong-doing. No one can assume that others will be more interested than himself in the triumph of right, nor ought he to assume that the sacrifices of others will be sufficient to save him from the natural results of his own indifference. Every one, the minister included, is in duty bound to give to his country the benefit of his judgment and his conscience.

OPENING A RESERVATION.

The opening of the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache reservations in the Indian Territory is an accomplished fact and the rush for homesteads is over. The disappointed land seekers now have time to reflect upon the situation and to form an intelligent judgment as to the rules governing the distribution of land. In the first place, the administration is to be commended for substituting the plan of drawing by lot for the old plan which made all applicants toe the line and then, at a given signal, enter into a mad struggle to see who could reach a desirable quarter section first. It is much fairer to ascertain how many want to locate on the reservations and then allow those equally entitled to land to draw lots for positions, than to make the selections depend upon fleetness of foot or physical endurance.

But why compel applicants to go all the way to the Indian Territory to file a claim? Why were they not allowed to send their claims to Washington? This would have given every one an equal chance. As it was, only one applicant in thirteen could secure an allotment and yet all the rest (except those who for special reasons were allowed to file their claims by proxy) were compelled to incur the expense and hardships of the trip. As no one knew in advance how many claimants there would be, each person had to risk a considerable sum without knowing what chance he had to secure a home. Those living nearest to the place of filing had the best opportunity, because their travelling expenses were light, and in case of failure to secure land their loss was least.

It was next to impossible for any one to go from a remote state. But the discrimination was even greater against the poor man—the very man most in need of land. It would have been difficult enough for a person of small means to have made the trip even if sure of getting land, but it was out of the question for him to borrow the

money when he had only a chance (it turned out to be one chance in thirteen) of securing land after he got there.

The railroads have profited largely by the plan which the administration adopted, because they collected fares both ways from disappointed ones and still have another chance at the successful ones when they return to make permanent settlements, but those desiring to locate upon the reservation have been put to much needless expense and trouble.

FUSION, OPEN AND SECRET.

In the last campaign the republican papers denounced democrats and populists for co-operating against the common enemy. Both parties were accused of sacrificing principle to "get office." The subject is mentioned at this time because D. Clem Deaver, a Nebraska politician who had charge of the middle-of-the-road populist campaign in the west, has recently received at the hands of President McKinley a substantial reward for opposing fusion. A republican by the name of Dickson severely criticised Mr. Deaver's appointment on the ground that Mr. Deaver was not a republican. In reply Mr. Deaver gave this explanation of his appointment:

"I have no desire personally to answer the strictures of Dr. Dickson, but as a matter of record I wish to say that my application for appointment to this office was indorsed by Governor Dietrich and every other republican state officer, also by R. B. Schneider, republican national committeeman, and the leaders of every faction of the republican party in this state.

"Further, upon the promotion of Governor Dietrich to the senate, he took up my case and enlisted the support of Senator Millard, who had never met me prior to the time of his election, March 28.

"In view of the fact," continued Mr. Deaver, "that the party leaders were a unit in supporting my application, Senator Millard's assent was cheerfully given. I have about perfected my bond and expect to assume the duties of the office August 1."

During the last presidential campaign Mr. Deaver went up and down the country urging the populists not to have anything to do with the democrats, and the republican newspapers spoke of Mr. Deaver as a populist who "stood by his principles." But now

all the republican leaders ask for and secure a valuable appointment for him. This proves, if indeed proof was necessary, that there was secret fusion between the republicans and the middle-of-the-road populists. In 1896 the republicans and gold democrats denounced fusion between democrats and populists, and yet when the election was over prominent democrats like Bynum and Irish applied for and received appointments from the administration, showing that there was a secret understanding between the republicans and those who were in charge of the Palmer and Buckner movement.

The cry "Down with fusion" does not come with good grace from populists and gold democrats who have been affiliating with republicans. With even poorer grace does the cry come from republicans who have made use of the two extremes, gold democrats on the one hand and middle-of-the-road populists on the other.

Honest co-operation between the reform forces is natural and necessary, and such co-operation will be advocated by those who are earnest in their effort to overthrow republican policies. Secret and dishonest co-operation will still be indulged in by those who denounce fair and open methods.

THE SILVER REPUBLICANS.

The Silver Republican State Committee of Nebraska has held its last meeting. The following resolution explains the action taken:

While we steadfastly adhere to the principles for the maintenance of which the "silver republican party" was organized, and are proud of the record made by the candidates of our party, yet believing that those principles can, in the future, be best maintained by co-operation with the other organized reform forces, and deeming it unwise and inexpedient to longer continue our party organization in the state of Nebraska as such, therefore be it

Resolved, That the organization of the "silver republican party" in Nebraska be, and the same is hereby dissolved.

The Silver Republicans have made a manly and honorable fight for their principles. They left the republican party when the money question was the paramount issue; they selected a name which distinguished them from the regular republicans

and they openly co-operated with the democratic party. The Silver Republican organization did not resort to deception as the gold democratic organization did, nor did the members of the Silver Republican organization attempt to control the party they had left.

The time has come when these men feel that they can accomplish more through other organizations and they will as individuals act either with the democrats or with the populists, according as personal preference or local conditions may determine. They are honest and patriotic men and believe in the principles which have held the reform forces together. They left the republican party because of their convictions and they will carry their convictions with them when they enter another party. They are intelligent men and will be valuable members of the organization to which they attach themselves. Such of them as choose to ally themselves with the democratic party ought to receive a hearty welcome, for by leaving the republican party to support the democratic ticket they have shown themselves better democrats than those who left the democratic party to support the republican ticket.

WHY NOT TO KRUGER?

On August 6 President McKinley sent to Emperor William of Germany a cablegram expressing regret because of the death of the Emperor's mother. Referring to this good woman, Mr. McKinley said: "Her noble qualities have endeared her memory to the American people in whose name and in mine, I tender to your Majesty heartfelt condolence."

It was proper that Mr. McKinley should express sympathy with the German Emperor because of his mother's death. But we are reminded that, although Mrs. Kruger, the wife of the President of the South African Republic, died more than thirty days ago, the President of the United States has not seen fit to tender his sympathy, or the sympathy of the American people, to the grief-stricken President of a republic that is fighting for existence.

Let us ask ourselves seriously why this very apparent duty has been neglected.

It cannot be that Mr McKinley feared to express his sympathy

with the Republic's President on the ground that it might be construed as an expression of preference between two friendly powers that are now at war. It happened that the Queen of England died while this war was in progress and no words of eulogy were too strong for our President to convey across the water by way of assuring the English people that we sympathized with them in their great loss.

How then does it happen that although the President of a small republic is staggering under the greatest load that can fall upon a man no word of sympathy has reached him from the President of the greatest republic on earth?

How does it happen that although the President of this great republican government loses no time in expressing sympathy with kings and emperors, that he utterly ignores the opportunity to express sympathy with the president of a republic?

It is true that the mother of the German Emperor possessed "noble qualities." These did "endear" her memory to the American people, exactly as the memory of any good woman is endeared to any good people. But the wife of Paul Kruger possessed "noble qualities." She made sacrifices which the good mother of the German Emperor was never called upon to make. She showed heroic devotion to her husband and to her country which the good mother of the German Emperor never had an opportunity to display. She died a prisoner of war, held a prisoner of war by the representatives of an empire, and her life was sacrificed because of her devotion to the principles which in the past we have been fond of calling "American principles."

And yet the President of this Republic has no word of comfort to give to the President of the South African republic; he has no word of consolation to offer to the stricken people of the South African republic; he has no tribute to pay to the "noble qualities" of one of the most heroic figures in the history of the world—for the wife of Paul Kruger was an heroic figure.

But it cannot be doubted that the American people, regardless of political prejudice, do entertain for President Kruger the most sincere sympathy in the hour of his bereavement; and they do entertain for the memory of his beloved wife that high and endearing respect which is due from a people who have lived and profited by a great principle to any man or woman who has suffered and died because of devotion to that same principle.

Mr. McKinley missed an opportunity when he permitted the time to pass away without giving expression to American sympathy for the bereaved President of the South African Republic.

It is entirely proper that we should have tears and love for the stricken people of a monarchy; but should we not also have love and tears for the stricken people of a republic?

WHY OSTRACIZE THE BEST?

The loyal democrats who have borne the burden of recent campaigns and who have made pecuniary sacrifice to support democratic principles ought to learn something of the meaning of re-organization by running over the list of suggested presidential candidates. Among the men who supported the democratic ticket in 1896 and in 1900 (not because of party regularity but because of conviction) were some of the best, bravest and truest democrats ever known and yet none of them are mentioned in connection with the presidency. The re-organizers want "harmony" and their method of securing it is to place under the ban all who believe in the creed of the party as promulgated by recent national conventions. The re-organizers consider three things essential to "success," viz., first, the abandonment of the Kansas City platform; second, the nomination of candidates who do not believe in that platform and, third, the selection of a national committee composed of men who either opposed the ticket in 1896 or gave it passive support. Why ostracise the best men in the party? Why place a premium on disloyalty?

XI.

INEXCUSABLE MISREPRESENTATION.

The New York *World* seems to love darkness rather than light. The following paragraph states what the *World* has ample reason to know is a misrepresentation. It says:

It is rather a pity that Mr. Bryan has discouraged the threatened bolt of the 16 to 1 lunatics in Ohio. It would have been interesting to see the simon-pure Chicago and Kansas City platform democrats of that state stand up to be counted this year on a bolt, with the full approval of their "matchless leader." But Mr. Bryan is too shrewd a politician to give the sanction of his name to such a test. He is now a great stickler for regularity, though he supported the Weaver electoral ticket in 1892, and in the elections of the three following years, including the important congressional election of 1894, he repudiated the sound-money plank of the national democratic platform of 1892.

It is a well-known fact that the Democratic National Committee, acting in the interests of Mr. Cleveland, advised the democrats of several western states to vote for the populist electors in order to take the states out of the republican column, it being impossible to elect the democratic ticket. In this way Kansas, Colorado, Nevada and Idaho were taken from the republicans and the republican majority in Nebraska reduced to about four thousand (it gave a republican majority of nearly thirty thousand in 1888). A man ought not to be called irregular when he follows the instruction of the national committee. It might be added that although Mr. Bryan tried to help Mr. Cleveland in 1892, Mr. Cleveland helped the republican party in 1896, while Mr. Weaver supported Mr. Bryan.

The *World* is also in error as to the platform of 1892. It contained the following plank: "We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage." Some qualifying words were added for use in the eastern states but the above declaration in favor of the double standard was used to hold the demo-

crats of the South and West in line. The principle of bimetallism was repudiated by Mr. Cleveland and his cabinet was made up of gold standard advocates. When it became evident that the party had been betrayed by its leaders, an organization was formed within the party—not to repudiate the platform of 1892, but to give to it an honest interpretation. The platform of 1896 (the silver plank) was not different in principle from the platform of 1892, but was free from ambiguity. It was in harmony with the party's record in Congress until Mr. Cleveland used the patronage of his high office to force through a republican measure—the unconditional repeal bill, and even then he could not secure a majority of his party to approve of his veto of the Seigniorage bill.

The financiers wrote the platform of 1892 to deceive the people and trusted Mr. Cleveland to betray his constituents. In 1896 the party clung to democratic principles and repudiated the construction which Mr. Cleveland had placed on the preceding platform. These facts are known to the readers of the *World* and ought to be to the editor.

SENATOR VEST'S INTERVIEW.

The *Kansas City Times* recently published an interview given out by Senator Vest, of Missouri. It is not necessary at this time to answer his criticism of Mr. Bryan's part in the ratification of the treaty. The readers of THE COMMONER are familiar with the reasons which led Mr. Bryan to prefer to have the war terminated and the independence of the Philippines secured through the action of this country rather than continue the war and risk international complication in an effort to compel Spain to do what we could more easily do ourselves. Neither is it necessary to discuss what he says in condemnation of "Mr. Bryan's leadership." Mr. Bryan makes no claim to leadership. He only claims the right to have convictions and to express them; if other people have like convictions, he will have company, if not, he will be alone.

Some one has defined a leader as "one who is going in the same direction as the people and a little bit ahead." Mr. Bryan believes in the principles set forth in the Kansas City platform, and is not willing to surrender them in order to win the approval

of those who oppose those principles. When the democratic party repudiates those principles, it will find itself going in another direction—with Cleveland, Carlisle, Whitney, Francis, et al, “a little bit ahead.”

Senator Vest outlines a platform which is good as far as it goes. He says:

“If I could write that platform without the intervention of any new issue I would declare:

“First—For a graduated income tax, which is the fairest and most equal system of taxation ever invented. Our present system of national taxation in the shape of internal revenue and tariff duties makes the poor man pay the expenses of the government while the multi-millionaire, who consumes neither beer nor whisky, and imports nothing from Europe except clothing, pays nothing. But in the event of war the poor man fights for the millions of dollars belonging to the plutocrat which is now exempt from taxation.

“Second—I would make the principal issue of the campaign of 1904 stern and unyielding opposition to the trusts and syndicates which are now crushing out individual enterprise of the country. Ten years ago a young man with \$15,000 or \$20,000 capital could start in some legitimate business with fair chance of success, but now he has no more chance against the trusts and department stores than an infant against the champion prize fighter of the world. I was told recently by a prominent broker of New York City—a very earnest republican—that nine men in New York, four of whom, J. Pierpont Morgan, George Gould, John D. Rockefeller, and James J. Hill, control the finances of the United States, and, as he expressed it, no one could go into a new enterprise or remain in an old one without the consent of these nine men.

“Third—I would declare against imperialism and the colonial system, for while this issue was before the country in 1900, everything else was subordinated to the fact that the country was doing very well and ought to be left alone. If the people of the United States see proper to indorse the foreign policy of President McKinley, that of course is the end of it, but no democrat should give his approval to the colonial system of Europe.

“What about the silver question?” was asked.

“As to the free coinage of silver, I have always been an earnest bimetallist and have not changed my opinions in the slightest. I do not believe that there is enough gold and silver in the world for the just and fair transaction of business, and I look upon the single standard of either gold or silver as doubling the power of oppression by the rich at the expense of the middle and poorer classes. I do not think the question of the free coinage of silver

is dead, but the abnormal and unexpected production of gold, and especially improvements in the processes of extracting gold from the earth, have given us more money in this country than any one could have anticipated. We have a larger per capita circulation than any other country in the world except France, and there is no immediate prospect of any decrease."

"Do you think that bimetallism will ever be the paramount issue again?" the Senator was asked.

"I believe that the time will again come when bimetallism will become the paramount issue, but it is not now a question upon which the democratic party can go into the contest in 1904," was the reply. "There are thousands of good democrats who refused to support Mr. Bryan in 1896 and 1900, because they did not believe this country could maintain free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 against the opposition of the great nations of the world. It seems to me suicidal for us to thrust this issue again upon them, when they are anxious to come back to the party on all other questions. I have no fear that the gold advocates will take possession of the democratic party, but I do fear that if we continue to quarrel over silver when there is no necessity for it, we will again go 'through a slaughter house into an open grave.'

"The democratic party must come together on some honorable adjustment of the money question, for it will require the vote of every man who has ever been a democrat to defeat the republicans in the next contest."

The income tax is all right, but it would be easier to secure a uniform rate than a graded one.

Mr. Vest will find, however, that the income tax is not a harmonizing issue.

Mr. Hill fought the income tax, Mr. Cleveland was opposed to it, and nearly all the gold men are as hostile to it as they are to free silver.

Mr. Vest emphasizes the trust issue, but that is not a harmonizing issue either, for the financial influences stand behind the trusts as solidly as they do behind the banks. The *New York Sun* is already declaring that free silver would do but little damage compared with the widespread demoralization which would be produced by effective anti-trust legislation.

The question of imperialism is rightly included among the issues—in fact, its importance cannot be overstated. Mr. Vest is right in saying that the election of 1900 cannot be considered a settlement of the question of imperialism, but why does Senator Vest try to drive away the allies who are willing to help us to

secure all needed reforms? Why does he prefer gold democrats who supported the republican ticket to populists who supported the democratic ticket?

He says:

“We must stop hunting around in corners and up canons for populist, socialist and single tax votes and go back to the doctrine of Mr. Jefferson, upon which alone we can achieve victory.”

The Senator should be a little more definite. To what planks does he refer? The only plank he speaks of discarding is the silver plank, and yet that is not nearly so populist as the income tax plank. The Senator was voting for free and unlimited coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation before the populist party came into existence. The income tax was advocated by the populist party several years before it found a place in the democratic platform. In fact, a graded income tax, such as Senator Vest and many populists advocate, never has been endorsed by a democratic national platform. This is no argument against the proposition, but it shows how inconsistent the Senator is when he condemns free silver as populist and then advocates a graded income tax.

Senator Vest insists that he is still a bimetallist, and declares that the money question will again become important, but he is willing to abandon it temporarily in order to “harmonize” with men who voted the republican ticket even at the risk of destroying industrial independence and converting a republic into an empire.

Senator Vest’s platform contains no reference to the question of paper money. The republicans and gold democrats favor national bank notes, while the democrats favor greenbacks. This question is entirely separate and distinct from the silver question. Why is it abandoned? The national bankers are in favor of a paper money trust which will issue and control the paper money of the country—the most dangerous of all trusts; is the Senator willing to wink at this conspiracy in order to “harmonize” with the re-organizers? If we are to go back to Jeffersonian doctrines what is more Jeffersonian than the greenback? Jefferson was the deadly enemy of banks of issue, and yet the Senator’s platform is silent on this question.

If the silver question is going to be important again, why turn

the party over to the re-organizers and allow them to aid the republicans in making the silver dollar redeemable in gold?

The Senator is anxious to secure "harmony" but he will find that there can be no harmony without the surrender of every essential principle of democracy. The men who voted the republican ticket on account of the silver plank are as a rule opposed to the income tax, and are also opposed to any effective anti-trust legislation. They are in favor of national banks of issue, and are also in favor of government by injunction (a subject which Senator Vest did not mention in his proposed platform). Even on imperialism many of the gold democrats have no fixed or definite convictions. In fact, the only way to harmonize with the re-organizers is to allow them to control the organization and write a republican platform. How much is Senator Vest willing to give up in order to bring the gold corporation element back? His platform is entirely too populist to entice the deserters into the fold. Perhaps they might allow him to write the platform if they are permitted to select a candidate who will disregard the platform as Mr. Cleveland did.

CHILDREN NOT BURDENSOME.

Alderman Wentz and Mrs. Wentz of Brooklyn, have given their names to fame and have set an admirable example to those people who are inclined to regard children as burdens.

Alderman and Mrs. Wentz are the parents of seventeen children. It was like the leaving of an emigrant train when the Wentz family went on a trip to the Buffalo fair, and the newspaper reporters were attracted to the spectacle. The reporters appeared to be surprised that this father and mother were really enjoying life while at the same time having the responsibility for seventeen children. But some of the things that the alderman said are worthy of preservation. Among other things Mr. Wentz said:

"It's a great thing to go home at night and find nineteen or twenty pairs of shoes waiting in the hallway to be cleaned. You can't come home feeling lively with the danger of waking up twenty-three people.

"I think if people knew the satisfaction of having babies about the house they would not want small families. I don't

feel old as the little ones multiply. I feel younger and younger, and think I'll become a child again myself some day."

And when Mrs. Wentz was approached for an opinion as to her manifold responsibilities, that good woman had this to say:

"It's a great time getting the children off to school. I line them up like an inspector of rifle practice.

"I don't think our family could get along on one of those dollar dinners provided for in the evening papers.

"We let the babies have lots of fresh air, and when they come in at evening they are anxious to go to bed. Every one helps here or it would be a task beyond my powers.

"I'm very happy with the little ones about. The work doesn't seem to tire me. I love every one of them and they love me, and there is something in that.

"We don't spoil our children by pampering. We expect them to be little men and women, and they are. They are placed upon their honor to behave, and they do so without much rod."

The large family is not common in this country to-day. It has come to be the exception, although it is true that nowhere do general content and happiness appear to rest more securely than in the centers of these large families. A few years ago the large family was not the exception. Fifty years ago, the sight of a family of seventeen children would not have provoked extraordinary comment, while that of twelve or thirteen children would hardly have attracted attention.

It is worthy of comment that one may find more nervousness, more care, more anxiety and more weariness in the home graced by a single child, than in the household to which a large number of children have come. Where poverty does not prevail in such a home, happiness, contentment and health are generally noticeable.

In the city of South Omaha, Nebraska, lives one of the best physicians in the west. There are in his home thirteen children. The mother would readily pass for a woman of twenty-eight or thirty, while the father would not be suspected of being far above the age of thirty-five. This home is famous, not only for its hospitality to the stranger, but for the peace, love, contentment and happiness that abound in its every-day life. The father and mother are among the most jovial and companionable people of the city and although the professional cares of the father and

the household duties of the mother are large, they both find some time to devote to the social pastimes of their neighborhood.

If it was desired to establish the claim that children are burdensome, neither this South Omaha family, nor the Wentz family of Brooklyn, nor any other family that may properly claim a place in the list of large ones, could be used as witnesses in the affirmative.

EMASCULATING DEMOCRACY.

In real Democracy there is throbbing, ever-present life. There is nothing more vigorous and virile than Democracy when it stands for the rule of the people—the right of the people to control their own government and the capacity of the people for self-government. Democracy in an open fight need not fear either aristocracy—the rule of the best (as the few style themselves) or plutocracy, the rule of the rich. In an honest fight Democracy can rely with confidence upon the righteousness of its cause and trust the conscience and intelligence of the people. Victory may be delayed, but it cannot be prevented if the democratic party remains steadfast in its support of Democratic principles. The greatest danger which confronts Democracy to-day is that it will be emasculated and robbed of its force and vitality by those who cling to the Democratic name but constantly give aid and comfort to the republican party. For the purpose of illustration three daily papers may be mentioned. They loudly proclaim their loyalty to Democratic principles and roundly condemn those who were responsible for the Chicago platform. They deserted the party in 1896 and supported the Palmer and Buckner ticket—a ticket that polled about one hundred and thirty thousand votes, all told, and carried one precinct in the United States. They gave a protesting support to the national ticket in 1900 and ever since the election have been industriously at work “re-organizing” the democratic party. The papers referred to are the *New York World*, the *Louisville Courier-Journal* and the *Chicago Chronicle*. Each paper is the best representative of its class in the section in which it circulates.

On the money question all three support the republican position; they are mouth pieces of the great financiers; they breathe the poisoned air that has passed through the lungs of Wall Street.

No financial policy is too cruel, no dollar too dear, no money system too despotic for them to endorse; provided, always, it has the endorsement of the money changers. They not only want to make gold the only standard money, but they want to retire the greenbacks and substitute national bank notes. They often prate of their love of Jefferson, and yet they know that Jefferson was always and at all times the enemy of banks of issue. They conjure with the name of Jackson, and yet Jackson made his greatest reputation fighting a bank of issue. If these papers had their way the democratic party would disregard entirely the interests which the masses have in a stable dollar, and would make the party the exponent of those whom Carlisle once described as the "idle holders of idle capital."

On the question of imperialism these papers do not entirely agree. The *World* still condemns an imperial policy, while the *Courier-Journal* and the *Chronicle* advocate a surrender to the republicans on this issue.

The *Courier-Journal* admits that the democratic position is the correct one so far as principles are concerned, but contends that commercialism is bound to win and that the democratic party should "get into the band wagon." It preaches the gospel of expediency—a doctrine which demoralizes the party by making everything subordinate to the desire to win a temporary success.

The *Chronicle* goes a little farther and declares that the democratic party would not carry out the promise made last fall, even if it could. The following is from a recent editorial in that paper:

There will be no revolution in American politics which will result in conferring independence on the people of the Philippines. If the democrats should carry the next presidential election, and should elect a majority in both houses of congress, the Philippines would not be abandoned. They are with us for good or for evil, as time shall determine, and it is mostly for them to say whether it shall be for their good.

It will be remembered that the democratic national convention of 1900, without a dissenting vote, and amid unparalleled enthusiasm, declared it to be the duty of this nation to immediately announce its purpose: First, to establish a stable government in the Philippines; second, to turn that government over to the

Filipinos and give them independence, and third, to protect the Filipinos from outside interference, as we have protected the republics of Central and South America. There was difference of opinion as to the wording of the money plank, but none as to the party's position on imperialism. And, yet, the *Courier-Journal* and the *Chronicle* are willing to give up the defense of the Declaration of Independence and accept the republican theory of government—a theory identical with that announced by George the Third.

On the trust question, no two of the three papers agree. The *World* is very much afraid of the trusts, but does not know what to do about them; the *Courier-Journal* does not know whether it is afraid or not, and the *Chronicle* isn't worried at all, but all three of the papers lose no opportunity to misrepresent and malign those who are in earnest in their efforts to destroy private monopolies.

The papers above mentioned illustrate the confusion, conflict and uncertainty that prevail among those who oppose the Kansas City platform. If a convention were called of the daily papers which want to repudiate the Kansas City platform, and their editors were required to submit a new platform satisfactory to all of them they would adjourn sine die before they agreed upon a single important plank. They represent all shades of opinion on every question, and are harmonious about nothing except their contempt for the patriotism and intelligence of the more than six million voters who in spite of corruption and coercion supported the party in two national campaigns. The Kansas City platform is a positive, clear and emphatic application of Democratic principles to present conditions. When a person stands upon that platform and gives it his unqualified endorsement the people know what to expect of him.

The opponents of that platform, however, quarrel and contend over every proposition submitted. Some want the party to declare boldly for the gold standard; others favor a cowardly evasion of the whole question. Some want the party to declare openly in favor of banks of issue; others want the party to keep still on the question in its platform, but to lend the party's influence after election to the retirement of the greenbacks.

Some want the party to continue the fight against imperialism; some want the party to quit opposing imperialism and acquiesce

in it without endorsing it, while others think that the party should have the courage to commend the administration's course. Some think that all trusts are bad; some think that a part of the trusts are good and a part of them bad, and still others believe that the trust is an economic development that is entirely beneficent in its operations.

The difference of opinion which manifests itself in the discussion of the larger questions is no less conspicuous in the discussion of minor questions. Because they can agree upon no platform the re-organizers content themselves with criticising Democratic principles and republican individuals.

Is it strange that the democratic party has made slow progress when it is remembered that for five years the leading dailies, which claim to be Democratic, have given more assistance to the opposition than to their own party? Between campaigns they have been condemning the platform of the party and discrediting those who endorsed the platform; it is impossible for such papers to repair during the campaign the damage which they do between campaigns. But for the weekly papers which have for the most part remained loyal, the Democratic voters would have had little opportunity to read Democratic literature. The republicans, on the contrary, have all their daily papers, all their weekly papers and a considerable portion of the so-called Democratic dailies continuously explaining and in whole or in part defending the course of the administration. The only wonder is that the rank and file of the party should have shown itself as steadfast as it has. If those who call themselves democrats will defend the Democratic platform for the next three years, we can win in 1904; but it is difficult to win when a numerically small but financially influential portion of the party is constantly compromising with the republicans.

MONEY PROBLEM IN PHILIPPINES.

In his annual report recently made public, General MacArthur recommends for the Philippine Islands a monetary system described as follows:

First—The American gold standard to be established by authorizing the coinage of a peso containing twelve and nine-

tenths grains, nine-tenths fine, to be represented in the circulation by coins containing such multiple of the standard peso as may be regarded as most convenient of mintage.

Second—A table of equivalents, to be declared by law, between Philippine gold money and United States money in all its various forms, including national bank notes, on the basis of 2 to 1; that is to say, one United States gold is equivalent to two Philippine gold pesos, as herein prescribed.

Third—A subsidiary Philippine coinage, embracing such subdivisions of the peso as are most convenient, conforming as much as possible to the subsidiary coin of the United States, and with an established rate of equivalents as in the case of gold; that is to say, one United States coin is equivalent to two Philippine coins of the same denomination.

Fourth—The establishment of Filipino national banks, precisely the same in all respects as now authorized in the United States, including United States bonds as a basis of circulation.

Fifth—All currency issued under the foregoing systems to have full legal tender function in the Philippine Islands for all public duties and private debts; and the equivalent United States currency and subsidiary coinage, as authorized in the foregoing section 2 and 3, to have legal tender qualities in the Philippines to the same extent and precisely the same as in the United States.”

MR. KNOX AND HIS SECRETS.

The American Anti-Trust League has sent to Attorney General Knox the following letter:

SIR: We have the honor to request that you afford us all the information that you are possessed of or can obtain concerning an agreement or agreements made between the constituent companies and individuals who organized the United States Steel corporation, commonly known as the steel trust.

The trust or syndicate agreement which we especially desire is the one which President C. M. Schwab of the United States Steel corporation refused to furnish to the United States industrial commission when on the witness stand before that body.

Our request is founded upon information and belief that at the time that this contract, or those contracts, was, or were, made you were in some way officially connected with the Carnegie Steel company, which institution is one of the principal companies in the United States Steel corporation. As this information is doubtless in your possession or conveniently at hand, you will greatly oblige this committee by giving us the substance thereof in your own language, or, if possible, a copy thereof.

This request is to cover any other contracts of a similar kind with which you are acquainted or which you can obtain for us. Our object is to prevent the failure of justice in certain legal proceedings which we contemplate in the near future.

It is not at all probable that the Attorney General will comply with this request. He will have good professional grounds for refusing to comply with it because he may say that whatever information he possesses concerning the trust was obtained in the capacity of attorney for the trust, and therefore it would be impossible for him to reveal his secret.

This emphasizes the iniquity of selecting a trust attorney for an office upon which rests the responsibility for enforcing laws against trusts. The Attorney General should be entirely free to act in the prosecution of violators of the anti-trust law. But would it be possible for even the warmest friend of Mr. Knox to say that he is in a position to discharge his duty as the attorney for the United States, when that duty conflicts with the interests of the trust? Here we have the attorney for one client who has in his possession the secrets of his client's opponent. Those secrets are sufficient to enable that client's lawyer to crush that client's opponent. Yet the lawyer is unable to take advantage of those secrets because of the fact that he obtained them in the capacity of an attorney. It would be very difficult for Mr. Knox to draw the line between the secrets he obtained in a confidential capacity while acting as attorney for the trusts and the secrets of the trust which he obtains through vigorous investigations while acting as attorney for the United States.

Aside from the fact that Mr. Knox's sympathies are naturally with the trust system, he is greatly handicapped in the discharge of his duty toward the United States by reason of the fact that everything which the United States Attorney General should know in his fight against the trust Mr. Knox knows and obtained in a confidential way. Is there an individual in the United States who would care to employ as his attorney a man who had acted as attorney for an opponent and aided that opponent in devising methods whereby this individual could be wronged?

It is impossible that Mr. Knox, having served as attorney for the trust in paving the way for the violation of the very laws which he is now called upon to enforce, should enforce those laws as the interests of the United States require.

Mr. Knox is a great lawyer, otherwise the trusts would not have employed him. But there are many other great lawyers in the United States to-day. The republican party is full of great lawyers, and among them are many men who could be depended upon to exercise the ability and fidelity essential to the enforcement of the anti-trust law. Why did not the McKinley administration select as its Attorney General one of this number? Why did it choose as Attorney General the most conspicuous trust lawyer in the United States?

TRICKERY OF WORDS.

The *Chicago Chronicle* warns "democrats in and out of conventions" that "sonorous declarations against 'imperialism' and 'colonialism' will not do." The *Chronicle* adds that "something more than mere declamation is needed. If democrats are opposed to imperialism, what do they propose to give the people in its place?"

Then the *Chronicle* complains that the Ohio platform, because of its indefiniteness on this subject is lamentably weak. It insists that this question must be met "intelligently, courageously and entirely free from demagogy and mere trickery of words." This is good advice; but if the advice be sound on the question of imperialism why is not similar advice sound on the money question?

The opponents of bimetallism would have the democratic conventions indulge in "sonorous declarations." But the advocates of bimetallism have said that "something more than mere declamation is needed." They have held that if democrats have any opinion on the money question, they should state that opinion "intelligently, courageously, and entirely free from demagogy and mere trickery of words."

But to-day the men for whom the *Chicago Chronicle* stands sponsor, while objecting to bimetallism and protesting against the definiteness with which democratic conventions have declared their position on the money question, insist upon a money plank composed of "sonorous declarations."

Why do not these gentlemen give the people "something more than declamation"? If the single gold standard is right, why do

they not abandon the "trickery of words" and boldly announce to the people their preference for the single gold standard?

Why does the *Chicago Chronicle* insist upon clearness and directness of statement so far as concerns the question of imperialism while it has no protest to make against a "trickery of words" in the democratic platforms on the money question?

What the *Chronicle* says on the form of the plank relating to imperialism, the bimetallists in the democratic party have said on the form of the plank relating to the money question: "Something more than mere declamation is needed. If democrats are opposed to bimetallism, what do they propose to give the people in its place?"

If the men who seek to re-organize the democratic party are opposed to bimetallism, what do they propose to give the people in its place? Do they propose to give them the single gold standard? If so, why not say so "intelligently, courageously and entirely free from demagoguery and mere trickery of words."

MR. LITTLEFIELD'S ADDRESS.

On another page THE COMMONER reproduces the address delivered by Congressman Charles E. Littlefield, of Maine, before the American Bar Association at Denver. Mr. Littlefield criticised the Supreme Court's insular decisions, and declared those decisions to be "without a parallel in our judiciary history." While disclaiming any disposition to reflect upon the court, Mr. Littlefield said: "I feel bound to say it seems to me that they were profoundly impressed with the supposed consequences of an adverse decision." One lawyer protested against Mr. Littlefield's discourse in the presence of the American Bar Association. That gentleman, Mr. Adolph Moses, said:

I wish to record my note of dissent to the general applause which followed the presentation of the insular cases by Mr. Littlefield. I regret to have listened to what I consider an unwarranted attack upon the supreme court of the United States, and, as a member of this association, I wish to raise my voice in protest against the use of this platform for a purpose of this kind.

The notion that men who occupy the bench are exempt from criticism will not do under a republican form of government.

To say that any opinion delivered by a man on the bench must seem to command respect and approval, although in fact it does not command either, is to say that men in official position can do no wrong; and the people of the United States know that men in official position are always liable to err.

Mr. Littlefield's opinion of the insular decisions is the opinion of a large majority of the lawyers of the United States. In truth one need not be a lawyer to realize the error of those decisions, because they involve the fundamental ideas of this government and are repugnant to the elementary principles of government as taught to every school-boy in the land.

Mr. Littlefield's criticism was courageous because he is a republican having, perhaps, some ambition for future honors at his party's hands. But Mr. Littlefield appears to be a lawyer and a patriot before he is a republican, and his condemnation of the insular decisions will meet the hearty approval of a very large majority of the people, although some may not be brave enough to give expression to their disapproval.

Mr. Moses' idea that even when one believes a judicial opinion to be wholly wrong and destructive of the very foundation of the government, no criticism should be uttered on that opinion, is not a good sentiment to create among a people whose happiness depends upon liberty. Mr. Littlefield has eminent republican authority for criticising the action of men on the bench. It was Mr. Lincoln who said that "The people of these United States are the rightful masters of both congresses and courts—not to overthrow the constitution, but to overthrow men who pervert the constitution."

Mr. Littlefield's statement that it seemed to him that the justices were "too profoundly impressed with the supposed consequences of an adverse decision," finds corroboration even in the opinion delivered by Justice Brown himself. In the concluding paragraph of that opinion Justice Brown said:

A false step at this time might be fatal to the development of what Chief Justice Marshall called the American empire. The choice in some cases, the natural gravitation of small bodies toward large ones in others, the result of a successful war in still others may bring about conditions which would render the annexation of distant possessions desirable. If those possessions are inhabited by alien races, differing from us in religion, customs, laws, methods of taxation and modes of thought, the administra-

tion of government and justice, according to Anglo-Saxon principles, may for a time be impossible and the question at once arises whether large concessions ought not to be made for a time, that ultimately our own theories may be carried out and the blessings of a free government under the constitution extended to them. We decline to hold that there is anything in the constitution to forbid such action.

Does this not indicate, exactly as Mr. Littlefield said, that the justices were "profoundly impressed with the consequences of an adverse decision"?

JUDICIAL TYRANNY.

Judge John H. Baker, of the United States Circuit Court at Indianapolis, issued an order against strikers, which is referred to as the most sweeping order of its kind ever issued by a court. Among other things, this order restrains the strikers "from compelling or inducing, or attempting to compel or induce, by threats, intimidations, persuasion, force or violence" any of their fellow employes "to refuse or fail to do their work or discharge their duties as such employes."

The strikers are also restrained from inducing any of their fellow employes to quit work. They are also restrained from inducing any persons to enter the employ of the concern against which the strikers are contending. It is also provided in this order that the strikers must refrain "from going, either singly or collectively, to the homes of employes" for the purpose of inducing these employes to quit work.

The attorney for the strikers has advised them,—“I do not believe the judge meant that you could not argue, soberly and pleasantly, to induce any man to join you. He could not forbid that.” If the judge did not mean this, then no meaning can be conveyed through the English language. And yet it is difficult to believe that in this free country a judge could be found who would issue an order, which, if it means anything at all, strikes a blow at free speech.

The attorney for the concern against which the strikers are contending says that the word persuasion means just what it says. “It means just this,” said this attorney, “that if any one of those strikers should go to the house of any employe, or stop him on the

street, or any other place, and endeavor to talk him or her into joining the strike, that person, or persons, is in contempt of court."

This is a very frank statement of the court's order; and yet can any one imagine a more un-American judicial decree than that which would prevent men from doing what this lawyer declares the court's order seeks to prevent?

MR. BRYAN'S PLANS.

Below will be found two press dispatches:

EVANSTON, WYO., Aug. 21.—William J. Bryan came to Wyoming recently to fish for trout, and as a side issue he has become interested in oil. Following the example of his colleagues in their fight against the oil octopus, former Governor Hogg of Texas, former Senator Pettigrew of South Dakota, and former Senator Charles A. Towne of Minnesota, the erstwhile democratic candidate has purchased oil lands in the petroleum soaked region of Spring Valley, near here.

CHICAGO, ILL., August 23.—William Jennings Bryan, rumor says, will probably move his paper, THE COMMONER, to Chicago and make this city his home.

Efforts have been made without success to trace the rumor to its source, but some of the leading democrats in Chicago have known it for some time past and are ready to sanction the project and bid THE COMMONER godspeed. The rumor credits Mr. Bryan with an intention to take political root here, with the hope of succeeding Mayor Harrison in the mayoralty. But the Harrison men shake their heads dubiously when that part of the plan is mentioned and intimate that Mr. Bryan stands more hope of the presidency than of that.

Mr. Bryan is now in Wyoming. His brother, business manager of THE COMMONER, was interviewed in Lincoln to-night and said he had no knowledge of the alleged plan of removal to Chicago.

These are reproduced to show the readers what passes for "news." Both items are entirely without foundation. Mr. Bryan not only has no investments in oil lands, but has never contemplated investing in oil lands. His only business enterprise is THE COMMONER, and he has no intention of taking stock or interest in anything else.

As to leaving Nebraska, he has no thought of such a thing. He is now preparing to build a cottage upon his farm, three miles southeast of Lincoln, and expects to spend the remainder of his days there. The readers of *THE COMMONER* will be kept fully informed as to Mr. Bryan's plans and purposes and they need not pay any attention to "rumors" and "reports" emanating from any other source. *THE COMMONER* will continue to be published at Lincoln. It is near the center of the union and from this point the paper can be distributed without inconvenience or delay to all the states and territories.

THE NATION MOURNS.

The nation bows in sorrow and in humiliation—in sorrow because its chief executive, its official head, is passing through the valley of the shadow of death—in humiliation because the president of our republic has fallen a victim to the cruel and cowardly methods employed in monarchies where helpless and hopeless subjects sometimes meet arbitrary power with violence.

In morals and in the contemplation of law all lives are of equal value—all are priceless—but when seventy-five millions of people select one of their number and invest him with the authority which attaches to the presidency, he becomes their representative and a blow aimed at him is resented as an attack upon all.

Beneath the partisanship of the individual lies the patriotism of the citizen, sometimes dormant, it is true, but always active in hours of peril or misfortune. While the president's life hangs in the balance there are no party lines. The grief of personal friends and close political associates may be more poignant, but their sympathy is not more sincere than that extended by political opponents. Although none but his family and his physicians are admitted to his room, all his countrymen are at his bedside in thought and sentiment and their prayers ascend for his recovery. It was characteristic of his thoughtfulness that, even amid the excitement following the assault, he cautioned his companions not to exaggerate his condition to his invalid wife.

The latest dispatches give gratifying news of his improvement, but there is still deep solicitude lest unfavorable symptoms may yet appear.

And the humiliation! Are our public servants—those who are chosen by the people and who exercise for a limited time the authority bestowed by the people—are these to live in constant fear of assassination? Is there to be no difference between our constitutional government and those despotic governments which rest, not upon the consent of the governed, but upon brutal force?

There is no place for anarchy in the United States; there is no room here for those who commit, counsel or condone murder, no matter what political excuse may be urged in its defense. The line between peaceful agitation and violence is clear and distinct. We have freedom of speech and freedom of the press in this country, and they are essential to the maintenance of our liberties. If any one desires to criticise the methods of government or the conduct of an official, he has a perfect right to do so, but his appeal must be to the intelligence and patriotism of his fellow-citizens, not to force. Let no one imagine that he can improve social or political conditions by the shedding of blood.

Free governments may be overthrown, but they cannot be reformed by those who violate the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill."

Under a government like ours every wrong can be remedied by law and the laws are in the hands of the people themselves. Anarchy can be neither excused nor tolerated here. The man who proposes to right a public wrong by taking the life of a human being makes himself an outlaw and cannot consistently appeal to the protection of the government which he repudiates. He invites a return to a state of barbarism in which each one must, at his own risk, defend his own rights and avenge his own wrongs.

The punishment administered to the would-be assassin and to his co-conspirators, if he has any, should be such as to warn all inclined to anarchy that while this is an asylum for those who love liberty it is an inhospitable place for those who raise their hands against all forms of government.

XII.

LABOR DAY.

Labor Day was quite generally observed this year. This is, in itself, a gratifying sign. A review of the speeches made in the various cities shows that the two subjects considered were, first, the dignity of labor and, second, labor's share of the rewards of toil.

It ought to be unnecessary to emphasize the fact that all honest labor is honorable, but there is such haste to be rich and such fawning before inherited and suddenly acquired wealth that it requires all the influence that Labor Day can exert to relieve manual labor of the odium into which it seems to be falling. There is a Bible text which is especially appropriate for consideration on Labor Day. It is a part of the old Mosaic law, but it is twice quoted with approval in the New Testament. It reads: "Muzzle not the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn." If the dumb beasts whose physical strength we utilize must not be neglected, with how much greater force does the injunction apply to our brethren of flesh and blood whose brawn and muscle furnish society with food and fuel, with clothing, shelter and all the comforts of life? And yet every decade sees a less per cent. of the wealth produced remaining in the hands of the wealth producers. This condition is neither just nor satisfactory. The toilers on the farm and in the factory have cause to believe that they are being cheated out of a part of their earnings.

One of the things that labor has reason to fear is the effect of private monopoly. The trusts have been growing rapidly during the last few years and all wage-earners are menaced by them. Some have suggested that the employes should join with the employers in controlling the industries and then divide the advantages of higher prices. Such a proposition is immoral as well as impolitic. The employes could no more justify aiding the trusts to extort from the consumers, even if they could share in the results, than an honest citizen could justify giving aid to a highwayman on promise of part of the plunder.

But such an agreement would be as unwise as wrong. If trust-made articles are sold at high prices, compared with other products, the demand will be reduced and labor thrown out of employment.

In a test of endurance the farmer can stand it longer than the man in the factory, but why should the laboring man in the city array himself against his best friend—the farmer?

The trust hurts the consumer first, and then the producer of raw material, and last—and possibly most—the laborer. All three should combine to destroy the private monopolies now in existence and to prevent the creation of any new monopolies.

Next to the trust in its evil effect upon labor is what is known as government by injunction. According to our theory of government, the executive, legislative and judicial branches should be kept separate and distinct, but it is coming to be the custom for the judge to issue an order declaring an act to be unlawful which before was lawful and then to assume the prerogatives of the executive and enforce the law, while as judge he sits without jury to condemn the person whom he is prosecuting. The main purpose of this judicial process is to deprive the accused of trial by jury, and while every citizen should resist this attack on the jury system the employes of great corporations are just now its special victims.

The wage-earners as a part, and as an important part, too, of society, are interested in all questions which affect our civilization, but they are at present experiencing the necessity of reform along the lines above suggested.

It was noticeable everywhere that those who addressed the people at labor-day meetings pointed out the fact that wrongs could only be remedied at the ballot-box. Mayor Reed of Kansas City stated the case aptly when he said that the laboring men were not law-breakers but should be law-makers.

Jackson, in his celebrated message vetoing the extension of the bank charter, said that the humbler members of society were the victims of injustice whenever the government, by granting legislative favors and privileges, made the rich richer and the potent more powerful. If the men who eat their bread in the sweat of the face would act in concert at the polls, a speedy and inexpensive remedy would be found for every evil complained of.

THE STAR'S INCONSISTENCY.

In its issue of September 3, the *Kansas City Star* took Mr. Bryan to task because of his labor day address. The *Star* insisted that Mr. Bryan was "looking on the dark side." Among other things that newspaper said:

"Look at the wealth of this country—is the division just?" was one of Mr. Bryan's interrogations. No, it is not just, nor can the distribution of wealth be absolutely just under any form of government and with any race of people. Even the socialistic doctrine, which aims at ideal co-operation, distribution and compensation, cannot possibly insure absolute equity, for some deserve more than others—earn more than others. Such a question answers itself, but the effect of asking it of the poorer class is to engender a feeling among that class against the richer—and that is not in accordance with the democratic spirit of this country, which gives every man a right to acquire and possess.

To say that absolute perfection cannot be attained in the distribution of wealth is no defense of a bad law or a bad system. It should be the aim of every good citizen to aid in making the government as nearly perfect as possible. Each person should receive from society in proportion as he contributes to society—this is the ideal condition and should be approached as nearly as human ingenuity can devise. But the purpose of this editorial is not to defend Mr. Bryan but to call attention to the *Star's* inconsistency.

In its issue of Wednesday, September 4, the *Star* made admirable answer to itself. Under the headline "Wounds of a Friend," the *Star* had this to say:

"Faithful are the wounds of a friend," said Solomon, the wise man of old. Under this head may be classed the utterances of Theodore Roosevelt in his address at Minneapolis on Labor Day. Standing out strong and clear among all of the declarations which have been made on the subject of trusts are the following sentiments by the vice-president: "We shall find it necessary in the future to shackle cunning, as in the past we have shackled force."
* * * "The vast individual and corporate fortunes, the vast combinations of capital which have marked the development of our industrial system create new conditions and necessitate a change from the old attitude of the state and the nation toward property."

These are direct and pointed sentiments inspired by conditions to which no thoughtful and sober-minded man can be blind. They

are not uttered in any spirit of intemperate agitation or with any purpose to excite false alarm for political purposes. They come from an influential member of the party which capital in modern years has regarded as its chosen champion. They do not proceed from a person who has excited the suspicion of the conservative element by the radical character of his opinions.

In admonishing the large capitalists of their duty Mr. Roosevelt is speaking to persons with whom he has been intimately associated. He is prominently identified with the social and political life of the richest community in America. He is a New Yorker by heredity. He is known and esteemed by the so-called money kings. He could have no possible motive in wishing to overthrow a fabric which would bring destruction to those who are of the same political household of faith with himself.

Mr. Roosevelt speaks as a friend to the rich men who are rapidly gaining control of the industries and the commerce of the nation. Will it not be infinitely wiser for them to hear him and heed him and follow his counsel than to persist in their scheme of self-aggrandizement at the certain risk of inviting a violent and implacable conflict with avowed enemies, who have none of the regard for the rights of capital which Mr. Roosevelt has always shown?

Why does the *Star* publish editorials like this, which have the effect "to engender a feeling among that class (the workingmen) against the richer"?

If it is wrong for a man who has "excited the suspicion of the conservative element by the radical character of his opinions" to utter the sentiments which Mr. Bryan did at Kansas City, is it not all the more wrong for a "thoughtful and sober-minded man" like Mr. Roosevelt to give expression to similar sentiments?

Mr. Roosevelt said that "we shall find it necessary in the future to shackle cunning as in the past we have shackled force." He even went so far as to intimate that it would be necessary to make "a change from the old attitude of the state and the nation toward property;" the very thing which above all others the republican party has insisted is sacred.

When Mr. Bryan said things of this character the *Kansas City Star* said it was "not in accordance with the democratic spirit of this country which gives every man a right to acquire and possess." But when Mr. Roosevelt said these things this same newspaper cordially commended the speaker and warned "the rich men who are rapidly gaining control of the industries and commerce of the

nation" that they will do well to hear and heed and follow the counsel of Theodore Roosevelt.

This same newspaper warns the trust magnates that they will make a mistake if they persist in their "scheme of self-aggrandizement," and that persistence in that direction will be "at the risk of inviting a violent and implacable conflict."

It will be observed that the *Star* points out that the opinions expressed by Mr. Roosevelt "do not proceed from a person who has caused the suspicion of the conservative element by the radical character of his opinions," and then in the same issue in which the *Star* commends Mr. Roosevelt's protest against the trusts it in another editorial says:

William Jennings Bryan, with all his professed hostility for combinations against trade, has never said anything in relation to trusts so emphatic and unequivocal as the utterances of Vice-President Roosevelt at Minneapolis. To the notable political epigrams of the day must be added the declaration of Mr. Roosevelt that "we shall find it necessary in the future to shackle force." The whole range of modern democratic literature might be searched in vain for a pronouncement more courageous than that on the tyrannical centralization of capital.

So, according to the *Star's* own statement, there is more of the "radical character" about Mr. Roosevelt's opinion than attaches to the opinion of Mr. Bryan.

But the question is—of what moment is it who gave utterance to protests against these "schemes of self-aggrandizement"? Of what importance is it whether the protests were uttered by a man like Mr. Bryan, who the *Star* says has "excited the suspicion of the conservative element by the radical character of his opinions," or from Theodore Roosevelt, whom this republican organ is pleased to consider "a thoughtful and sober-minded man"? Is not the question—"Is it the truth?"—the all important one in the contemplation of such a protest?

If conditions warrant such a protest, if the protest is based on justice and truth, is the fact in any wise altered whether the protest is made by Mr. Bryan or by Mr. Roosevelt?

Why is it that, when a democrat enters protest against "self-aggrandizement," this Kansas City paper finds it necessary to argue that such a protest is "not in accordance with the democratic spirit of this country which gives every man a right to

acquire and possess"; while when a similar protest is made by a republican this same Kansas City paper on the very following day refers to the latter protest as "direct and pointed sentiments, inspired by conditions to which no thoughtful and sober-minded man can be blind"?

If every man has a right to "acquire and possess" regardless of the rights of others, as the *Star* intimated in its criticism of Mr. Bryan, then with what reason may we object to the schemes of "self-aggrandizement" by which certain rich men are "rapidly gaining control of the industries and the commerce of the nation"?

Is there not danger that by the publication of such editorials as these the *Kansas City Star* will do things "not in accordance with the democratic spirit of this country which gives every man a right to acquire and possess"?

In all seriousness, can a great newspaper like the *Kansas City Star* hope that its readers will give serious attention to its opinions when on one day it condemns Mr. Bryan for giving utterance to certain sentiments, and on the next day commends Mr. Roosevelt for giving expression to similar sentiments?

MAKING AND RECEIVING APOLOGIES.

The Emperor of Germany has done the world a distinct service by modifying his requirements of the Chinese representative, charged with making an apology to Germany, to the extent that it was not necessary for the Chinese representative to "kowitz." This ceremony would have consisted of the Chinese representative approaching the Emperor of Germany on his knees and knocking his head on the floor nine times.

In the presence of an apology between individuals, if both parties be intelligent, there must necessarily be some embarrassment, and the embarrassment is by no means one sided. It is just as difficult to accept an apology gracefully as it is to gracefully extend an apology. And the burden of acting gracefully rests as heavily upon the recipient of an apology as it does upon the one required to make the apology.

The man who, being tendered a full and complete apology, made in a manly way with the form of the apologist erect, with the eye of the apologist looking frankly into the eye of the one

to whom the apology is due, must on his part be equally manly. He must accept it in the spirit in which it is tendered, and the real man, appreciating the difficulties of his unfortunate fellow, will make the situation as easy as possible for the apologist.

So the ruler of a nation to whom an apology must be made by the representative of another nation has nothing to gain and everything to lose when he makes conditions that in no way benefit his country, but bear heavily upon the individual representative of the apologising country.

The people of Germany are too intelligent to require at the hands of China's representative the humiliation that the "kow-towing" ceremony would impose upon him. Had that ceremony been required, the people of Germany would themselves have been humiliated before the civilized world, and the representatives of civilization would have lost another opportunity of setting a good example to the world's barbarians.

WILL THEY REMEMBER?

Mr. Davis, vice-president of the Amalgamated Association, in a recent speech, charged J. Pierpont Morgan with a fixed determination to destroy all labor organizations. He said:

The steel men are picked as the first organization to be wiped out. That is why the opposition to us is so bitter, so uncompromising, so regardless of the possibility of arbitration. Next will come the poor old miners, if we are beaten. Then the carpenters and machinists, and after them one trade after another. If we are defeated we shall all become slaves, and life will no longer be worth living.

That the trusts, if permitted to exist, will ultimately destroy the labor unions, is too plain a proposition to admit of dispute, but will the laboring men remember at the polls the lesson they are learning at the door of the factory? The wage-earners have it in their power to destroy every trust and, by so doing, to restore the era of industrial independence, but will they exert that power on election day? No one who understands history or human nature can doubt that private monopolies are a menace to employes, as well as to producers of raw material and to consumers. The time

will come when the evils of the trust system will be recognized by all, but in the meantime many bitter lessons are being learned. "Experience is a dear teacher," but apparently the only one whose instruction is heeded.

"GOD'S WILL, NOT OURS, BE DONE."

These were the last words of President McKinley as he bade farewell to the loving companion of his life, to whom his kindness and devotion have been so constant and conspicuous. It was with this beautiful spirit of resignation that he turned from the realities of earth to explore the mysteries of the world beyond.

The struggle was over—the struggle of a week during which hope and fear alternately gained the mastery. The book of life is closed, and his achievements are a part of history. After he became conscious that the end was drawing near, but before the shadows quite obscured the light, he was heard to murmur some of the words of "Nearer, my God, to Thee." This sacred hymn, which will be found in full upon another page, contains several lines inspired by Jacob's night at Bethel:

Though, like a wanderer,
The sun gone down,
Darkness be over me,
My rest a stone

Thus do the lines immortalize the pillow which to Jacob must have seemed hard indeed—the pillow which, when morning came, the patriarch would not have exchanged for the softest one on which a weary head was ever laid.

It is still true that one's sorest afflictions and most bitter experiences are sometimes stepping stones to higher rewards.

The terrible deed at Buffalo, rudely breaking the ties of family and friendship and horrifying every patriotic citizen, crowns a most extraordinary life with a halo that cannot but exalt its victim's place in history, while his bravery during the trying ordeal, his forgiving spirit and his fortitude in the final hours give glimpses of his inner life which nothing less tragic could have revealed.

But, inexpressibly sad as is the death of McKinley, the illustrious citizen, it is the damnable murder of McKinley, the president, that melts seventy-five million hearts into one and brings a hush to the farm, the factory and the forum.

Death is the inevitable incident of every human career. It despises the sword and shield of the warrior, and laughs at the precautions suggested by science; wealth cannot build walls high enough or thick enough to shut it out, and no house is humble enough to escape its visitation. Even love, the most potent force known to man—love, the characteristic which links the human to the divine—even love is powerless in its presence. Its contingency is recognized in the marriage vow—"until death us do part"—and is written upon friendship's signet ring. But the death, even when produced by natural causes, of a public servant charged with the tremendous responsibilities which press upon a president, shocks the entire country and is infinitely multiplied when the circumstances attending it constitute an attack upon the government itself. No one can estimate the far-reaching effect of such an act as that which now casts a gloom over our land. It shames America in the eyes of the world; it impairs her moral prestige and gives the enemies of free government a chance to mock at her. And it excites an indignation which, while righteous in itself, may lead to acts which will partake of the spirit of lawlessness.

As the president's death overwhelms all in a common sorrow, so it imposes a common responsibility, namely, to so avenge the wrong done to the president, his family and the country, as to make the executive's life secure without bringing insecurity to freedom of speech or freedom of the press.

HUSBAND AND WIFE.

One of the many striking and touching incidents occurring at Buffalo was the meeting between the President and Mrs. McKinley for the first time after the assault. The dispatches report that Mrs. McKinley took a seat at the bedside and held the President's hand. The distinguished sufferer looked into the face of his good wife and said in a low tone, "We must bear up; it will be better for us both." With tears streaming down her cheeks, Mrs. McKinley nodded assent.

There is a depth of pathos in this little incident that must appeal forcefully to those who appreciate the strength of the ties that bind a good husband to a good wife.

There may be some people who have no idea of the thoughts

that were passing through the minds of this couple at that moment. There are, however, many others who can imagine what these thoughts were. There, on the bed of pain, lay the strong, powerful man. By his side sat the frail woman, whose physical weakness has been, for so many years, the subject of this husband's tender solicitude. In an humble way they began life together. Two little graves had for them a common interest. In prosperity and in adversity they had stood together, participating equally in the joys and sharing equally in the sorrows of life. The wife had shared in the great honors that had come to her husband, and now, when the very summit of political ambition had been reached and political honors had become so common that the conveniences of a quiet, domestic life were longed for by the woman, in order, as she often expressed it, that she might have her husband to herself, the bullet of an assassin had done the work that threatened to blast the highest ambition of this woman's life.

"We must bear up," said the President; "it will be better for us both." It matters not to what extent other men and women may have grieved; it matters not how many tears other men and women may have shed and how much other hearts may have ached. All of this grief and woe could not have been so acute as was the grief and woe which this man and woman suppressed in compliance with the suggestion, "it will be better for us both."

There is nothing in all this world more beautiful than a happy marriage. There is in all this world nothing more inspiring, nothing more encouraging than the devotion and love that abounds between thousands of men and women; devotion and love which were exemplified in the relations that existed between the late President and his wife.

THE CURE FOR ANARCHY.

It is natural that the wanton and brutal assassination of the President at Buffalo should lead to a discussion of ways and means for driving anarchy out of the United States, and it is important that the subject should be dealt with in a broad and comprehensive way. Czolgosz had no personal animosity; he was not seeking revenge for any wrong that the administration had done him; he was aiming a blow at the government of which Mr. McKinley was

the official head. No considerable number of the American people can have any sympathy with the murderer or with those who entertain his views in regard to government. That there should be laws giving all possible protection to our officials every one will concede; the only question open for discussion is how to apply an effective remedy. The suppression of anarchy is only a temporary relief; we should seek not merely the suppression, but the permanent eradication of anarchy. Stealing can and should be suppressed by law; but stealing cannot be eradicated until people are convinced that it is wrong to steal. So, anarchy can and should be suppressed by law, but it cannot be entirely eradicated until all are convinced that anarchy is wrong. Free government, springing as directly as possible from the people and made as responsive as possible to their will, is the only permanent and complete cure for anarchy. The arbitrary governments of the old world have tried suppression, but have not succeeded. They have lessened anarchy just in proportion as they have extended civil liberty and participation in the government.

Stern measure must be invoked for the suppression and punishment of every manifestation of the anarchistic spirit, but beyond this remedy there must be education. All must be taught that government is an absolute necessity and that our form of government is the best ever devised. Then our government must be made as good as intelligence and patriotism can make it.

There is in every human heart the love of justice and to this love of justice every government should appeal. Victor Hugo described the mob as the human race in misery. No government can afford to make its people miserable—not even a small part of its people. Let a man believe that he is being justly treated by his government and he will endure almost anything, but let him feel that he is being unjustly dealt with and even a slight wrong will rankle in his bosom.

In a government deriving its powers from the consent of the governed men will endure much because they hope for a remedy at the next election. Jefferson understood this and among the things urged in his first inaugural address was “a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution, where peaceable remedies are unprovided.”

A man is never dangerous so long as he has hope of relief from

an evil, whether fancied or real, but when despair takes the place of hope he becomes a menace to society because he feels he has nothing to lose.

While we are legislating to prevent any manifestation of the anarchistic spirit on American soil, we should avoid those things which breed anarchy. Partiality in government kindles discontent; the exaltation of money above human rights, the fattening of a few at the expense of the many, the making of artificial distinctions between citizens and the lessening of the sacredness of human life—all these in their full development encourage the anarchistic spirit. We cannot give full protection to our officials merely by passing laws for the punishment of those who assault them; neither can we give them adequate protection by closing our gates to those known to advocate anarchy. These remedies, good as far as they go, are incomplete. We can only bring absolute security to our public servants by making the government so just and so beneficent that every citizen will be willing to give his life if need be to preserve it to posterity. When Pericles sought to explain the patriotism of his countrymen who fell in battle, he described Greece and then added: "It was for such a country then that these men, nobly resolving not to have it taken from them, fell fighting, and we their survivors may be well willing to suffer in its behalf."

We shall fail to do our full duty as citizens unless we bend every energy toward the reform of every governmental abuse and the enactment of such laws as are necessary to protect each citizen in the enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and to restrain every arm uplifted for a neighbor's injury.

CONTEMPTIBLE POLITICS.

Chairman Dougherty of the Ohio Democratic State Committee, with commendable courtesy, sent a communication to Chairman Dick of the Republican State Committee proposing that, in view of the president's assassination and as a mark of personal respect for him, political speaking in Ohio be suspended during the present campaign. Mr. Dick promptly refused, and if he had stopped there no serious criticism could have been made against his action, but in the course of his reply he resorted to as contemptible a piece of politics as has been practiced for a long time. He said:

If it seems best to your committee to withdraw from antagonizing those principles, and to cease from further advocacy of political doctrines which the President has always believed to be perilous to the prosperity of the entire country, we shall be very glad indeed to be advised to that effect, and to have your co-operation hereafter in the maintenance of more wholesome public politics.

It is a small man who would attempt to turn a great national sorrow into a little partisan advantage. The assault upon the president, dastardly as it was, does not change the character of public questions. Imperialism is just as un-American as it was before and the trusts just as menacing to every legitimate industry. The volume of money has not been increased by the calamity which has befallen the country, nor has the production of gold or the balance of trade been augmented by it. State issues have been as little affected as national ones. The necessity for reform in taxation and for the better control of corporations is just as imperative as it would have been had no anarchist attacked the president. The people must vote on these questions.

The republican party must be in a desperate condition in Ohio if it is compelled to shield itself behind the universal sympathy felt for the late president and his widow. Mr. Dougherty acted wisely in making the offer which he did, but Mr. Dick has not raised himself in public esteem by his reply.

DOOLEY DISCUSSES CANDIDATES.

Mr. Dunn, the humorist, has fairly outdone himself in his discussion of the men who have been suggested for the democratic presidential nomination. His business is to find the weak points in the armor of each, and every public man has some weak points. He condenses the whole question into a sentence when he says that the difficulty is that every candidate mentioned is "either a traitor or a man whom the traitors won't vote for." He intimates that the party might advertise for a candidate, and outlines an advertisement which ought to be satisfactory to those democrats who want a candidate who will believe in enough things to please everybody and yet not believe in anything earnestly enough to offend anybody. The proposed advertisement reads:

Wanted—A good, active, inergetic dimmycrat, sthrong iv lung an' limb; must be in favor iv sound money, but not too sound, an' anti-impeeryalist, but f'r holdin' onto what we've got, an' inimy iv thrusts, but a frind iv organized capital, a sympathizer with th' crushed an' downthrodden people, but not be anny means hostile to vested inth'rests; must advocate sthrikes, gover'mint be injunction, free silver, sound money, greenbacks, a single tax, a tariff f'r rivinoo, th' constitootion to follow th' flag as far as it can go, an' no farther, civil service rayform iv th' la'ads in office an' all th' gr-eat an' gloryous principles iv our gr-eat an' gloryous party or anny gr-reat an' gloryous parts thereof.

One beauty about Dooley's writings is that he appears to have no malice. His wit is so clean and innocent that even his victims enjoy his thrusts.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

Theodore Roosevelt assumes the duties of the presidency under conditions calculated to call out the best that is in him; conditions which will make more ardent his natural desire to fulfill the expectations of his countrymen. While he was in perfect accord with Mr. McKinley in regard to public questions, his strong individuality will doubtless cause some uncertainty until his administrative policies are developed. He enters office more free from political obligations than he could have done had he received a party nomination after a long contest. Mr. Roosevelt has a high conception of civic virtue and his opponents will probably find more to criticise in his doctrine than in his methods. There will be do disposition to prejudice him, but an earnest wish that the governmental policies for which he and his party stand may be tested upon their merits.

HIGH TARIFF DOOMED.

In his speech at Buffalo, the last speech that he made, President McKinley sounded the death-knell of a high tariff. He said:

We have a vast and intricate business, built up through years of toil and struggle, in which every part of the country has its stake, which will not permit of either neglect or of undue selfishness. No narrow, sordid policy will subserve it. The greatest skill and

wisdom on the part of the manufacturers and producers will be required to hold and increase it. Our industrial enterprises, which have grown to such great proportions, affect the homes and occupations of the people and the welfare of the country. Our capacity to produce has developed so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention. Only a broad and enlightened policy will keep what we have. No other policy will get more. In these times of marvelous business energy and gain we ought to be looking to the future, strengthening the weak places in our industrial and commercial systems, that we may be ready for any storm or strain.

By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production we shall extend our outlets for our increasing surplus. A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued, healthful growth of our export trade. We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible it would not be best for us or for those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

“The period of exclusiveness is past.” That means that our country must enter the markets of the world, and when it does so it will be absurd to talk about needing protection from foreigners. When we sell abroad, the freight must be added to the price—we must sell at the foreign price, less the freight. In other words, we have the advantage of double freight when we sell at home. When it is admitted that we can pay the freight and compete with foreigners, no one will have the audacity to ask for a high tariff to protect domestic manufacturers against foreign competition.

Mr. McKinley's statement that we cannot sell everything and buy nothing is an axiom, but it will shock the high tariff advocates who have gone on the theory that we ought to sell to everybody and

buy of nobody. But the President's speech suggests one melancholy thought. Tariff reform is about the only thing the re-organizers favor that is democratic and it would be really cruel if the republicans should abandon protection and leave the re-organizers no issue at all.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

Some of the republican papers are suggesting limitations upon the freedom of speech as a cure for anarchy. The editor of THE COMMONER has as much reason as any living man to know of the abuse sometimes heaped upon candidates for office. He has been the victim of as much malice and vituperation as have ever been employed against an American, and yet he is opposed to placing any additional restriction upon the freedom of speech or the freedom of the press.

First, because the evils of restriction are greater than the evils of freedom, and, second, because abuse does not hurt the man or the party made the subject of attack. The death of President McKinley cannot be traced to anything ever spoken or written against him. The assassin spoke affectionately of his victim and said that he killed him not because of his dislike for the man, but because of his opposition to government of any kind. Some who are engaged in schemes which will not bear the light will shield themselves behind the murderous deed of the assassin and denounce freedom of speech because they do not want the public to be informed of their doings. Others, stirred by a righteous indignation, strike at free speech because some have abused the latitude allowed. It is time for liberty-loving citizens to protest against the attempt to suppress free speech. The warfare must be against anarchy, not against freedom of speech. Anarchy is an European product and thrives most where there is least freedom of speech and least freedom of the press. Let us not make the mistake of undermining our institutions under the delusion that we are thus protecting those institutions.

Free speech and free press are essential to free government. No man in public life can object to the publication of the truth and no man in public life is permanently injured by the publication of a lie. That much is published that should not be is only too evident, but let public opinion correct the evil; that will be

more effective than law and will bring no danger with it. If a paper abuses a political opponent stop your subscription and teach the editor to conduct his paper on respectable lines. There is a sense of justice in the human heart and he who violates it violates it at his own peril. This sense of justice ultimately turns abuse to the benefit of the man abused. The present laws against slander and libel are sufficient; leave the rest to a healthy public sentiment—and then help to create the sentiment.

THE TURNING POINT.

Theodore Roosevelt has reached the turning point in his political career. For several years he has cherished the ambition to be President; when he was offered the nomination for Vice-President last year he hesitated to accept it for fear that it might interfere with his desire to reach the first place. Ever since his inauguration he has looked forward to 1904 as the time for the realization of his hopes. He expected to secure the nomination of his party, but he knew that it would be secured, if secured at all, at the end of a spirited contest. All at once, as the result of an assassin's shot, he was ushered into the Presidency. His fondest aspirations have been realized; the highest honor within the gift of the people in any land is now his. With what spirit will he enter upon the discharge of his duties? The answer to this question is of tremendous importance to him and to his country. He has three years and one-half in which to show the American people his conception of official duty. Will he be content to devote himself unselfishly to the public good as he sees it, or will he begin to plan for the capture of the next republican convention? Will he decide all controversies with an eye single to the nation's welfare, or will the advancement of his own political fortune be uppermost in his mind? When Mr. Cleveland accepted the democratic nomination in 1884, he said:

When an election to office shall be the selection by the voters of one of their number to assume for a time a public trust instead of his dedication to the profession of politics; when the holders of the ballot, quickened by a sense of duty, shall avenge truth betrayed and pledges broken, and when the suffrage shall be altogether free and uncorrupted, the full realization of a govern-

ment by the people will be at hand. And of the means to this end, not one would, in my judgment, be more effective than an amendment to the Constitution disqualifying the president from re-election.

When we consider the patronage of this great office, the allurements of power, the temptation to retain public office once gained, and, more than all, the availability a party finds in an incumbent whom a horde of office-holders, with zeal born of benefits received and fostered by the hope of favors yet to come, stand ready to aid with money and trained political service, we recognize in the eligibility of a president for re-election a most serious danger to that calm, deliberate and intelligent political action which must characterize a government by the people.

Mr. Cleveland would have stood better in history and his party would have been benefitted if he had followed his own advice and declined a second term, but his acceptance of a renomination only proved the strength of the influences against which he warned his countrymen.

If Mr. Roosevelt desires republican authority on this subject, he can find it in the letter of acceptance of Mr. Hayes in 1876. He said:

The declaration of principles by the Cincinnati convention makes no announcement in favor of a single presidential term. I do not assume to add to that declaration, but believing that the restoration of the civil service to the system established by Washington and followed by the early presidents can be best accomplished by an executive officer who is under no temptation to use the patronage of his office to promote his own re-election, I desire to perform what I regard as a duty in stating now my inflexible purpose, if elected, not to be a candidate for election to a second term.

President Hayes adhered to his determination and his party was stronger in 1880 than it was in 1876.

Mr. Roosevelt will find that there are many things that "can be best accomplished by an executive officer who is under no temptation to use the patronage of his office to promote his own re-election." If he will announce his determination not to be a candidate for renomination, he will be relieved of a great deal of embarrassment and anxiety, and he will find sufficient "strenuous life" in an effort to make his administration conspicuous for its honesty and efficiency. If he intends to appear before the next republican convention as a candidate he must prepare to fight the

bosses of his party or to surrender to them. He is aware of the fact that the republican organization did not look with favor upon his candidacy; he was thought too independent. If he is independent and does his own thinking he will alienate those gentlemen (it is not necessary to name them) who insist upon controlling political affairs in their various sections. There is one question which President Roosevelt will have to meet upon which his course is likely to be determined by his ambition. If he is going to seek another term, he will find it difficult to antagonize the great corporations which are rapidly securing a monopoly of the nation's industries, for the trust magnates are influential in republican conventions and their contributions are helpful during campaigns. The financiers will insist upon controlling the financial policy of his administration and their threats will be potent if he must pass through a republican convention before he can get to the people for an endorsement, but their fury will be of no avail if he is content with the record made during the present term.

Scarcely a day will pass but that he will have to decide between himself and the people. What will his decision be? Three years and a half of work as a conscientious, earnest and brave defender of the interests of the people would win for him more real glory than seven years and a half devoted to the advancement of his own interests—the first half spent in contracting obligation with influential men and corporations and the second half spent in discharging the obligations at the expense of the people.

President Roosevelt has reached the parting of the ways; which road will he take?

ANOTHER PROBLEM.

By way of London, the information comes to the United States that the Danish Ministry "has decided to accept the United States' offer of 16,000,000 kroner for the Danish West Indies." This sum represents, in our money, about \$3,500,000. If this offer has been made, it has been made by the executive, because it is not recalled that congress has given authority for any such proposition to be made. Is this another case where Providence will have dropped the Danish West Indies into our possession? It will be interesting to observe the position to which the adminis-

tration politicians will relegate these new possessions after we have paid our \$3,500,000 and have obtained the transfer of the title. Will they become by a mere purchase a part of the great American Empire? Will they be domestic or foreign territory? Will they become an integral part of the Union with their inhabitants entitled to all the rights, privileges and immunities that old-fashioned people thought our Constitution guaranteed to all men under our flag, or will they be mere colonists, subject to the whims and caprices of American politicians? It is presumed that if the President concludes to make this purchase, he assumes to act under the clause providing that the President by and with the consent of the senate may make treaties. We may soon be confronted with the problem as to what position the Danish West Indies will occupy with relation to the United States.

DOLLIVER ON ANARCHY.

Senator Dolliver, of Iowa, made a speech at the Memorial Services, held in Chicago, on Sunday, September 22. In the course of his remarks he took occasion to discuss two phases of the question of anarchy, or rather, two remedies. Some seem to think that anarchy cannot be suppressed without limiting the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press. It is refreshing to find one so eminent in the republican party as Mr. Dolliver challenging this dangerous doctrine. He says:

A government like ours is always slow to move, and often awkward in its motions, but it can be trusted to find effective remedies for conditions like these, at least after they become intolerable. But these remedies, in order to become effective, must not evade the sense of justice which is universal, nor the traditions of civil liberty, which we have inherited from our fathers. The bill of rights written in the English language, stands for too many centuries of sacrifice, too many battlefields sanctified by blood, too many hopes of mankind reaching toward the ages to come, to be mutilated in the least in order to meet the case of a handful of miscreants whose names nobody can pronounce.

Anarchy can be overcome without impairing the liberties of the people or trenching upon those rights which are essential to the republic. His suggestions go further than temporary suppres-

sion of anarchy. He deals with some of the causes which lead up to and develop the spirit of anarchy. He says:

It ought not to be forgotten that conspirators, working out their nefarious plans in secret in the dens and caves of the earth, enjoy an unconscious co-operation and side partnership with every lawless influence abroad in the world. Legislatures who betray the commonwealth, judges who poison the fountains of justice, city governments which come to terms with crime—all these are regular contributors to the campaign fund of anarchy.

There is food for thought in what Senator Dolliver says. Lawlessness in high places breeds lawlessness among less conspicuous individuals, and it will be difficult to teach the humbler members of society respect for law and government if there are men or corporations so great that they can with impunity defy the law and the authority of the government.

The senator also refers to the burnings which have taken place in several sections of the union, and declares that they do not contribute to the safety of society. Lynch law is either a reflection upon the government or it is an indication of unrestrained passion upon the part of the mob. If the government is efficiently administered, there is no occasion to resort to lynch law, and if it is not efficiently administered, it is better to reform the government than to set aside its authority.

But when the mob, not satisfied with taking the life of the victim, adds torture, it betrays a brutality that shames our civilization. The assaults upon women which have been the cause of most of the burnings, are indescribably wicked, but it is enough that the guilty party should atone for the deed with his life. The taking of a human life, even in the enforcement of laws of society, is a grave and serious thing. To torture a human being to death amid shouts of revenge is debasing and cannot but result injuriously to society.

The assassination of the President will bring about a discussion of lawlessness and lead to an investigation of the influences which lead to lawlessness.

Senator Dolliver has gone deeper into the subject than many of the republican editors who have sought to hide their own responsibility behind columns of partisan abuse. He is to be congratulated upon the courage which he has manifested and the breadth of view he has shown.

XIII.

NEBRASKA DEMOCRATS FIRM.

The Democratic State Convention, held at Lincoln, September 17, adopted a strong platform endorsing the principles of the Kansas City platform, and nominated one candidate for Supreme Judge and two candidates for regents of State University. The convention was one of the largest ever held in the state. The populists met at the same time and the ticket named was agreed upon by both conventions. The candidate for the bench, Judge Conrad Hollenbeck, is a Democrat and J. H. Bayston and L. G. Hawksby, candidates for regents, are Populists. The fusion committees expect to get out a full vote and elect the entire ticket. Mr. Bryan had not met the representatives of the two parties since the last presidential election. In addressing the conventions he avoided partisan politics owing to the death of the President. In the course of his remarks he said that the loss of the state brought more humiliation to him than the national defeat (not that he regretted it more, as some papers reported). He said that he would remain a citizen of Nebraska and help win back the state.

ROOSEVELT ON TRUSTS.

In his speech at Minneapolis on Labor Day, President Roosevelt said:

More and more it is evident that the state, and if necessary the nation, has got to possess the right of supervision and control as regards the great corporations which are its creatures, particularly as regards the great business combinations which derive a portion of their importance from the existence of some monopolistic tendency.

Mr. Roosevelt was then Vice-President and as such had little influence in shaping the policy of his party. He is now President and in a position to give force and effect to his views on the trust

question. As the Chief Executive it is his duty to enforce the law as he finds it. If the present Attorney-General is not willing to carry out his instructions he can demand his resignation and appoint a new Attorney-General. He can give no excuse for a failure to enforce the law. When he was exercising authority in New York City he took the position that a law ought either to be enforced or repealed. It is to be hoped that he will take the same position now.

Not only is he in control of the Executive Branch of the government, but he has a Senate, House and Supreme Court in political harmony with him. If existing laws are not sufficient, he has the power of recommendation and can propose measures sufficiently severe to give to the people the protection which he admits to be needed. It will be interesting to watch the new President and see whether the hostility to trusts manifested by him when he was laying his plans to capture the next republican convention is increased or lessened by the responsibilities of the office to which he aspired.

AN EXAMPLE OF PARTISANSHIP.

Many of the republican papers have been denouncing those who criticised the administration, and some have gone so far as to charge that the murder was inspired by the abuse directed against the President. As a matter of fact, very little has been said against the personal character of Mr. McKinley, and it is evident from the statement made by the assassin that he was not actuated by any hatred of the man or even by lack of respect for him. The blow was aimed at the government and could not have resulted from anything that was ever said or written about the President. However, while the republicans are finding fault with the language employed by democrats or populists who have criticised officials and candidates, it may be worth while to recall the fact that the republicans have gone far beyond the democrats in personal abuse. For the present, one illustration will suffice. The New York *Tribune*, once edited by Horace Greeley and now owned by a man who came near being Vice-President of the United States, contained the following critical editorial just after the election of 1896:

The thing was conceived in iniquity and was brought forth in sin. It had its origin in a malicious conspiracy against the honor and integrity of the nation. It gained such monstrous growth as it enjoyed from an assiduous culture of the basest passions of the least worthy members of the community. It has been defeated and destroyed because right is right and God is God. Its nominal head was worthy of the cause. Nominal, because the wretched, rattle-pated boy, posing in vapid vanity and mouthing resounding rottenness, was not the real leader of the league of hell. He was only a puppet in the blood-imbued hands of—the anarchist and—the revolutionist and other desperadoes of that stripe. But he was a willing puppet, Bryan was, willing and eager. Not one of his masters was more apt than he at lies, forgeries and blasphemies and all the nameless iniquities of that campaign against the Ten Commandments. He goes down with the cause, and must abide with it in the history of infamy.

This is one of the utterances of the republican press that objects to the criticism of republican officials or republican candidates.

NO TIME FOR DESPAIR.

The editor of *THE COMMONER* has recently received a letter from a democrat who, feeling that his efforts have been fruitless, is inclined to hibernate for a while and take no interest in public affairs.

While this is the only letter of the kind received, it probably reflects the feelings of a considerable number of persons who have labored long and earnestly in behalf of reforms without being able to note the progress which they hoped for and had reason to expect. It is not unnatural that a period of enthusiasm and earnestness should be followed by a period of depression and despondency. Even the best of men have sometimes halted and hesitated in the prosecution of a noble cause. Elijah, one of the most courageous of the prophets of the olden time, once became discouraged, but the Lord revived his drooping spirits by showing him that there were thousands who had not "bowed the knee to Baal."

So reformers can take courage to-day, for although the enemy is even more strongly entrenched than we thought, there are millions who are still loyal to Jeffersonian principles, and still interested in reforming the abuses which have grown up under republican rule.

The fight must be continued. Whether the battle be long or short, it is the duty of every citizen to think for himself, form his own convictions, and then stand by his opinion, confident that the right will finally triumph and that truth will ultimately prevail. There is comfort and inspiration in Bryant's "Battle Field."

FACTS ARE STUBBORN THINGS.

Under the above caption the *New York World* attempts to disprove a statement made in a recent issue of **THE COMMONER**. It says:

Mr. Bryan would be a greater success as a controversial writer if he were to cultivate a larger respect for facts—especially facts of record. In his **COMMONER** he says that "Mr. Cleveland used the patronage of his high office to force through a republican measure—the unconditional repeal bill."

It was the Sherman silver purchase law which was a "republican measure." It was passed exclusively by republican votes, not a single democrat voting for it. The repeal act was a democratic measure though passed by the help of republican votes. The national democratic platform adopted at Chicago in 1892 thus characterized it:

"We denounce the republican legislation known as the Sherman act of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift, fraught with possibilities of danger in the future, which should make all its supporters, as well as its author, anxious for its speedy repeal."

The "possibilities of danger" were realized in the summer of 1893, when the enforced inflation of the currency with steadily depreciating dollars contributed to, if it did not wholly cause, the disastrous panic of that year. President Cleveland simply fulfilled the promise of the national platform in calling congress together to repeal this disaster-breeding law, and its unconditional repeal was largely due to the inflexible determination and the parliamentary skill of the senior democratic senator from this state—David B. Hill. Mr. Cleveland's only mistake was in not calling congress together at once—in March—to secure the "speedy repeal" as promised, instead of waiting until August, when the panic was beyond control.

Even Mr. Bryan's fountain pen cannot rewrite history.

THE COMMONER reiterates its statement that the Unconditional Repeal Bill which Mr. Cleveland forced through by the use of patronage was a republican measure, and for proof it points

to the bill itself. Below will be found in parallel columns a bill introduced by Senator Sherman and the bill introduced by Mr. Wilson at the request of Mr. Cleveland:

Fifty-second Congress, first session. S. 3423, introduced in the senate July 14, 1892, by Mr. Sherman.

A bill for the repeal of certain parts of the act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes, approved July 14, 1890.

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, That so much of the act entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," approved July 14, 1890, as directs the secretary of the treasury to purchase, from time to time, silver bullion to the aggregate amount of 4,500,000 ounces, or so much thereof as may be offered in each month, at the market price thereof, and to issue in payment for such purchases of silver bullion treasury notes of the United States; is hereby repealed, to take effect on the 1st day of January, 1893; Provided, That this act shall not in any way affect or impair or change the legal qualities, redemption or use of the treasury notes issued under said act.

Fifty-third Congress, first session. H. R. 1, introduced in the house August 11, 1893, by Mr. Wilson.

A bill to repeal a part of an act, approved July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes."

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, That so much of the act approved July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and issue of treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," as directs the secretary of the treasury to purchase, from time to time, silver bullion to the aggregate amount of 4,500,000 ounces or so much thereof as may be offered in each month, at the market price thereof, not exceeding \$1 for 371.25 grains of pure silver, and to issue in payment for such purchases treasury notes of the United States, be, and the same is hereby repealed; but this repeal shall not impair or in any manner affect the legal tender quality of the standard silver dollars heretofore coined; and the faith and credit of the United States are hereby pledged to maintain the parity of the standard gold and silver coins of the United States at the present legal ratio, or such other ratio as may be established by law.

A comparison of these bills will convince any one that Mr. Cleveland adopted Mr. Sherman's bill, and Mr. Sherman was not in the habit of introducing democratic measures.

The case might be submitted upon this evidence, but additional evidence is furnished by the vote in the House and Senate.

A larger percentage of the republicans than of the democrats voted for the measure urged by Mr. Cleveland. The republicans are not in the habit of supporting democratic measures, and yet in spite of the natural disposition of the republicans to antagonize a democratic administration, and in spite of the natural disposition of democrats to support a democratic administration, Mr. Cleveland in his fight for unconditional repeal received more support from the republicans than from his own party. This fact alone would be sufficient to support THE COMMONER'S charge; certainly, the proof brought from the two sources above mentioned establishes the proposition.

But this is not all. When the next democratic national convention met the democrats repudiated the position taken by Mr. Cleveland because it was a republican position and inconsistent with democratic principles and democratic record, and the convention did this in spite of all the great corporations and in spite of nearly all the great daily papers.

In making its denial the *World* relies upon a garbled extract from the democratic platform of 1892. That platform denounced the Sherman law as a cowardly makeshift and declared that the democrats "hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage." A makeshift is an inferior thing that is used until something better can be secured. To denounce the Sherman law as a cowardly makeshift would have been absurd if the convention had not pointed out the better thing, namely, bimetallism. The democratic party never demanded unconditional repeal; it never approved of the President's plan of putting the country on a gold basis. No sensible or sane man could have construed the platform of 1892 so as to support Mr. Cleveland's course. Mr. Cleveland made no attempt to carry out the platform; he made no effort to conform to the wishes of the men who voted for him. He was apparently under some secret obligation to the financiers and proceeded to carry out their plans in utter disregard of the pledges

made by his platform. While a majority of the men who voted for him believed in "the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage," he selected a cabinet, every member of which was opposed to that doctrine. He consulted with the republican financiers more than he did with democratic representatives, and he rewarded with lucrative positions several congressmen and senators who were persuaded by him to betray their constituents. He even promised some that he would favor silver legislation as soon as he could get the Sherman law repealed, and yet, at the request of New York bankers, he vetoed the Seigniorage Bill, which was supported by a majority of the democrats in both the House and Senate. Many of the democrats who had been persuaded to vote for the repeal bill, learned to their surprise that Mr. Cleveland did not intend that anything should be done to rehabilitate silver.

Facts are, indeed, stubborn things and the *World* knows these facts because it was in the thick of the fight and was as active an organ as the money power had during that memorable contest.

If the *World* desires to defend Mr. Cleveland it can do so, but it ought to do so on the ground that it thinks the republicans were right and the democrats wrong, not on the ground that Mr. Cleveland supported a democratic measure.

The *World* gives Mr. Hill credit for valiant service in aiding the passage of that republican measure. Yes, the country well remembers how the interests of Wall Street brought about a reconciliation between Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Hill, who was supposed to be Mr. Cleveland's most bitter political enemy. When the financiers said dance, the Senator from New York chose the President for his partner and they waltzed together until the bill became a law. No contest through which this country has passed better illustrated the almost irresistible power of organized capital. The banks coerced the borrowers and the desks of the members were yellow with telegrams that poured in by concerted action from the money centers. The democratic party was first betrayed and then disrupted in order to carry out the financial plans of men who were ready to leave any party or to join any party according as their pecuniary interests would be advanced.

Facts are stubborn things.

THE ASSASSIN SENTENCED.

Leon F. Czolgosz, the President's Assassin, has been sentenced to death and will be electrocuted at the Auburn State Prison during the week beginning October 28, 1901.

The only statement he made at the trial was made just before his sentence and was: "There was no one else but me, no one else told me to do it. I was not told anything about the crime and I never thought anything about that until a couple of days before I committed the crime."

He had excellent counsel but as there was no defense to be offered and nothing that could be said in palliation of his act the trial was brief. He will now have a month's time to reflect upon the terrible deed, which even he now describes as a crime, and it will be strange, indeed, if meditation does not awaken his dormant conscience.

KIND BUT SURPRISING.

THE COMMONER does not, as a rule, publish the kind of things said about its editor for the reason that he does not desire the paper to appear to be a defender or eulogist of him. Occasionally, however, it becomes necessary to use the paper to defend him against unjust attack, and sometimes a word of commendation is published for the purpose of commenting upon it.

The *Topeka Capital* recently contained the following editorial:

The *Capital* has never had any prepossessions favorable to W. J. Bryan. The issues he has stood for have been the contradiction of everything this paper believes in. His manner and method in campaigns have seemed to us better calculated to divide than unify the country and people, to set section against section, and destroy sympathy and sense of fellowship and of common interest between men in one condition of life and men in another condition. We were just beginning as a party in Kansas to see the money question in its true light, when Bryan, by his eloquence and the fiery inspiration of his personality plunged us into a campaign for which as republicans we were unprepared. The more we saw of his kind of statesmanship the less we thought of it.

Mr. Bryan's political opinions are no better to-day than five years or one year ago; but Mr. Bryan's personal character and his patriotism and manly nature as exhibited by his comments

and conduct since the assassination of his successful rival have been such as to make every American heart warm to him. His tributes to the late president have been as sincere as they have been just. No man spoke more promptly or more feelingly when the news flashed across the country that the president had been struck down at Buffalo; and no man bowed his head in more honest sorrow when the tidings followed of his death. These manifestations of Mr. Bryan's goodness of heart and patriotism have won him a higher place in the respect of the nation as a man and a citizen than he has ever held in the past.

The kindly spirit which pervades the above editorial is duly appreciated, but attention is called to it for the purpose of asking why democrats are so misunderstood by their opponents. Certainly republicans had a right to expect, not only from Mr. Bryan but from all democrats, sincere sorrow at the President's death and indignation at the fact that it came through the act of an assassin. It was to be expected that every patriotic citizen would condemn the deed and the doctrine which led to it, as well as sympathize with the members of the stricken family. Neither should it be a matter of surprise that democrats entertained a respect for Mr. McKinley's many personal virtues, or were touched by the scenes which attended the closing moments of his life.

Democrats and republicans differ upon public questions, and Mr. Bryan has always contended that this difference is, for the most part, an honest difference. No one makes a greater mistake than he who assumes that any considerable portion of any party is unpatriotic or bent upon mischief. The democrats have not attempted to array one class against another. It became necessary to point out the effect of republican policies, and, as is always the case, those policies helped some people and injured others. Mr. Bryan never said anything on the silver question more calculated to array class against class than Mr. McKinley, Mr. Blaine, Mr. Sherman and Mr. Carlisle had said before him.

That a rising dollar is an advantage to the money owner is a self-evident truth, and that it is hurtful to the producers of wealth and to the debtor is equally plain. That a national bank currency is a good thing for the national banker is apparent to any one, and that it is dangerous as well as expensive to other people ought to be easily understood. The democrats believe that trusts and imperialism are beneficial to a portion of the people and injurious to the masses. It is impossible to discuss public ques-

tions without pointing out the effect of the policies upon the different classes, and no party has ever employed this method of argument more persistently than the republican party.

Have not the protectionists appealed to the sheep raisers, as a class, and warned them against free wool? Have not the republicans posed as the special guardians of the wage-earners, and have they not declaimed about the home market? Have they not charged the democrats with favoring low tariff for the benefit of English manufacturers and against the welfare of American producers? Have not republican papers contended that democratic policies would bring idleness to the wage-earners? Did not Mr. McKinley make capital out of a banquet given Mr. Wilson when he visited England? And did he not insist that his party would open the mills, charging inferentially that the democratic party had closed them?

It is gratifying to know that many republican editors have recently begun to realize what they seem to have ignored, namely, that the Democrats, Populists and Silver Republicans are earnestly endeavoring to secure what they believe to be needed reform. The members of these three parties have co-operated on paramount issues while they differed about minor ones; they have defended their convictions and will continue to defend them, but none surpass them in devotion to their nation's interest or in their support of the constituted authorities.

In view of all that has been said and done, is it not strange that any republican should be surprised at the words spoken by Mr. McKinley's opponents at the time of the assassination? The editor of *THE COMMONER* is greatly obliged to the *Topeka Capital* for its compliment, but regrets that any doubt ever existed as to the honesty and sincerity of himself and his supporters in recent campaigns.

THE FARM.

As the daily papers have seen fit to make some comments upon the house which I am building, it may not be out of place to present the facts to the readers of *THE COMMONER*. In the spring of 1893 I purchased five acres of ground about three miles southeast of Lincoln. The land is situated on the top of a beautiful knoll overlooking the Antelope valley. The view from this

spot is unsurpassed; as far as the eye can reach the land is under cultivation and the colors change with the crops and the seasons.

In 1897 twenty acres were purchased adjoining the original five, and in 1898 I began improving the place by setting out an orchard and shade trees. Since then, ten acres more have been added so that the farm now consists of thirty-five acres. Our only son is past twelve, and believing that life on a farm will be beneficial to him as well as pleasant to the rest of us, we are now about to realize the plans made years ago.

The first day of October was the seventeenth anniversary of our marriage and the fourteenth anniversary of my removal from Illinois to Nebraska. To celebrate this double anniversary Mrs. Bryan and I went out to the farm on that day and helped to stake off the ground for the house and took out the first shovelful of dirt. The foundation will be put in this fall, so that the house can be completed early next spring. When it is ready for occupancy a picture of it will appear in *THE COMMONER*—until it is completed the plans are subject to change.

THE PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE.

The Pan-American conference to be held in the City of Mexico the latter part of this month is of great importance to the countries participating. A number of subjects of general interest will be considered. Probably the most important question that will arise is arbitration, and it is to be hoped that the representatives of the United States will use their influence to secure the adoption of the resolutions brought before the last Pan-American conference by Secretary of State Blaine.

They were as follows:

First. That the principle of conquest shall not, during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration, be recognized as admissible under American public law.

Second. That all cessions of territory made during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration shall be void if made under threats of war or in the presence of an armed force.

Third. Any nation from which such cessions shall be exacted may demand that the validity of the cessions so made shall be submitted to arbitration.

Fourth. Any renunciation of the right to arbitration made

under the conditions named in the second section shall be null and void.

The fact that the Central and South American republics have been alarmed by the recent-imperialistic tendencies of the administration makes it especially opportune for this country to give the assurance which such resolutions would offer.

It would also be worth while to consider the propriety of inviting the other American republics to adopt our ratio between gold and silver and provide for the issuance of coins of the same weight, fineness and denominations as ours. This would facilitate trade between the countries of the western hemisphere. The building and protection of the Nicaragua Canal by the United States is a matter of great importance to all Pan-American countries and the subject should of course be considered.

The Monroe doctrine should be endorsed, for it is of vital concern to the republics of Central and South America, as well as to the United States.

There are other questions looking to the establishment of better mail facilities and better trade regulation which deserve attention; in fact, the scope of the meeting is so great that it would be difficult to limit the discussion to particular questions named in advance. The members of the conference ought to be free to consider all matters of interest to the republics represented.

“UNCONSCIOUS ANARCHY.”

A recent issue of the Rochester *Democrat and Chronicle* (why the word “Democrat” should be a part of the paper’s title is a mystery) contains a most interesting editorial under the caption “Unconscious Anarchy.” It is devoted to the criticism of an editorial which appeared in THE COMMONER a short time ago. The *Democrat and Chronicle* says:

As Mr. Bryan has said “our form of government is the best ever devised”—for a people capable of self-government. The reason that it is the best devised for such people (and the worst ever devised for people unfitted for self-government) is that it places the governing power unreservedly in the hands of the people. The people have full power, except as it is limited by the fundamental law, to govern or mis-govern themselves exactly

as they please and they can alter a fundamental law whenever they choose.

It will be noticed that the *Democrat and Chronicle* qualifies Mr. Bryan's statement by adding the words, "for a people capable of self-government."

The above language shows the standpoint from which republicans are beginning to view the subject of government. Their attempt to misrepresent democratic doctrines is of little importance, and their conscious and constant twisting of democratic arguments does not deserve attention. But the increasing emphasis with which they denounce the principles of American government is worthy of serious consideration. This doctrine that some people are capable of self-government and that other people are incapable of it, has as a corollary the imperialistic doctrine that the "capable" people should assume, as matter of duty, the government of the incapable ones, and of course while the capable ones are governing the incapable ones, the incapable ones must pay the expenses and the capable ones must make as much profit as possible, nationally and individually, out of the self-imposed duty. Public attention should be called to the present attitude of the republican party, and its position should be compared with the position taken by those who have been regarded as authority.

Jefferson in his first Inaugural Address said: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the governing of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the governing of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question."

If republicans are unwilling to accept the authority of Thomas Jefferson, they ought certainly to heed the words of Henry Clay. The whig party was the forerunner of the republican party, and Abraham Lincoln was one of Clay's warmest supporters. In 1818 Clay made a speech in the House of Representatives on the emancipation of South America (see the *World's Best Orations*). In the course of his argument he took occasion to condemn the very sentiment which now finds expression in the republican papers. Here are his words:

It is the doctrine of thrones, that man is too ignorant to govern himself. Their partisans assert his incapacity, in reference to

all nations; if they cannot command universal assent to the proposition, it is then demanded to particular nations; and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us. I contend, that it is to arraign the dispositions of Providence himself, to suppose that he has created beings incapable of governing themselves, and to be trampled on by kings. Self-government is the natural government of man.

If, however, the republicans want some more recent authority—authority more closely identified with the Republican party—let them turn to the speech made by Abraham Lincoln at Chicago in 1858 and they will find there a complete and conclusive answer to such a sentiment as that quoted from the *Democrat and Chronicle*.

Lincoln said:

Those arguments that are made, that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying, that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow—what are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument.

What a fall is this! The self-evident truths, proclaimed in the beginning of our nation's history and revered for a century and a quarter, have become "unconscious anarchy!" They must not be uttered aloud for fear they will stimulate anarchy. Was ever a party's transformation more complete?

If one says, as the editor of *THE COMMONER* did, "partiality in government kindles discontent, the exaltation of money above human rights, the fattening of the few at the expense of the many, the making of artificial distinctions between citizens and the lessening of the sacredness of human life—all these in their full development encourage the anarchistic spirit—" is he guilty of "unconscious anarchy"? The *Democrat and Chronicle* even finds fault with the declaration that "our government must be made as good as intelligence and patriotism can make it." This, also, is "unconscious anarchy."

Anarchy cannot be defended under any circumstances, and no democrat has any sympathy with it or toleration for it, for the

word "democrat" means that the people rule; it is not chaos that is desired, but "a government of the people, by the people and for the people." But a democrat not only believes in government, but in just government, and he will not be deterred from pointing out and correcting injustice by the fear that some one will carry his discontent to the point of despair. What is the alternative? It is to praise evil or to be silent in its presence. It is to encourage misrule and corruption; it is to bring this government down to the condition of those governments in which oppression is so great and relief so remote that the people become desperate. To point out the governmental abuses which cause anarchy is not to justify or defend anarchy. A disease cannot be treated until the cause is ascertained. To charge a democrat with being responsible for anarchy because he tries to apply a rational and permanent remedy is as unfair as to blame a physician for a disease which he points out and tries to cure.

If those who believe in self-government and who want to make the government entirely beneficent are to be charged with "unconscious anarchy," of what are they guilty who pervert government, profit by its perversion and then denounce criticism of their misdeeds?

CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE ON TRUSTS.

It is a matter of regret that the *Christian Advocate* should appear as a defender of the trusts. It does not say that they are good, but does say: "The simple facts are that there are no trusts in the country, and though some concerns or owners are united for the same purpose, they are not trusts, nor have they by any means all the legal powers that the trusts had." After declaring that there are no trusts it fails to condemn private monopolies in the form in which they now appear. It simply says: "Whether some way of regulating the size of such corporations can be devised without violating essential rights, or whether, if possible, it should be done, are other questions."

The readers of the *Christian Advocate* have reason to expect more frankness and candor than are shown in the editorial quoted. If the *Advocate* believes that the trusts are good, it ought to say so and attempt to defend them. If it believes them bad, it owes it to its readers to condemn them and point out a remedy. The

Advocate will find it difficult to support the trusts system without so amending the commandment as to make it read "Thou shalt not steal—on a small scale." Trusts steal on a large scale, and cannot be justified on political or economic grounds, much less on religious grounds.

MR. CUMMINS' ERROR.

In a speech delivered at Centreville, Iowa, Mr. Cummins, the Republican nominee for Governor, said: "Five full years of experience have approved every statement, verified every argument and vindicated every principle asserted by the Republicans."

Let us take a glance at the statements, arguments and principles asserted by the Republican party in 1896.

The leaders of that party asserted that we did not need more money and yet to-day, after "five full years of experience" they boast that their party has made wonderful increase in the volume of money.

They declared that the policy of protection was "the bulwark of American industrial independence and the fountain of American development and prosperity," and yet in the last speech delivered by Mr. McKinley, that great Republican leader pointed out very clearly that the Republican position on the question must be modified.

That platform asserted the principle of bimetallism by international agreement. No serious effort was made to fulfill the pledge relating to international bimetallism and after "five full years of experience" the Republican position of international bimetallism in 1896 has been abandoned for the Republican position of the single gold standard in 1901.

That platform declared that the Nicaraguan canal should be built, owned and operated by the United States, and yet a Republican secretary of state after several "full years of experience" sought to negotiate a treaty in which much of the practical control of that canal would have been surrendered to Great Britain.

That platform declared that "from the hour of achieving their own independence the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other American people to free themselves from European domination;" and yet after "five full years of experience" the Republican party of to-day finds itself

in a position where it dare not express sympathy with the struggles of the Dutchmen of South Africa to free themselves from European domination.

That platform promised to the American workingmen "protection against the fatal competition of low priced labor" and declared that the immigration laws should be thoroughly enforced; and yet no serious effort has been made to fulfill this pledge.

That platform declared in favor of a strict enforcement of the principle of the civil service law and after one or two "full years of experience" this pledge and its principle were violated by the removal of at least 10,000 public positions from the civil service list.

That platform promised the creation of a national board of arbitration to adjust differences between employer and employe, and yet that pledge has never been fulfilled.

That platform promised that the remaining territories would be admitted and that the citizens of Alaska should have representation in congress and yet neither of these pledges has been fulfilled.

There are many statements, arguments and principles asserted by the Republican party that have not been approved, verified or vindicated after "five full years of experience." The above are a few.

AN INQUIRY ANSWERED.

A reader asks for a definition of the word "Democracy" as used by Thomas Jefferson, and also a definition of the word "Republicanism" as used by Abraham Lincoln. If the reader will compare the utterances of Jefferson with the utterances of Lincoln he will find that Lincoln used the word "Republican" in the same sense that Jefferson used the word "Democrat." In fact, the followers of Jefferson were first called Republicans, and Jefferson speaks of Republicanism as synonymous with Democracy. For instance, in 1790, in a reply to an address (see Jeffersonian Cyclopaedia, page 754), he said:

The republican is the only form of government which is not eternally at open and secret war with the rights of men.

In 1793, in a letter to Madison, he said:

The war between France and England has brought forward the republicans and monocrats in every state so openly that their relative numbers are perfectly visible. It appears that the latter are as nothing.

In 1821, toward the close of his life, in a letter to General Dearborn, he said:

It is, indeed, of little consequence who governs us if they sincerely and zealously cherish the principles of union and republicanism."

Jefferson embodied in the Declaration of Independence his idea of Democracy and of Republican government, for the word Republican is taken from the word republic, and that means a government in which the people act through representatives chosen by themselves.

Among those who believe in a Democratic-Republic, there is a wide difference between those who emphasize the democratic part of the name and want the government as near as possible to the people, and those who emphasize the representative part of the name and want the government as far removed from the people as possible. Both Jefferson and Lincoln had confidence in the people—both as to their right to a voice in government and as to their capacity for self-government.

Lincoln was an enthusiastic admirer of Thomas Jefferson, and in one of his speeches said that he drew every political principle he had from the Declaration of Independence.

While there is little or no difference between the meanings of the words "Democrat" and "Republican" as used by Lincoln and Jefferson, each word has a party sense in which it describes the members of a political organization. In this sense the meaning of the word may change as a party changes. The word "Democratic" stands for different policies to-day from what it did when it described those who supported Mr. Cleveland's administration, and the word "Republican" now stands for principles quite antagonistic to those which Lincoln advocated. Some think more of the party name than they do of the principles for which a party stands, and such change their principles, when necessary, to maintain their party affiliations.

A LOVER OF LIBERTY.

The editor of *THE COMMONER* has recently met an American citizen of Russian birth whose love for liberty and whose intense devotion to our principles of government ought to serve as a rebuke to those who are endeavoring to obliterate the difference between a republic and a monarchy. He was the son of a well-to-do Russian and received a university education. While in college he happened to see copies of the Declaration of American Independence and the Constitution of the United States. The governmental theories set forth in these instruments found a response in his heart, and he became so devoted a believer in government resting for its authority upon the consent of the governed that he was compelled to leave Russia and the estate he inherited from his father was confiscated. He is now building himself up in his chosen occupation with every promise of success. He knows what imperialism means and prizes the right to think for himself and to express his thoughts.

His face glowed with patriotic pride as he declared that he would rather live in this country, even though poor, and be free to believe in our form of government, than to enjoy his family estate and be compelled to live under the arbitrary rule of a monarch.

Those who are so anxious to exploit foreign lands that they look with favor upon a colonial policy do not realize how steadily and stealthily the doctrine of colonialism extinguishes that regard for the inalienable rights of man upon which our government is founded.

“A WORLD POWER.”

A subscriber asks what is meant by the phrase “a world power” when used in connection with the United States? That depends upon the view point from which the subject is considered. When the imperialists talk about this nation being a world power, they mean that we should have a large army and a large navy, and join European nations in parceling out the land of what are called the inferior races. When the anti-imperialists speak of this nation as a world power, they mean that it should, in the future as in the past, influence the world through its ideas and example.

For a century this nation has been the most potent influence in the world, and has done more to affect the politics of the human race than all the other nations combined. It has been a world power and its influence has been exerted without any evil effect upon our own institutions.

THE PRODUCER'S SHARE.

The New York *Nation* turns its face away from its golden god long enough to shout a denial of Mr. Bryan's statement that every decade finds a less proportion of the wealth produced in the hands of the producers. The statement is so easily verified that it is surprising that the *Nation*, even with its predisposition to take the side of wealth, would deny it. The census of 1890 showed a general and alarming increase in the proportion of tenants and a corresponding decrease in the proportion of home owners, and Mr. George K. Holmes, of the Census Department, forming his opinion from the census figures, stated in the *Political Science Quarterly* that nine per cent. of the families of the United States own seventy-one per cent. of the wealth of the nation, while the remaining ninety-one per cent. divided among them only twenty-nine per cent. of the wealth.

As an illustration of what is going on one state will be cited now. Mr. Eltweed Pomeroy in an article written for the *Challenge* has given some tables showing the distribution of wealth in Massachusetts as set forth by the probate of estates. From 1829 to 1831, sixty-one per cent. of the population died without property, nineteen per cent. died owning property worth less than one thousand dollars in value, and thirteen per cent. owned property valued at from one thousand to five thousand dollars. About ninety-four per cent. of the people owned about twenty-five per cent. of the property. From 1859 to 1861, the statistics showed that sixty-six per cent. died without property, that twelve per cent. died with property worth less than one thousand dollars, and less than fourteen per cent. owned between one thousand and five thousand dollars worth of property—about ninety-two per cent. of the people owned less than fifteen per cent. of the property. From 1879 to 1881, sixty-nine per cent. died without property, nine per cent. had less than one thousand dollars, and less than thir-

teen per cent. had property from one thousand to five thousand dollars value—by this time about ninety-one per cent. owned less than ten per cent. of the property.

These figures show a constant increase in the percentage of persons who die without property, and a constant decrease in the possessions of a large majority of the people. The last ten years will doubtless show still greater concentration of wealth. The *Nation* may try to justify this concentration; it may argue that the speculators and manipulators are entitled to a larger and larger share of the wealth produced, but it cannot disprove the proposition stated by Mr. Bryan.

TARIFF CONCESSIONS TO CUBA.

There are indications that the sugar trust is determined to make a vigorous fight against the proposition that tariff concessions be made to Cuba. Congressman Hepburn, of Iowa, says: "I have heard much talk about the tariff concessions that should be made to Cuba. I have but little sympathy with the idea of concessions. The articles that Cuba would desire to have admitted free of duty, or at a less rate than other nations pay, would be sugar and tobacco. We are probably producing in the United States this year 200,000 tons of beet sugar, justifying the expectation that in ten years' time, with the present conditions continued, we will produce all the sugar needed in the United States." We are not producing sufficient sugar to supply the demand in this country. Will public interests suffer by tariff concessions that permit the entrance into this country of Cuban sugar? The *Washington Post*, commenting upon Congressman Hepburn's statement, presents a few figures of its own. The *Post* says:

Suppose we produce 200,000 tons this year, how far will it go toward supplying the demand? That would make a huge pile of sugar, but our total consumption is ten times that quantity, being 2,000,000 tons of 2,240 pounds each. We produce 300,000 tons of cane sugar, to which add the beet product of 200,000, and we are 1,500,000 short. In other words, we must import 75 per cent. of our enormous consumption. Our present importation is about 1,800,000 tons per annum.

With what reason shall we refuse tariff concessions to the Cuban

people on the sugar question when the demand in the United States cannot be supplied by the sugar produced in this country? We have assumed considerable authority over Cuba in spite of our pledge to see to it that the Cuban people were free and independent. It seems, therefore, that on our part we should be willing to make some concessions; and those concessions which will contribute at once to the public welfare of Cuba and to the public welfare of the United States would seem to recommend themselves to practical men.

THE ELECTIONS AT HAND.

Next Tuesday's elections in Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Jersey, Ohio and Pennsylvania will be watched with interest and variously interpreted. In all of the states the republicans have indorsed the last national platform of the party, and in case of victory will claim that republican policies have been approved by the people.

The democrats, on the contrary, have been divided and therefore weakened by the effort of gold democrats to emasculate the party creed. Where they have failed to secure the repudiation of the Kansas City platform they have been sore and disgruntled. Where they have been successful in suppressing the last national utterances of the party they have alarmed and offended the real democrats by rejoicing over what they term "the party's return to conservatism."

In some states national issues have been entirely ignored, and while the re-organizers have thus avoided the charge of discrimination against any particular issue, they have exposed themselves to more bitter attack from the opposition, for the republicans stand ready to force the fight upon any issue which the democrats dodge. If the Kansas City platform democrats were to follow the example set by the gold democrats, the party would be overwhelmingly defeated in all of the states in which the leaders have shown themselves hostile to democratic principles as enunciated last year; but those who kept the faith and made sacrifices during the campaigns of 1896 and 1900 will not falter in their allegiance to the party merely because of temporary defeat. They will support the ticket and then begin at once to perfect an or-

ganization which will make it impossible for the re-organizing element to steal another march on the voters.

The re-organizers, where they are in control, are in a position to blame local issues for their defeat if defeat comes, and to claim credit for victory, if victory is won; but this will not deter the regular democrats from doing their duty.

In Iowa the democrats reaffirmed the Kansas City platform, but declared their purpose to make the fight upon state issues. While our party has a normal majority of considerable size to overcome, the full democratic strength is likely to be polled.

In Maryland, no reference was made to national issues, and the negro question seems to be the main local issue. The failure of the convention to take a position upon national issues leaves the voters in the dark as to the views of the senator, in case a democrat is elected.

In Massachusetts, the Kansas City platform was reaffirmed, and ex-Mayor Quincy, nominated for governor. The convention was a very harmonious one, and the ticket will doubtless make a good showing. While Mr. Quincy was a gold democrat in 1896, he took an active part in the campaign of 1900, and in his public speeches accepts the democratic platform, preferring to support the democratic party, even though more radical than he would desire, rather than risk a continuation of republican policies.

In Nebraska, there is complete fusion, the democrats furnishing a candidate for supreme judge and the populist party the two regents. The Kansas City platform was reaffirmed by the democratic convention, and indications point to an increased fusion vote. The republicans have imported some of their speakers of national reputation and are striving hard to overcome the depressing influence exerted by the party's mismanagement of the treasury department. The present republican treasurer fails to show where all of the state's money is located, and one of the regents nominated by the convention had to withdraw because it became known that he had not repaid money borrowed of the defaulting state treasurer.

The campaign in New Jersey is being fought on local issues and it is difficult for an outsider (or for an insider, either, for that matter), to make an estimate upon the result.

The returns from Ohio will be watched with the most interest because it is the home of the late president as well as the home

of the chairman of the republican national committee. The republicans are trying to turn the assassination of the president to political advantage, and are using his name to rally the lukewarm members of the party. Mr. Kilbourne, the democratic candidate, has the confidence of the masses, and will make an excellent showing, notwithstanding the manner in which he was handicapped by the action of the convention in ignoring the Kansas City platform. He would be much stronger if he were at liberty to combat the republican position on every question. His conduct in past campaigns shows his loyalty to the party and he should have the good will and cordial support even of those who felt aggrieved because the convention gave some evidence of the return to the cowardice and evasion that characterized convention utterances when the gold standard element was in control of the party.

The Pennsylvania election will turn upon state questions and the democrats will be aided to some extent by the anti-Quay republicans—may their tribe increase!

Let every democrat, populist and silver republican be at the polls! The republican party is becoming more and more subservient to the corporate interests of the country and every republican victory makes the leaders more arrogant. We cannot afford to give open support or silent encouragement to the imperialistic-trust-gold standard and bank monopoly policies of the republican party.

ONE EYE OPEN.

When Mr. Bryan spoke at Minneapolis, during the campaign of 1896, former Senator Washburn addressed a letter to him asking certain questions. It was an unusual thing for a man of Mr. Washburn's prominence to inject himself into a public speech, but Mr. Bryan read his letter at the meeting and responded to it. It seems that Mr. Washburn is getting acquainted with the trust question. In a recent interview he discusses the subject with intelligence and even vehemence. It is gratifying to note some evidence of revolt among the republicans, who are responsible for an administrative policy that permits the trusts to thrive and fatten upon people at large. THE COMMONER is glad to give circulation to the following extract from Mr. Washburn's interview:

Steel rails can be manufactured to-day at a fair profit and sold at \$17.50 a ton. At that price the rail mills would make a larger profit on their product than the flouring mills would make by a profit of ten cents a barrel on flour—which the flouring mills would be glad to make, but do not. From the best information I have been able to gather, steel rails can be manufactured at about \$16 per ton. Sold as they were two and a half years ago at \$17.50, there was a profit of \$1.50 per ton, which is more than the profit on flour at 10 cents per barrel, and that is a larger profit than is averaged by the flouring mills of this country. Yet such rails are now being sold at \$28 per ton, making it easy to understand, with such enormous profits, how the steel mills are enabled to pay dividends on shares three-fourths of which are composed of water. I do not know just what sum would be required to rebuild these properties, but from what I am able to learn I am satisfied that they can be reproduced at less than one-half of the amount for which they are capitalized. The consequence is that the people and consumers of the country are being taxed to this enormous extent in order that the trusts and consolidations may pay such dividends. And yet, with this condition of things, we now have a duty of \$7.80 per ton on steel rails! And what I have here said of steel rails can also be said of structural steel, which now enters into construction of different kinds to such an enormous extent. If this is not robbery I would like to find some stronger word to characterize it.

“Robbery” is a strong word, but Mr. Washburn wants something even stronger. What will he say of an administration that permits the robbery to go on without making an effort to protect the public? Possibly Mr. Washburn has only one eye open; with this he sees the trusts very clearly. When he gets the other eye open he will be able to see the republican party standing behind the trusts and receiving for campaign purposes a part of the money extorted from the people.

XIV.

THE NEGRO QUESTION.

The action of President Roosevelt in inviting Prof. Booker T. Washington to dine at the White House was unfortunate, to say the least. It will give depth and acrimony to a race feeling already strained to the uttermost. The race question, so far as it concerns our colored population, presents itself in four phases; first, the legal rights of the black man; second, his educational opportunities; third, his political privileges, and, fourth, his social status.

As to the first there can be no question. The negro is a citizen, and as a citizen is entitled to all the guarantees of the federal and state constitutions. He has freedom to speak and to write; freedom of conscience and the right "to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." In these respects there is no distinction between him and the white man. The republicans, when challenged to defend imperialism, are in the habit of referring to the suffrage amendments adopted in some of the Southern states, as if the black man of the South and the brown man of the Orient were being similarly treated. The fact is, however, that in none of the Southern states has an attempt been made to take from the negro the guarantees enumerated in our constitution and in the bill of rights; whereas the Filipino in the Orient and the Porto Rican in the West Indies are denied the protection of the constitution. In the South the Negro is still a citizen and entitled to the consideration due a citizen. Under republican rule in Porto Rico and the Philippines, however, the inhabitants are subjects and suffer the common lot of those who live under arbitrary power.

In the matter of education the negro is entitled to all the opportunities offered to the white man. The negro must be educated; no community can afford to permit any portion of its population to remain ignorant or to become imbruted. The whites, for their own welfare as well as for the good of the negroes, must see to it that the free school is open to every child, white and black.

The negro has already made great progress in intellectual development, and this, too, largely through the aid of the white people of the south. The former slave-owners have at their own

expense been educating the former slaves, while the more partisan republicans, some of them holding office by the aid of negro votes, have been inciting the negro to oppose everything advocated by the southern whites, regardless of the merits of the proposition under consideration.

The political rights of the negro have for a quarter of a century been the subject of public discussion.

The republican party did not urge emancipation in the beginning; Lincoln, the head of that party, expressly declared that he had no intention of interfering with slavery in the states in which it then existed, but emancipation followed as a result of the war and now no one in all the land would advocate a reinstatement of the system of slavery.

The franchise was conferred upon the negro soon after the war by the republican party, but during the past few years that party has shown less and less interest in the political status of the colored man.

In some of the Southern states educational qualifications have been prescribed with a view to securing white supremacy in the state and local governments.

While universal suffrage is the ideal condition toward which the world is moving, and while it is a matter to be regretted that even educational qualifications are ever found necessary, it must be admitted that such qualifications have been prescribed and are still in existence in some northern as well as in some southern states.

These qualifications are defended, where they exist, not on the ground that the Declaration of Independence is wrong, not on the ground that all men are not created equal or that they are not endowed with inalienable rights, nor yet on the ground that governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, but upon the theory that, when races of different degrees of civilization are thrown together and must necessarily live together under the same government—when, in other words, it is simply a question as to which race shall exert a controlling influence—then the more advanced race has always exercised the right to impose conditions upon those less advanced.

Every race is capable of self-government—it would be an insult to the Creator to assume that He brought into existence a race of people incapable of self-government and entirely dependent upon

some other race for government—but while every race is capable of self-government, a race may not be capable of sharing upon equal terms in the control of a government whose blessings are enjoyed by, and whose burdens are imposed upon, several races differing in their advancement. No argument will justify one race in invading the territory of another race in order to force upon that race an alien government and the evils of a colonial system, but when conditions force the two races to live under the same government in the same country the more advanced race never has consented, and probably never will consent, to be dominated by the less advanced. Whether the conditions in the south are such as to justify the amendments which have been adopted is a question of fact which must be decided upon evidence—not a question of theory which can be settled by those far removed from the conditions which have to be considered.

Northern states imposed qualifications upon white men before any southern state imposed qualifications upon black men.

It must be remembered that a qualification for suffrage, undesirable as it is, raises a very different question from that presented by a colonial system. In the first place, a suffrage qualification is temporary and those who are excluded to-day may qualify themselves to vote to-morrow; the condition is not hopeless. Under the colonial system, however, the disqualification is permanent. There are no means provided whereby the subject may become a citizen.

In the second place, the man excluded from suffrage because he cannot meet the requirements of the law lives under the constitution and laws made by the voters for themselves, while the subject under a colonial government lives under laws made by the voters, but not binding upon the voters. Both of these differences are important. The temporary character of the obstacle to suffrage above referred to finds its parallel in the probationary term prescribed for, and the conditions imposed upon, those who seek to be naturalized.

As to the second difference, every thoughtful person knows that the danger of oppressive and unjust legislation is infinitely multiplied when the man who makes the law not only avoids the provisions of the law, but finds a profit in enforcing its provisions against others. This is the foundation of all the crimes committed by empires against their subjects.

The social phase of the negro question has seldom been discussed for the reason that no man or party has advocated social equality between the white man and the black man. McClure, Phillips & Co. have recently published a little volume entitled "Abraham Lincoln, His Book, a facsimile reproduction of the original with an explanatory note by J. McCan Davis." This is a book prepared by Abraham Lincoln himself for the use of Captain Jas. N. Brown, of Illinois, a candidate for the state legislature in 1858. Mr. Brown was confronted with the charge that Mr. Lincoln, whom Mr. Brown was supporting for the United States senate, was in favor of "negro equality." In order that Mr. Brown might answer his critics, Mr. Lincoln made a collection of his own utterances on the subject, and on the first page wrote: "The following extracts are taken from various speeches of mine delivered at various times and places and I believe that they contain the substance of all I have said about 'negro equality.'" The sixth extract quoted in this remarkable little volume contains the following:

Now, gentlemen, I don't want to read at any greater length, but this is the true complexion of all I have ever said in regard to the institution of slavery and the black race. This is the whole of it, and anything that argues me into this idea of perfect social and political equality with the negro, is but a specious and fantastic arrangement of words, by which a man can prove a horse chestnut to be a chestnut horse. (Laughter.) I will say here, while upon this subject, that I have no purpose directly or indirectly to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and have no inclination to do so. I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which in my judgment will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality, and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas am in favor of the race to which I belong, having the superior position. I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that notwithstanding all this there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. (Loud cheers.)

The above quotation selected by Mr. Lincoln himself from one of his own speeches for the purpose of answering the criticism of

his political opponents, sets forth the great emancipator's views on three of the four phases of the negro question. He believed that the negro was equal to the white man in the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence and he believed that it was the duty of the government to protect him in the enjoyment of these rights. He opposed slavery, believing it to be wrong in principle, although he expressly declared that he had no intention of interfering with slavery in the states in which it then existed.

Second, he recognized the distinction between political rights and natural rights, and exhibited that partiality toward his own race which is inherent to every one.

Third, he recognized the fact that social equality is not necessary to the protection of the negro in the enjoyment of all his natural rights. Mr. Roosevelt will not find, therefore, in the life or words of Lincoln anything to justify him in advocating social equality, if his act can be construed as representing his views on this subject.

The natural rights of all are the same, and it is the province of government to protect these natural and inalienable rights—rights which were vested in man by the Creator, rights which cannot be taken from him without rendering his life valueless to him and to his fellows. But man chooses his society for himself. It is as much a matter of taste as the selection of a husband or a wife. It is no cause for offence to any man that you prefer to associate with some one else; it depends upon your character and virtues whether the preference is a compliment to or a reflection upon him, but in either case you have a right to choose congenial companions, and in doing so you are not only within your rights, but you are doing what every one does. Those who love books enjoy each other's company, although some may be very rich and some very poor. The rich may enjoy each other's company although some are ignorant and some are intellectual. People are drawn together by family ties, by church relations, by neighborhood associations, and in a multitude of other ways. Usually social lines are invisible ones, but they are everywhere recognized. They are no more inconsistent with universal brotherhood than are family ties or national obligations. The families of a community are separate and distinct; each is engaged in its work and each decides how far it will share its confidence and its companionship with the families about it, but this does not

prevent the recognition of the right of all families to equal consideration and protection at the hands of the government, nor does it prevent the exercise of charity, mercy and benevolence. The various nations are but groups of families associated together for mutual protection and benefit. The fact that each nation has customs, institutions and laws peculiar to itself, does not prevent its recognition of those natural rights which are broader and deeper than national boundaries.

So, the members of a race are bound together by sympathies and sentiments which are both natural and permanent. Those who oppose social equality between the white man and the negro do so on the ground that they do not believe that the amalgamation of the two races is desirable. They think it better for the white man to work out the problems of his race while the black man is working out the problems of his race. There can be co-operation and helpfulness without inter-marriage. Each race can recognize the natural rights of the other and both can contribute as far as is within their power, to the strength and development of the nation. The advocacy of social equality will tend to throw the white and the black races into greater antagonism and conflict rather than to bring them together, and the wiser members of the negro race know this.

President Roosevelt doubtless recognizes, as all well informed men do, the great service which Mr. Washington has rendered to the members of his race. He is not the only colored man who deserves great credit, but he is probably its most conspicuous member of the present generation. The president may have invited him without considering the question that it raises, and Mr. Washington may have accepted from a feeling that an invitation from the president was equivalent to a command. It is to be hoped that both of them will upon reflection realize the wisdom of abandoning their purpose to wipe out race lines, if they entertain such a purpose. Prof. Washington's work as an educator will be greatly impaired if he allows it to be understood that his object is to initiate the members of his race into the social circles of the whites, and he will do injustice to those of his own color if he turns their thoughts away from intellectual and moral development to the less substantial advantages—if they are any advantages at all—to be derived from social equality. The negro can find a sufficient stimulus in the ambition to so elevate himself

and the members of his race as to create a satisfactory society among his own people; his efforts in behalf of his race will be weakened rather than strengthened by any effort on his part to desert those of his own color in order to shine in white society. No advantage is to be gained by ignoring race prejudice; it is wiser to recognize it and to make our plans conform to it. Race pride, like self-respect, is a valuable characteristic. Race pride will do the negro good; he has reason to be proud of what his race has already accomplished and he can employ all the energies of a strenuous life in an effort to show that his race is deserving of a high place among the races of the earth, and that place will depend, not upon social distinctions, but upon mental breadth and moral worth. The race question which we have on hand will require for its proper solution the intelligence and patriotism of all the people, black as well as white. The recent occurrence at the White House will not make that solution easier, but it ought to convince all of the folly of adding to those problems which we must meet another greater and more complicated race problem in the Orient.

THE MONEY QUESTION AGAIN.

The republicans and gold democrats are continually declaring that the money question is dead, yet there are at this time three important financial measures under consideration. The national bankers at their recent meeting held in Milwaukee discussed and apparently approved of both the "branch bank" and "the asset currency." An effort is to be made to so change the national bank law as to permit the organization of a great central bank with numerous branches scattered throughout the country. If this effort succeeds the small banks will be driven out of existence and the business interests of the land will be under the control and at the mercy of the group of financiers in charge of the central institution. Every senator chosen by a legislature elected this fall will have to vote on this question, and yet gold democrats object to having the people express themselves on this subject.

The national bankers who attended the meeting above referred to were practically unanimous in their support of what is called an "asset currency"—a bank currency issued in proportion to and secured by the assets of the respective national banks. This system

is not only open to all the objections urged against other kinds of bank currency, but in addition to these objections it is evident that the asset currency is not as safe as a currency based upon bonds; and it is plain that such a currency impairs the security of depositors. Every senator chosen by a legislature elected this fall will have to act upon this proposition, and yet gold democrats are opposed to allowing the people to express themselves upon this question.

A few days ago the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* said editorially:

There is an excellent chance for the enactment in the coming session of congress of the silver redemption bill which Representative Overstreet, of Indiana, introduced in the recent congress, but which failed for want of time for its adequate consideration. This measure, which will be introduced in the house immediately after it meets a few weeks hence, proposed the exchange of silver dollars in gold, the gold for this purpose to come from the regular redemption fund of the treasury. This would strengthen the gold standard act of March 14, 1900, in a place which it would be desirable to strengthen it.

There is no doubt that the advocates of the gold standard are planning, first, to make silver dollars redeemable in gold; and, second, to retire the silver dollars. When the financiers wanted to bring discredit upon the treasury notes, issued under the Sherman law they presented them for redemption and then clamored for gold bonds to furnish the necessary gold. Having coerced the treasury department into the issue of bonds, they declared that the treasury notes constituted an endless chain and demanded their retirement. When they had succeeded in securing the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law, they resorted to the same tactics to secure the retirement of greenbacks. They are endeavoring to create a still larger and longer "endless chain" by making the silver dollar redeemable in gold, and if this crusade against the white metal is successful they will insist that the silver dollar must be retired in order to protect the treasury.

The financiers have several other measures in contemplation, but these three are now being openly advocated. Every senator chosen by the legislatures elected this fall will have to vote upon these questions. If the gold democrats do not know this they lack information; if they know it and avoid the subject they lack honesty; and in either case they do not deserve the confidence of the democrats whom they offer to lead.

It seems incredible that any real democrat should be deceived by men who spend half the time vociferously declaring that the money question is dead and the other half in aiding a conspiracy which has for its object the establishing of a bank despotism.

Even in Missouri several persons have been "mentioned" for the United States senate who, if they boldly announced their views on the money question, could not carry a single primary in the state; but they will not announce their position on the money question; they will plead for harmony and claim that they are loyal democrats. Their first effort is to get rid of the Kansas City platform and then they will try to secure the nomination of uninstructed representatives who are under secret pledge to them.

The corporations stand ready to furnish money to elect members of the legislature who can be relied upon to vote for senators satisfactory to the corporations, but such senators will not only be hostile to the democratic party on all phases of the money question, but they will be so obligated to organized wealth that they cannot be trusted to give earnest support to any needed reform. The money question cannot be eliminated from politics so long as the financiers are proceeding step by step to secure new privileges and new advantages at the expense of the rest of the people.

HOAR IS CONSISTENT.

Senator Hoar has shown his consistency by declining an invitation to deliver a political eulogy on the late president. In explanation of his refusal he says that he is extremely busy just now, but adds:

I ought in frankness to state another and even stronger reason. I think the eulogy on the president should be delivered by some person who was in full accord with him upon the principal political measure of his administration. I never questioned his absolute honesty, his devotion to the public welfare, his love of liberty and his desire to do his duty as God gave him to see it. I was fully in accord with him on the great fiscal measures with which he was identified. But, as you know, I differed with him and his administration (and my opinion on that subject has been strengthened and not weakened in the lapse of time) in regard to his policy in dealing with the Philippine Islands.

Like many others who differed with Mr. McKinley on one or more political questions, Senator Hoar has expressed his admiration for the many personal virtues of the dead chief magistrate, his sorrow at his death and his detestation of the manner of his taking off, but he thinks, and very properly, that praise of the president's views on political questions should come from some one in harmony with all of the policies of the administration. It will be remembered that the Massachusetts senator declared that, if an imperial policy was pursued, the fall of the republic would date from Mr. McKinley's administration, and it will also be remembered that he closed his memorable speech against imperialism by appealing from "Philip drunk to Philip sober." He says that his opinion on this subject has been strengthened rather than weakened by subsequent observation. How then, could he be expected to deliver an eulogy that would satisfy partisan republicans?

Opponents of imperialism may be expected to share in all exercises that give expression to the unanimous regard for Mr. McKinley as a man and to the respect entertained for the high office to which he was elevated by his countrymen, but they cannot be expected to participate in any demonstration which could be construed as an endorsement of the late president's change from hostility to "forcible annexation," and "criminal aggression," to the advocacy of "benevolent assimilation." The moment the republicans attempt to use the life or death of Mr. McKinley to advance the policies for which their party stands, that moment they substitute partisan ends for a patriotic purpose and should confine their appeals to those who are republicans on all questions.

DEATH WITHOUT HOPE.

The lesson taught by the last hours of Czolgosz should not be lost upon the world. He expired like one who sinks in mid-ocean without a sail in sight. How barren of real happiness must be the life of one who denies the existence of a God, defies all government, and cultivates the belief that he can, without moral guilt, take the life of a fellow being merely because that fellow being is administering for a little while the authority conferred upon him by his countrymen. How can he delude himself with the belief that he is living upon a more exalted plane than ordinary people?

Consider the perennial joys of the gray-haired patriarch who learned in youth that "The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom," who has met life's responsibilities with a prayer for light to see his duty and courage to perform it, and who approaches the grave "like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him and lies down to pleasant dreams." Consider the life of such a one, and compare it with the career of one who lives in constant rebellion against nature and in constant antagonism to society, and then ends life as a lonely traveler would turn from a deserted house out into a dark and starless night.

Compare the sweet contentment of one who accepts life's successes and reverses with the sentiment of the psalmist: "The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters. * * * Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: For Thou art with me: Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me." Compare this with the lot of one who curses the Creator and His creatures, and then swears back at the echo of his blasphemy.

AN INTERESTING LETTER.

The editor of **THE COMMONER** has received an interesting letter from one who describes himself as a former gold democrat, one who in 1896 supported the Palmer and Buckner ticket until election day and then voted the republican ticket. He says that when the campaign of 1900 began the republicans advanced the same arguments that they had in 1896, namely, that "if a party comes into power that will not cater to the large institutions, capitalists and bankers, the money of the country will be taken from circulation."

He says that this was the argument which caused him to leave the democratic party in 1896, but that in 1900 the same argument drove him "from the party that advocated such unpatriotic principles."

He commends the work which **THE COMMONER** is doing and protests against any surrender to the re-organizers. He says: "What would democratic victory amount to if the leadership was in the hands of those who represent the financial institutions of this country? What every true patriotic democrat wants is a

victory at the polls won on the principles set forth in the Kansas City platform."

He suggests that it takes many people a long time to learn to vote for their own interests, (and adds that it took him four years), but insists that the fight must be continued until a victory is won. The letter is referred to because so many democrats do not seem to realize that re-organization, as advocated by the gold democrats, would mean the despotic control of conventions and democratic administrations (if there were any under such leadership) by the financial interests that are to-day arrayed against the masses on every important issue. It is not so much the gold standard that these men want as the absolute and unquestioned control of the treasury department, and with it the control of the attorney general's office. They will be satisfied with nothing less, but as soon as their real purpose is fully understood they will be powerless to thwart the honest aims and plans of the rank and file of the party.

THE ELECTIONS OF 1901.

While it is impossible at this time to measure and weigh the local influences which may have affected the general result, enough is known to justify the conclusion that the two leading political parties show practically the same strength that they did a year ago. If the republican policies which have been developing during the last twelve months have aroused any protest among the people, that protest has been off-set by the influence exerted by the assassination of the president. The republicans everywhere confessed their reliance upon this influence when they devoted so much time to appeals to the personal regard felt for McKinley, the man. It is not unnatural that the republicans should have been spurred to greater activity by the president's death, neither is it strange that it caused some apathy on the other side.

There was another general cause which helped the republican position, namely, the ability of the republicans to get out their vote. The off-year elections always show a falling off in the voting population as compared with presidential and congressional elections, and the party that is best organized and most successful in getting its voters to the polls has an advantage. Take, for instance, the election in Nebraska this year. The total vote will probably

fall fifty thousand below the vote of last year. If there is a loss in the republican vote of twenty thousand, and a loss in the fusion vote of thirty thousand, the republican candidate can have ten thousand majority more than his ticket had last year, and yet have twenty thousand votes less than his party polled last year.

Aside from having federal officials everywhere through whom to reach the voters, and besides having money everywhere with which to organize, the republicans in some of the states are able to secure from the railroad companies transportation for all persons who desire to return home to vote. In every community there are voters who, for business reasons, have frequent occasion to be absent from home. The party that is able to bring every voter home on election day has an immense advantage over the party that cannot furnish transportation. During the recent campaign the republican authorities were prepared to secure passes and send every Nebraska student home to vote, a practice not only helpful to the party, but demoralizing to the citizen.

The returns do not give any considerable advantage to either element of the democratic party. The re-organizers have not gained any prestige where they have secured control, neither have the regular democrats won any signal victories where they have been in charge of the campaign.

We gain a senator in Kentucky and the state shows an increase in the strength of the democratic party, but as we elected a democratic senator there two years ago, and carried the state last year, the result this year, though gratifying, was confidently expected. The democrats have carried Maryland, and Mr. Gorman will in all probability be re-elected to the senate, but as the campaign was fought purely on local issues, (the negro question being the main issue), the victory is not a vindication of any national policy. In Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, where the conventions failed or refused to reaffirm the Kansas City platform, the republicans won. In Massachusetts, Iowa and Nebraska where the conventions did reaffirm the Kansas City platform the republicans also won. In so far as the result has any influence upon the democratic party, it will tend to strengthen those who believe in fighting for principle rather than those who are all the time offering to lead the party to a glorious victory,

provided it will abandon its principles. Those who fight for principle may mourn over a defeat, but their purpose is not shaken because they are doing what they believe they ought to and find their reward in the consciousness of duty done. Those, however, who are willing to suspend their principles in the hope of securing political success have little to console them when a reverse comes. If a man barter his convictions for a promise of success and then loses, he has nothing left; if a man keeps his convictions with him he has a foundation upon which to build in future contests.

It would seem that republican policies ought to arouse overwhelming opposition among the wealth-producers of the country, for surely no man who earns his living can point to any advantage which the republican party brings or can bring to the masses of the people. In the bank control of our currency, in the monopolistic control of our industries and in an imperial policy for the country there are danger and disaster for a large majority of the people. But they evidently fail to appreciate the viciousness of the principles which are at work. The only lesson that can be drawn from the election returns is that still more work is necessary. The "let-well-enough-alone" argument cannot always prevail, for bad principles will ultimately bring about bad times, and experience, costly experience, will teach those who refuse to foresee evil and provide against it.

ORGANIZE DEBATING SOCIETIES.

The election is over, and while the returns are not sufficiently complete for analysis it is evident that the democratic party has not made any considerable gains since 1900. In another column, the returns, so far as they are in, have been discussed and some of the difficulties encountered have been enumerated. It is plain that there must be a large amount of educational work done if the country is to be saved from the evil results that must necessarily follow the continued support of republican policies. How can this work be done? The large dailies cannot be relied upon, because they are too intimately connected with the men and the corporations enriched by republican policies. It cannot be done entirely through the democratic and populist weeklies, for they

do not, as a rule, reach the people who most need enlightenment. A debating society should be organized in each country precinct and in each village. Let it be non-partisan in its membership and educational in its purpose. Meetings should be held once a month, or, if possible, once in two weeks, for the discussion of public questions.

Let the motto of the society be: "Country first, party afterwards."

To avoid any wrangle about the officers it would be well to select the president from the party having the largest vote in the precinct, and the vice-president from the leading minority party. If three other officers, recording secretary, corresponding secretary and treasurer, are selected, all parties can be given a fair representation in the management of the society and the arrangement of programs. The officers of the society, if they constitute a committee on program, should arrange, besides other features, for a discussion of some live question at each meeting—the leaders to open the debate and the other members of the society to have an opportunity to speak briefly when the leaders are through.

No one should be afraid of having his party injured by a full and fair presentation of all public questions. The person who objects to the discussion of public questions confesses the weakness of his own cause or brings an indictment against the intelligence and patriotism of the people. The hope of the nation lies, first, in the study of public questions, and, next, in a ballot cast according to the dictates of conscience and judgment.

SEVERE ON BOLTERS.

Sometimes the gold democrats who bolted the ticket in 1896 complain because the regular democrats insist that those who deserted the party five years ago should, on coming back, give some assurance of their purpose to support the ticket hereafter. While the conditions imposed have never been unreasonable or severe, they have aroused violent criticism in some quarters. It may not be out of place, therefore, to quote what the *St. Paul Globe* says about local bolters. In a recent issue it condemns some St. Paul aldermen who deserted their party in the election of a county commissioner. The following is an extract from the *Globe's* editorial:

It is as the *Globe* predicted it would be: A democratic county commissioner has been elected by the votes of the democratic aldermen assisted by one republican, and democratic traitors are ignored and spat upon, as they long since should have been. Treason to the party has not been found profitable in practice among St. Paul democrats. It will be found no more in the future. Hunt and Bantz have a severe reckoning before them; and we apprehend that the mass of St. Paul democrats will find as little use for them in the future as the democratic aldermen found for them in the election of County Commissioner Kelly.

The way of the transgressor is hard, and transgressors these men have been of all the rules and observances in political life which all true party men and good citizens will hold themselves bound by. The *Globe* will gladly aid their return to the obscurity from which they should never have emerged.

The *Globe* is much more severe in denouncing democratic aldermen who refuse to support their party in a local fight than the silver democrats are in condemning papers, which, like the *Globe*, deserted the presidential ticket in a national contest.

EX-GOVERNOR TAYLOR'S CASE.

Governor Durbin, of Indiana, has refused to honor a requisition made upon him by the Kentucky authorities for ex-Governor Taylor, who is now enjoying protection in the Hoosier state. Governor Durbin gives his reasons at length, but the reasons are all to enforce his statement that Governor Taylor would not receive a fair and impartial trial in Kentucky. This is a serious charge to be made by the chief executive of one state against the courts of a sister state, and the weight of the objection is entirely destroyed by the fact that Governor Taylor is a prominent member of the republican party, and is being shielded from arrest by another prominent member of the same party. It will be recalled that Governor Goebel was shot down as the result of a political conspiracy, and it will also be recalled that many of the republican papers throughout the land failed to express any indignation or condemnation of the act. Governor Taylor escaped from Kentucky before arrest and has since been a fugitive from justice.

On June 13, 1900, Governor Mount, of Indiana, refused to honor a requisition for Taylor on substantially the same grounds as those given by Governor Durbin. Six days afterwards, on June 19, ex-Governor Taylor appeared at the republican national convention.

The papers reported that Temporary Chairman Wolcott recognized "Governor Taylor of Kentucky," and addressing him, said: "Come to the platform, governor, they want to see you." Mr. Taylor accepted the invitation, and Chairman Wolcott advanced to meet him, and, according to the press reports, "the convention cheered."

This is the way that the republican national convention acted toward a man at that time charged with participation in the assassination of the chief executive of one of the states of the union. While the republicans are denouncing anarchy they ought not to forget that among the causes which lead up to the assassination of presidents is the heroizing of a man charged with the assassination of a governor. No one is able to form a correct opinion as to the guilt or innocence of Governor Taylor until the evidence is presented in court, but an indictment rendered by a grand jury raises a presumption that cannot be overthrown by the partisan opinion of a governor who has a political interest in the welfare of the man under accusation.

The above facts are given that the readers of THE COMMONER may see how political conditions affect the action of republican leaders. President McKinley was assassinated by an anarchist whose act had no political significance and could not be traced to anything said or done by any member of the opposite party, and yet republican papers were quick to try to make political capital out of the terrible deed, and some of them boldly charged the responsibility upon the democratic party. The Goebel assassination was purely a political act, participated in by republicans, and after an indictment was returned against the most prominent of these republicans, the chairman of a republican national convention invited him to the platform, republican delegates cheered his appearance, and two republican governors refused to surrender him for trial.

If a republican cannot be tried in a democratic state, will the republicans insist that a democrat could have a fair trial in a republican state? If the reasons presented by Governor Durbin are sound, then it is perfectly safe for a republican to kill any democratic executive and flee to a republican state, and if democratic governors act upon the same principle, it is safe for a democrat to kill a republican official and then flee to a democratic state. In other words, the position taken by Governor Durbin, if accepted as a precedent, invites a reign of lawlessness, and ought to alarm the friends of law and order, regardless of political affiliations.

XV.

SUSPICIOUS REJOICING.

Why do the republican papers rejoice over every event which they can torture into a victory for the re-organizing element of the democratic party? It is only fair to assume that the republican editors have a partisan interest in weakening the democratic party. It is only fair to assume that they will be pleased by any indication of weakness on the part of their political opponents. Why is it then, that they exult whenever gold and corporation democrats secure control of the party organization? Why is it that they constantly suppress all evidence encouraging to Kansas City platform democrats, and magnify everything that gives hope to the men who oppose the Kansas City platform? Read, for illustration, the republican comments on the recent election. The republican papers gave columns of editorial space to the suppression of the Kansas City platform by the Ohio convention and declared that the democrats of that state had put themselves in good fighting trim by discarding the so-called "heresies" that had "handicapped" them. They also vociferously asserted that the democratic candidate for governor in Iowa was opposed to allowing national issues to enter into the campaign. Now, they point to the republican majority in Iowa as a defeat for silver, and they either ignore the result in Ohio altogether, or, as some of the papers do, explain it by saying that Mr. Kilbourne was at heart a silver man and that he did not poll as large a vote as he would have polled had he been an advocate of the gold standard.

The result in Nebraska is especially pleasing to the republicans, although the republican candidate this year polled fifteen thousand votes less than the fusion state ticket and Mr. Bryan polled last year.

The *Chicago Tribune* says that Tuesday's elections "are gratifying," and that they "indicate plainly that the democratic party is rehabilitating itself by returning gradually to its old doctrines." How fortunate it is that the gold standard papers, that call themselves democratic, and the republican papers are able to agree so

completely as to the best course for the democratic party to pursue. This harmony is so harmonious as to arouse the suspicion that either the republicans are badly deceived as to what is best for their party or that gold democrats are very much mistaken as to what is best for the democratic party.

“THE PEOPLE SOVEREIGN.”

In his seventh annual message to congress, President Monroe said:

Meeting in you a new congress, I deem it proper to present this view of public affairs in greater detail than it might otherwise be necessary. I do it, however, with peculiar satisfaction, from a knowledge that in this respect I shall comply more fully with the sound principles of our government. The people being with us exclusively the sovereign, it is indispensable that full information be laid before them on all important subjects, to enable them to exercise that high power with complete effect. If kept in the dark, they must be incompetent to do it. We are all liable to error, and those who are engaged in the management of public affairs are more subject to excitement and to be led astray by their particular interests and passions than the great body of our constituents, who, living at home in the pursuit of their ordinary avocations, are calm, but deeply interested spectators of events and of the conduct of those who are parties to them. To the people every department of the government and every individual in each are responsible, and the more full their information the better they can judge of the wisdom of the policy pursued and of the conduct of each in regard to it. From their dispassionate judgment much aid may always be obtained, while their approbation will form the greatest incentive and most gratifying reward of virtuous actions, and the dread of their censure the best security against the abuse of their confidence. Their interests in all vital questions are the same, and the bond, by sentiment as well as by interest, will be proportionately strengthened as they are better informed of the real state of public affairs, especially in difficult conjunctions. It is by such knowledge that local prejudices and jealousies are surmounted, and that a national policy, extending its fostering care and protection to all the great interests of our union, is formed and steadily adhered to.

This sentiment from one of the greatest as well as one of the earliest presidents is respectfully commended to the present chief executive, who not only meets a new congress, but is himself new

to the responsibilities so suddenly and unexpectedly thrust upon him.

The people have been agitated by conflicting principles; they have discussed conflicting policies and they have been led or misled by conflicting evidence. It would be well for the president to take the people into his confidence at the very beginning of his official career and state to them the facts as he understands them and the policies which he believes it best to pursue. If he believes that a "branch bank" is a desirable thing, let him frankly say so and give his reasons; if he believes that an "asset currency" is safe, let him declare it; if he thinks that the silver dollar should be made redeemable in gold, let him say so and also state whether he recognizes the fact that the retirement of the silver dollar is the natural and necessary result of its being made redeemable in gold. If he thinks that a national bank note, issued for the profit of the banks and controlled in volume by banks for their own interests, is better than a greenback, let him state his position and invite judgment upon it. If he thinks that a private monopoly is a good thing, let him explain why; or, if he believes that it is indefensible and intolerable, let him point out an efficient remedy.

If he believes in the strenuous doctrine that this nation will decay unless it diverts itself with the pastime of subjugating or killing off "inferior races," let him openly announce his advocacy of an imperial policy and reconcile, if he can, the principle of such a policy with the principles of a republic. If he believes in taxation without representation and government without the consent of the governed, let him apologize, in the name of the American people, for the war of the revolution and for the loud professions which we have made on the subject for more than a century. If, on the contrary, he accepts the doctrines set forth in the Declaration of Independence, let him reconcile them with the actions of our carpet-bag government in the Philippines, or use his great influence to bring the government back to its old foundations.

The president has shown that he possesses physical courage; will he now prove his possession of moral courage? Will he be entirely frank with the people, outline his policies and ask judgment upon them? Or, will he resort to the ambiguity that has characterized the utterances of most of the republican leaders? The people are the exclusive sovereign, and they are entitled to candor and honesty from those whom they entrust with authority.

OUR DUTY TO THE BOERS.

The struggle which the brave Dutchmen of the Transvaal are making for national existence will soon require American attention, however much political leaders in this country may seek to close their eyes to the situation.

It is not too much to say that the battle which the Boers are waging against Great Britain is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, among all the heroic struggles in the world's history. No thoughtful American would suggest that the United States take actual part in the war. There are, however, some things which the United States can do, which would be natural for them to do, and which will in time be essential for them to do, if the administration would reflect the very apparent sentiment and sympathy of the people.

American presidents have never hesitated to express public sympathy with a people struggling for liberty and a republican form of government. There is in such sympathy something besides the sentimental; there is an intensely practical feature. The United States of America furnishes a living protest against the monarchical theory of government. Every monarchy that is transformed into a republic strengthens the United States. Every republic that is erected on foreign soil is distinctly a benefit to our own republic. When a republic is crushed, or dies, the United States suffers, perhaps unconsciously to many of its people, but suffers nevertheless. Hence, in a contest between two little republics in South Africa and the British nation, the American sympathies must be with the South Africans.

President Roosevelt is preparing his message to congress. He has an opportunity to express the sympathy of the American people with the republics of South Africa. He has an opportunity to reflect the overwhelming popular sentiment in this country and to give voice to the well-nigh unanimous hope and prayer that Great Britain may not succeed in its efforts to destroy the two republics.

It is not necessary that any unfriendly spirit should be shown towards Great Britain on the part of the one who expresses the hope that the people of the Transvaal will win in this great battle. It would, indeed, be surprising if the American people were not

heart and soul in sympathy with the South Africans, and there is no good reason, in law or in morals, why this sympathy should not find reflection in the president's message. There are models at the president's hand for such an expression.

In 1822, President Monroe, in a message to congress, said:

Europe is still unsettled, and although the war long menaced between Russia and Turkey has not broken out, there is no certainty that the differences between those powers will be amicably adjusted. It is impossible to look at the oppressions of the country respecting which those differences arose without being deeply affected. The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and refinement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of personal and public liberty, are associated with our recollections of ancient Greece. That such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret to generous minds for ages past. It was natural, therefore, that the re-appearance of those people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce that great excitement and sympathy in their favor which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States. A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth.

In 1823, President Monroe, in a message to congress, said:

A strong hope has been entertained, founded on the heroic struggles of the Greeks, that they would succeed in their contest and resume equal station among the nations of the earth. It is believed that the whole civilized world takes a deep interest in their welfare. Although no power has declared in their favor, yet none, according to our information, has taken part against them. Their cause and their name have protected them from dangers which might ere this have overwhelmed any other people. The ordinary calculations of interest and of acquisition with a view to aggrandizement, which mingles so much in the transactions of nations, seem to have had no effect in regard to them. From the facts which have come to our knowledge there is good cause to believe that their enemy has lost forever all dominion over them; that Greece will become again an independent nation. That she may obtain that rank is the object of our most ardent wishes.'

In 1827, President John Quincy Adams, in a message to congress, speaking of "the suffering Greeks," said:

The friends of freedom and of humanity may indulge the hope that they will obtain relief from that most unequal of conflicts which they have so long and so gallantly sustained; that they will enjoy the blessings of self-government, which, by their sufferings in the cause of liberty, they have richly earned, and that their independence will be secured by those liberal institutions of which their country furnished the earliest examples in the history of mankind, and which have consecrated to immortal remembrance the very soil for which the people and government of the United States have so warmly indulged with their cause have been acknowledged by their government, in a letter of thanks, which I have received from their illustrious president, a translation of which is now communicated to congress, the representative of that nation to whom this tribute of gratitude was intended to be paid, and to whom it was justly due.

President Taylor, in 1849, in a message to congress, said:

I have scrupulously avoided any interference in the wars and contentions which have recently distracted Europe. During the late conflict between Austria and Hungary there seemed to be a prospect that the latter might become an independent nation. However faint that prospect at the time appeared, I thought it my duty, in accordance with the general sentiment of the American people, who deeply sympathized with the Magyar patriots, to stand prepared, upon the contingency of the establishment by law of a permanent government, to be the first to welcome independent Hungary into the family of nations. For this purpose I invested an agent then in Europe with power to declare our willingness promptly to recognize her independence in the event of her ability to sustain it. The powerful intervention of Russia in the contest extinguished the hopes of the Magyars. The United States did not at any time interfere with the contest, but the feelings of the nation were strongly enlisted in the cause and by the sufferings of a brave people, who had made a gallant though unsuccessful effort to be free.

In 1850, President Taylor, in a message to congress, said:

It will be seen by the documents now transmitted that no minister or agent was accredited by the government of Hungary to this government at any period since I came into office, nor was any communication ever received by this government from the minister of foreign affairs of Hungary or any other executive officer authorized to act in her behalf.

My purpose, as freely avowed in this correspondence, was to have acknowledged the independence of Hungary had she succeeded in establishing a government de facto on a basis sufficiently permanent in its character to have justified me in doing so according to the usages and settled principles of this government; and although she is now fallen and many of her gallant patriots are in exile or in chains, I am free still to declare that had she been successful in the maintenance of such a government as we could have recognized, we should have been the first to welcome her into the family of nations.

What has occurred in the history of the United States of America, since the days of Monroe, of Adams and of Taylor that this great republic cannot give expression to its honest sentiments?

What is there in the atmosphere of the present day that would restrain an American president from expressing in a polite, yet vigorous way the hope and prayer of the American people that in every struggle between an empire and a republic, in every contest between a monarchy and a people's government, the republic may live, and that the people's cause may prevail?

WORKINGMEN AT THE POLLS.

The recent municipal elections in San Francisco illustrate the power of the workingmen when they unite at the polls. Members of the union labor organizations organized a party during the campaign, nominated Mr. Schmitz as their candidate for mayor and carried the city by a plurality of four thousand in a total vote of fifty-three thousand, defeating both the republican and the democratic candidates.

San Francisco has been the seat of labor troubles for some months past. It will be remembered that the iron workers struck early in the summer and that many other trades unions went out or were locked out as a result. An association called the Employers' association tried to compel teamsters to abandon their unions, and the trouble continued until about the time candidates were nominated for city offices. As Mayor Phelan, the democratic candidate, was elected two and four years ago, and as the republican candidate this time was second in the race, it is evident that a large proportion of the democratic strength went to the labor candidate. This is proof, first, that the wage-earners constitute a larger element of

the democratic party than of the republican party and, second, that democratic wage-earners are an independent class of voters who cast their ballots according to their judgment. There are so many local questions involved in a municipal campaign that the readers of THE COMMONER scattered throughout the country may not be able to pass judgment upon the issues which the citizens of San Francisco had to act upon, but it is interesting to every one to know the power that the laboring men have when they choose to exercise it. If they would show the same earnestness all over the country they would prove a most effective, if not an irresistible, force in reform movements. If the laboring men who are in the habit of supporting the republican ticket would by their votes make it known that they could not be counted upon to aid a party controlled by banks, corporations, syndicates and monopolies, the republican leaders would find that no corporation funds, however vast, could secure them a national victory.

THE GOLD STRONGHOLD CAPTURED.

The readers of THE COMMONER know that in the campaign of 1896 the Palmer and Buckner ticket carried but one precinct in the United States, namely, Dudley township, in Haskell county, Kansas. The vote there stood: Palmer and Buckner, 3; McKinley and Hobart, 2; Bryan and Sewall, 1. A reader of THE COMMONER sends in a statement signed by the county clerk of that county to the effect that Dudley township went democratic this year by a majority of seven.

The attention of the *Chicago Chronicle*, the *New York World*, the *Louisville Courier-Journal* and other gold standard papers is called to this fact. While they are "pointing with pride" to victories won by the re-organizers, let them "view with alarm" the recapture of this gold standard stronghold, which became so conspicuous five years ago.

The gold standard papers have magnified every victory which the re-organizers have won since 1896, now let them bow in humiliation over the sweeping defeat that has robbed them of the only precinct which their party has ever carried.

Ordinarily the change of a precinct would not be a matter of national significance, but the change of the only precinct that the

Palmer and Buckner ticket carried is certainly a serious blow to the men who carried on that unique campaign of fraud and deception. The men who did the most talking for Palmer and Buckner voted the republican ticket, as did all whom they could secretly influence. The re-organizers are being led by those who either voted for the ticket that carried but one precinct, or pretended to support it while they voted the republican ticket. What will the democratic party be if they secure control of the organization? What promise of relief can the party give to the people at large if the policies of the party are controlled by bolters who have shown no repentance since 1896? What hope of victory can we have under the leadership of those who conducted the Palmer and Buckner party to so disastrous a defeat?

DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP.

The *Chicago Chronicle*, emboldened by the success which has in some quarters attended the efforts made to re-organize the democratic party, comes out with the demand for new leadership. It wants a new platform, candidates who are acceptable to the moneyed interests and an organization that will draw its sinews of war from the corporations, and then conduct the government according to the plans and specifications furnished by the corporations. It says:

It is not surprising that with a presidential candidate and these managers from states at a far distance from the business and political center of the country the democratic party has been defeated disastrously in two campaigns and finds difficulty in rising from its overthrow. In the future such states as are now republican, but may be gained by the democrats, must furnish the democratic managing committeemen as well as the democratic national candidates. * * *

Not only must the new leaders be from the central states, but they must be familiar with all classes of people—with the educated, the enterprising, the prosperous, with those who have built up and manage the great commercial, industrial and transportation interests, with the farmers of the great agricultural states, with the educators and professional men of the country. * * *

In democratic party management the frontiersmen must give way to representatives from those parts of the country that have emerged from limited backwoods views of public affairs, of politics

and statesmanship, of education and progress, of the methods by which a great party may be led along the lines of enlightened policy, attract adherents from the best elements of citizenship, gain the support of independent voters and gain all those forces by which an apparent minority in the campaign is swelled into a majority at the ballot box.

We are to have leaders who are familiar (why not intimate?) with the "educated, enterprising and prosperous" and with "those who have built up and manage the great commercial, industrial and transportation interests."

Probably the *Chronicle* would consent to have the word "educated" stricken out if the party would agree to consult only the "prosperous" and "those who have built up and manage the great commercial, industrial and transportation interests."

The proposition plainly stated is that the democratic party, which owes its voting strength to its advocacy of democratic principles and to its championship of the rights of the common people, must now turn itself over to the men who manage the great corporate enterprises, and must secure the support of organized wealth by pledging itself not to interfere with privileges, favoritism and exploitation. The principal owner of the *Chronicle* is Mr. John R. Walsh, president of the Chicago National bank. He votes the republican ticket, and is on intimate terms with the corporations which his paper thinks ought to control the democratic party. Why not nominate Mr. Walsh for president? With such a candidate it would not be necessary to have a platform, and thus a great deal of contention might be avoided. The platform would be unnecessary for two reasons, first, because Mr. Walsh's environment is a guarantee that he would do nothing to disturb the enterprises and privileges of those who "have built up and manage the great commercial, industrial and transportation interests," and, secondly, men of that stamp care nothing for platforms and would not be bound by them in case of success. Mr. Walsh's nomination would have another advantage, namely, it would not be necessary to nominate a candidate for vice president. The convention could instruct the electors to vote for any person whom Mr. Walsh, after election, should suggest. This would enable him to choose his successor in case he should undermine his own constitution in his effort to override the federal constitution. Neither would it be necessary to have any campaign managers,

because the clerks in Mr. Walsh's bank could attend to the details of the campaign, and the financiers throughout the country could be the local representatives of the organization.

If the *Chronicle's* theory is correct, such a nomination would not only transfer the party management from the "frontiersmen" to "representatives from those parts of the country that have emerged from the limited backwoods view of public affairs," etc., but it would attract adherence from the "best elements of citizenship" (as measured by the pocketbook standard), and gain the support of those "independent voters" who allow the financiers to do their thinking for them. No doubt such a policy would swell the vote "of an apparent minority in the campaign" into "a majority at the ballot box"—provided always that the organization had enough money to buy all the republican votes, and was able at the same time (a very difficult matter) to retain the democratic vote. Probably the *Chronicle* goes on the theory that we would not need any of the democratic votes if we could buy all the republican votes.

This is the substance of the advice given by a paper controlled by a republican, but pretending to be democratic, and its advice is in entire harmony with a number of other papers owned in the same way and operated for the same purpose. Is it possible that such papers can have any influence with democrats who believe in democratic principles and think more of the party's honor than they do of any temporary success won by a sacrifice of the interests of the people?

A PROPHECY THAT FAILED.

In the campaign of 1900 the republican leaders denied that their party contemplated a permanent increase in the standing army. They asserted that a large army was only necessary because of the insurrection in the Philippines, and they boldly declared that the insurrection would cease immediately if the republican ticket was successful. The democratic platform and democratic speakers were blamed for the prolongation of the war. "Just re-elect President McKinley," they said, "and let the Filipinos know that they are not to have independence, and they will lay down their arms and our soldiers can come home."

Well, the republican ticket was elected, and the Filipinos were notified that they were not to have independence, but a month after the election the republicans rushed through congress a bill authorizing the president to raise the regular army to 100,000, and now, after a year has elapsed, the insurrection is still in progress and the end is not yet. Some of the worst losses of the year have been suffered by our troops within two months. General Chaffee reports that the Filipinos have profited by the deception practiced upon them when Aguinaldo was trapped. He says that "insurgent soldiers in ordinary civilian's dress lurked about and among American garrisons," and he adds that "with deceptive cunning they obtained credentials from American authorities." We were assured a year ago that only a small fraction of the Filipinos were hostile to the American government. We were told that the great majority of the Filipinos welcomed the American government and were glad to be made subjects. The *Times-Herald* quotes General Chaffee as saying that "the whole people of the Philippines are engaged in waging war upon the United States." The *Times-Herald* (a republican paper) adds: "The Filipinos who are friendly to the United States are said to be those holding office, and the officers who discussed the situation to-day assert that their loyalty will continue only so long as they have the opportunity of drawing American dollars."

If Mr. McKinley was correctly informed when he stated that most of the Filipinos were friendly, then the insurrection has, according to General Chaffee, increased rather than diminished.

After the republican victory made it impossible for the imperialists to blame the anti-imperialists for the continuation of hostilities, the republican leaders declared that Aguinaldo, actuated by selfish ambition, was compelling his countrymen to continue the war. But even after his capture and imprisonment—yes, even after his captors had secured from him an address advising his comrades to surrender—the insurrection continued. How long will it take the imperialists to learn that we can never have peace in the Philippine Islands? That we can suppress open resistance is certain, although the cost may be far beyond any gain that can be derived from a colonial government, but that we can ever make the Filipinos love us or trust us while we rule them through a carpet-bag government, is absurd.

If the republicans had read the speeches of Abraham Lincoln

as much recently as they did in former years, they would have known that hatred of an alien government is a natural thing and a thing to be expected everywhere. Lincoln said that it was God Himself who placed in every human heart the love of liberty. Lincoln spoke the truth. Love of liberty is linked to life itself, and "what God hath joined together let no man put asunder."

A DEMOCRATIC DUTY.

With the opening of the first session of the Fifty-seventh congress the congressional campaign of 1902 begins. The Philippine question will be the most important matter considered by this congress and in all probability the most important issue in the campaign of 1902. The democrats not only have an opportunity to make a strong appeal to the country on this question, but it is their duty to do so. The republicans do not dare to meet the issue of imperialism openly and honestly; they do not dare to invite judgment upon a colonial policy; they do not dare to candidly avow their purpose to hold the Philippine Islands permanently. A large majority of the rank and file of the republican party cherish the belief that their party intends ultimate independence for the Filipinos. The democrats can remove this delusion by compelling the republicans to accept or reject the democratic plan of dealing with the Philippine question.

The democratic platform of 1900 not only presented a plan for the peaceful and permanent settlement of the Philippine question, but it presented the only complete plan that has been offered to the American people. It reads as follows:

WE CONDEMN AND DENOUNCE THE PHILIPPINE POLICY OF THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION. IT HAS INVOLVED THE REPUBLIC IN UNNECESSARY WAR, SACRIFICED THE LIVES OF MANY OF OUR NOBLEST SONS AND PLACED THE UNITED STATES, PREVIOUSLY KNOWN AND APPLAUDED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD AS THE CHAMPION OF FREEDOM, IN THE FALSE AND UN-AMERICAN POSITION OF CRUSHING WITH MILITARY FORCE THE EFFORTS OF OUR FORMER ALLIES TO ACHIEVE LIBERTY AND SELF-GOVERNMENT. THE FILIPINOS CANNOT BE CITIZENS WITHOUT EN-

DANGERING OUR CIVILIZATION; THEY CANNOT BE SUBJECTS WITHOUT IMPERILLING OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT, AND AS WE ARE NOT WILLING TO SURRENDER OUR CIVILIZATION OR TO CONVERT THE REPUBLIC INTO AN EMPIRE, WE FAVOR AN IMMEDIATE DECLARATION OF THE NATION'S PURPOSE TO GIVE THE FILIPINOS, FIRST, A STAPLE FORM OF GOVERNMENT; SECOND, INDEPENDENCE; AND, THIRD, PROTECTION FROM OUTSIDE INTERFERENCE, SUCH AS HAS BEEN GIVEN FOR NEARLY A CENTURY TO THE REPUBLICS OF CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA.

The democrats can afford to take their stand upon this platform and challenge the attack of imperialists. More than a year has elapsed since the election of 1900, which, according to the republican prophecy, was to terminate the war in the Philippines. Every month has shown more clearly the failure of republican arguments and the evils of an imperialistic policy. The democratic platform charges that imperialism "has involved the republic in unnecessary war, sacrificed the lives of many of our noblest sons and placed the United States, previously known and applauded throughout the world as the champion of freedom, in the false and un-American position of crushing with military force the efforts of our allies to achieve liberty and self-government."

The war is unnecessary because the Filipinos are ready to lay down their arms whenever independence is promised them. The sacrifice of life has continued unabated and the imperialists seem as little concerned about the death of American soldiers as they do about the killing of the natives. The effect of imperialism has manifested itself in the failure of republican leaders to express any sympathy for the Boers, or to feel an interest in their struggles for liberty and self-government. The indictment which the democratic party made against the republican administration was sufficiently sustained by the events that had transpired prior to the convention, and the trend of events since that time has furnished overwhelming evidence in support of that indictment. Let the democratic leaders in the senate and house present this evidence in their speeches so that it may reach the entire country through the *Congressional Record*.

Why do the republicans hesitate to outline a policy? The reason is suggested in a portion of the platform already quoted: "The Filipinos cannot be citizens without endangering our civilization; they cannot be subjects without imperilling our form of government."

The republicans are not willing to say that they intend to make the Filipinos citizens with a voice in the conducting of our (and their) federal government. This would be to propose a heterogeneous government which would ultimately fall to pieces because of diversity of races and interests. Neither are they willing to declare that the Filipinos are to be kept subjects forever, for this would be plainly inconsistent with our form of government, our traditions and the well-nigh universal sentiment of our people. When one understands that we must put the Filipinos into training for ultimate citizenship or condemn them to perpetual servitude under a colonial system; when one understands that we must either hold before the Filipinos the hope of full participation in our government or doom them to despair,—when one understands this alternative he readily sees why the republicans refuse to divulge their purpose.

The democratic plan for the settlement of the Philippine question is identical with the plan proposed by the republicans for the settlement of the Cuban question, and the republicans cannot reject the democratic plan without showing some essential difference between the rights of the Cubans and the rights of the Filipinos. First, a stable form of government must be established in the place of the one overthrown by us, but it will be easy to establish this stable government when the Filipinos know that it is to be their government. There would be insurrection now in Cuba if we had treated the Cubans as we have treated the Filipinos; there would now be peace in the Philippines if we had treated the Filipinos as we have treated the Cubans. We have not scrupulously observed the promise made to the Cubans, and yet the confidence which the Cubans have felt in ultimate independence has led them to submit even when our demands seemed unreasonable and unjust.

Independence is the desire and the right of the Filipinos. If we denied them independence and gave them full citizenship in our government, it might possibly be satisfactory to them, although it would be dangerous to us, but the republican leaders do not

promise them citizenship in this government as a substitute for an independent government of their own. The Filipinos are not enjoying the guarantees of our constitution; they are enduring a carpet-bag government such as the American people would not submit to. We are not giving the Filipinos American liberty, American institutions or an American constitution. We are giving them an arbitrary and despotic government, for a government imposed by force and administered according to foreign ideas is always despotic, no matter how benevolent may be the purpose of those who administer it.

In proposing protection from outside interference the democrats offer to the Philippine republic the same guardianship which has been given to the republics of Central and South America, a guardianship that gives to the smaller republics the protection of our strength without making them the victims of our greed. For seventy-five years the Monroe doctrine has been a bulwark to the independent governments which have sprung up to the south of us. It has not involved us in any considerable expense, but it has been immensely valuable both to the wards and to the guardian. When England recently asserted the right to fix arbitrarily the boundary line between her South American possessions and Venezuela, it only required a firm, but friendly warning from the United States to prevent a conflict and secure equity and justice for Venezuela.

No nation in Europe would wage war against the United States in order to secure the Philippine islands, and it is doubtful if any of the leading nations of Europe would be willing to allow any other European nation to own the Philippine islands.

The republicans said that it would cost us an enormous sum of money to extend the Monroe doctrine to the Philippine islands. It has already cost us an immense sum to attempt to assert our own authority in those islands. Against the republican prophecy we place republican history; against the ungrounded fear of expense we place the money already expended. When we try to govern the Filipinos against their will and tax them without representation, they fight us, and we have found that they are able to force us to vast expenditures. If, on the other hand, we protect them from outside interference, they fight the nation which attacks them instead of fighting us, and if they can give other

nations as much trouble as they have given us they will not require much help from us to maintain their independence.

The democratic position is not only sound, but it is unassailable; it rests upon the Declaration of Independence; it is in harmony with the constitution and the bill of rights. Now that the party can choose the battleground, let it challenge the republicans to attack the conscience and the moral sentiment of the people as well as the principles of free government. If the democrats will present a united front on this issue—an issue upon which the Kansas City convention was unanimous—there is hope of a victory that will not only reinstate the democratic party, but restore the government to its old foundations and the nation to that high position among the nations to which its ideas and its ideals have entitled it.

THE YELLOW PERIL.

It will be necessary for the present congress to take action upon the Chinese exclusion act which expires by limitation May 24, 1902. The Kansas City platform contained the following plank on the subject:

We favor the continuance and strict enforcement of the Chinese exclusion law and its application to the same classes of all Asiatic races.

This plank was unanimously agreed upon by the platform committee, and there was no dissent from it among the delegates. It is to be expected, therefore, that the proposition to extend the Chinese exclusion act will receive the support of all the democrats in the house and senate. The editor of THE COMMONER received a letter a few days ago from a democrat who complained that the laboring men of the Pacific slope had ignored the Chinese question in the last campaign and suggested that it would only be a merited punishment if the republican party refused to extend the exclusion act. It is not unnatural that some resentment should be felt toward those who supported the republican party in spite of the dangers which republican supremacy involves, and yet no one can justify himself in either supporting a bad policy or in failing to protest against it merely because the policy would punish some who ought to have exerted themselves to prevent it. That

many of the republican leaders are in favor of a policy that will flood the country with cheap Chinese labor is true, and that an imperial policy tends to lend encouragement to the cheap labor proposition, is also true, but the failure of the laboring men to see these dangers in advance would not justify democrats in remaining quiet on the subject, although the republicans are in power and are responsible for legislation.

The Chinese question is one that effects the entire country, not the Pacific Coast alone or the laboring men alone. It is true that the Pacific Coast would feel the evil effects of Chinese emigration first, and it is also true that the laboring men would come into immediate contact with oriental labor, but in its ultimate influence the subject touches all parts of the country and reaches all classes. The question is whether we are going to build up a strong, independent, upright and patriotic people and develop a civilization that will exert a helpful influence on all the world, or whether we are going to be a greedy, grasping nation, forgetful of high ideals and concerned only in the making of money.

Chinese emigration is defended by two classes of people. First, by those, comparatively few in number, who believe that universal brotherhood requires us to welcome to our shores all people of all lands. This is the sentimental argument advanced in favor of Chinese emigration. There is no more reason why we should construe brotherhood to require the admission of all people to our country than there is that we should construe brotherhood to require the dissolution of family ties. The family is a unit; it is the place where character and virtue and usefulness are developed, and from the family a good or evil influence emanates. It is not necessary nor even wise that the family environment should be broken up or that all who desire entrance should be admitted to the family circle. In a larger sense a nation is a family. It is the center for the cultivation of national character, national virtue and national usefulness. A nation is under no obligation to the outside world to admit anybody or anything that would injuriously effect the national family; in fact it is under obligation to itself not to do so. The influence of the United States will be much more potent for good if we remain a homogeneous nation with all citizens in full sympathy with all other citizens. No distinct race like the Chinese can come into this country without exciting a friction and a race prejudice which

will make it more difficult for us to exercise a wholesome influence upon the Chinese in China, not to speak of our influence on other nations.

Let us educate the Chinese who desire to learn of American institutions; let us offer courtesy and protection to those who come here to travel and investigate, but it will not be of permanent benefit to either the Chinese or to us to invite them to become citizens or to permit them to labor here and carry the proceeds of their toil back to their own country.

The second, and by far the larger class, embraces those who advocate Chinese emigration on the ground that it will furnish cheap labor for household and factory work. There is no force in the argument that is made by some that it is difficult to secure girls to do housework. If domestic service is not popular as compared with other work, it is because the pay is not sufficient to make it attractive and the remedy lies in better wages. Labor can be secured for any and every honorable position when the price is sufficient to attract it, and the demand for Chinese servants comes with poor grace from those who often spend on a single social entertainment as much as a servant's wages would amount to in an entire year. At this time when skilled and intelligent American labor is able to compete in foreign markets with the cheapest labor in the world, it is absurd to talk about the necessity for cheap factory hands.

The increase in Japanese immigration, or rather importation (for large numbers of them are brought for specific purposes) has been referred to in a former issue of THE COMMONER. It was there suggested that the Japanese government would doubtless, if asked to do so, place restrictions upon Japanese emigration that would make it unnecessary for us to deal with the subject by legislation. This matter should at once be brought to the attention of the Japanese authorities, and unless sufficient and satisfactory action is taken by the home government the Chinese exclusion act should be made broad enough to extend to Japanese of the same class.

The subject of oriental emigration cannot be discussed without giving some consideration to the danger of cheap labor from the Philippine islands. It will soon be necessary to legislate on this subject. If the Filipinos are permitted to come here there is danger that the Philippine question will become only second in aggravation

to the Chinese question. If, on the other hand, the Filipinos are prohibited from coming here (if a republic can prohibit the inhabitants of one part from visiting another part of the republic), will it not excite a just protest on the part of the Filipinos? How can we excuse ourselves if we insist upon opening the Philippine islands to the invasion of American capital, American speculators, and American task-masters, and yet close our doors to those Filipinos who, driven from home, may seek an asylum here?

The democratic party should take a strong and aggressive position on this question. It can afford to oppose Chinese emigration and insist upon the unity and homogeneousness of our nation. It can afford to insist that Japanese laborers shall be treated the same as Chinese laborers and excluded, by agreement with the Japanese government if possible, by congressional legislation if necessary.

The democratic leaders should further point out that the Philippine question involves the same menace to our country, and that as we can neither afford to admit the Filipinos nor yet make a distinction between different parts of the republic, we should at once declare our purpose to give the Filipinos independence as soon as a stable government can be established.

EXIT, JONES OF NEVADA.

Senator Jones of Nevada has by his return to the republican party given much joy to the gold organs, both republican and democratic. He claims to be as firm a believer in bimetallism as when he left the republican party, but says that the enormous output of gold "has accomplished what bimetallism would have accomplished," and that silver is dead. He adds that he has been in harmony with the republican party on all other issues, and can, therefore, easily return. It is true that the senator from Nevada, distinguished by his great service in behalf of bimetallism, has been in harmony with the republican party on all questions save the silver question alone, and therefore his apostacy at this time is not surprising, although much to be regretted.

If Senator Jones will review the arguments which he himself has made, he will be convinced that the output of gold has not been sufficient to accomplish "what bimetallism would have accomplished." The restoration of bimetallism would have raised silver to \$1.29 an

ounce; it would have brought into full monetary use throughout the world four billions of silver which has been constantly legislated against. It would have raised prices to the former bimetallic level and placed the business of the world upon a solid basis. The output of gold has not done this, and as a mere matter of mathematics it is easy to demonstrate that it will require a great many years for the present output to furnish a quantity of gold sufficient to accomplish "what bimetallicism would have accomplished." But before gold can be used to take the place of silver we must subtract from the annual product, first, enough for use in the arts; second, enough to cover lost coins and abrasion, and, third, enough to furnish the gold using nations with the annual increase necessary to keep pace with the demand for money. When Senator Sherman was defending the act of 1890, known as the Sherman law, he argued that we needed fifty-four millions of new money every year to keep pace with population and industry. If that quantity is necessary for this country alone, what sum would be sufficient to supply all the gold using nations of the world?

The financiers of all countries oppose any permanent rise in prices because that would lessen the purchasing power of the dollar and depreciate the exchange value of their money and securities. If they thought there was any danger of the gold supply being sufficient to accomplish "what bimetallicism would have accomplished," they would be clamoring for the use of gold in the retirement of uncovered paper, and, finally, they would demand a limitation of the coinage of gold. There has been a rise in the level of prices since 1896, but a part of this was the natural rebound after panic conditions, part was due to the prevailing wars, and a part to the manipulation of prices by trusts. We have not yet reached normal conditions, and, therefore, cannot say how much the general level of prices will be increased by the output of gold. We do know, however, that gold has not raised, and probably will not raise prices to anything like the bimetallic level. We cannot accept the gold standard as final until we are sure that we have gold enough, not only for the nations that now use it, but for the nations that will be ultimately driven to it if the United States surrenders its contention for bimetallicism. Where would the three hundred million people of India and the four hundred million people of China secure gold if they were to go to the gold standard? What nation has any considerable gold to spare?

It is evident that Nevada's senator has reached a point where his interest in other policies of the republican party outweighs his attachment for bimetallism. The fact that he is not alarmed by the republican advocacy of a "branch bank," an "asset currency," and trusts, or by the corporate domination and the imperial policy of the republican party, shows that devotion to silver was due more to the fact that he came from a mining state than to any broad and deep sympathy with the masses of the people. If his belief in bimetallism had grown out of his desire to see the government administered according to the doctrine of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none," no increase in the production of gold could have carried him back to the republican party. He gained his reputation as the champion of the rights of the people on one question—the money question. Let us see if he ever makes a speech in favor of present republican policies that will compare with the speech which he made in denunciation of the gold standard.

CAN IT BE?

Referring to the great railroad trusts, the *Chicago Tribune* says:

An issue of tremendous consequence is thus being brought to the whole country. It is a matter for conjecture if these railroad and financial manipulators comprehend what this issue is. The failure of full and effective government regulation which the roads have so far succeeded in breaking down means government ownership, nothing less than that. And toward just that conclusion the combinations are forcing the country. It will be a great mistake to suppose that the present patience of the people with the growing domination of monopoly is a test of what the public temper will always prove to be.

What right has the *Tribune* to "contribute to the disquiet of the people"?

What right has the *Tribune* "to seek to make the people discontented"?

What right has the *Tribune* to "attack property"?

Does not the *Tribune* know that trusts are "indispensable to progress," that "consolidation is the decree of destiny," that a railroad octopus for the United States of America will make us what we so long have wished to be, "a world power"?

The *Tribune* threatens government ownership, which the *Tribune* and other republican newspapers have so often denounced as a populist fallacy. What is the world coming to when so strong a republican newspaper as the Chicago *Tribune* finds it necessary to raise its voice in protest against monopoly and goes so far as to threaten a populist remedy for a republican disease?

Can it be that after all there is evil in the trust system? Can it be after all that consolidation and destruction of competition are not good for the public welfare?

A STABLE DOLLAR.

A reader of THE COMMONER asks for a definition of an honest dollar. Stability is the test of honesty. An absolutely honest dollar would be one whose average purchasing power would remain the same from year to year. The advocates of the gold standard are in the habit of speaking of the gold dollar as an honest dollar, but one of the leading monometallists, Professor Laughlin, in his work on bimetallism, says: "Monometallists do not (as is often said) believe that gold remains absolutely stable in value. They hold that there is no such thing as a 'standard of value' for future payments in gold or silver which remains absolutely invariable."

This must be admitted by every intelligent student of the science of money. The value of the dollar depends on the number of dollars and an increase or decrease in the volume of money (out of proportion to the change in the demand for money) will affect prices. For instance, if all the world used the gold standard and the production of gold suddenly increased, say two or threefold, the increase in prices would be very great. The same effect, though in the opposite direction, would be noticed if the supply of money suddenly decreased.

Professor Laughlin, discussing the subject further, says:

As regards national debts, it is distinctly averred that neither gold nor silver forms a just measure of deferred payments, and that if justice in long contracts is sought for, we should not seek it by the doubtful and untried expedient of international bimetallism, but by the clear and certain method of a multiple standard, a unit based upon the selling prices of a number of articles of general con-

sumption. A long-time contract would thereby be paid at its maturity by the same purchasing power as was given in the beginning.

Here is a clear recognition of two facts, first, that justice lies in absolute stability, and, second, that human ingenuity can only approximate, never reach, perfect stability. A dollar resting upon two metals more nearly approaches stability, and, therefore, justice, than a dollar resting upon one metal. According to the same process of reasoning, a dollar resting upon a hundred articles would make a still nearer approach to stability.

The multiple standard is not, however, deemed practicable. Both gold and silver fluctuate (the production of gold has fluctuated more often and more violently than the production of silver) but they have not usually fluctuated in concert. When part of the nations used gold and part of them silver, so that all of the product of both metals could find a place for coinage, it did not make so much difference which standard a nation had, for both of the metals contributed to make up the standard money of the world, but with all the nations using gold alone, or all the nations using silver alone, the situation would be different. If the gold standard ever does produce a stable currency it will disappoint the gold standard advocates, for they want a rising dollar.

XVI.

LET OUR IDEAS CONQUER.

One of the presidentes of Lipa, Batanzas Province, P. I., has addressed a letter to the "Presidentes of the Province" inviting them to join him in sending two young men, to be selected from the students by competition, to the United States for the purpose of studying American institutions. He offers to give thirty dollars (Mexican money) a month, and asks the other "Presidentes" to contribute a like proportion of their salaries.

It is a worthy precedent, and it is to be hoped that it will be followed in other provinces. Of course these Filipino boys cannot come here to study our institutions without becoming aware of the inconsistency between our professions at home and our practices abroad, but their acquaintance with our form of government will fit them to help us to conquer the world with our ideas after we have withdrawn the authority which now makes subjects out of the Filipinos.

The country can do infinitely more for itself and infinitely more for the world by educating representatives of foreign nations and sending them back to apply American principles to their social and political problems than it can by wars of conquest. No alien government will ever meet the expectations or satisfy the longings of any people. The foreigner lacks the race sympathy that is necessary to the upbuilding of a nation. Americans who go to the Philippine islands will find it impossible to withstand the temptation to use the government for exploitation—it has been so with carpet-bag governments in the past and it will be so in the future. Human nature has not changed much, and is yet far too weak to exercise arbitrary and irresponsible power.

A hundred students educated in the United States and returned to the nations of the Orient would do more toward extending our trade and our civilization than an army of an hundred thousand

men. The federal government could well afford to establish a school and educate all the students that would be sent here from South America and Asia. The cost to the nation would be small compared with the cost of a single war of conquest, and the profit would be immeasurably greater.

ANTI-ANARCHY BILLS.

It is probable that a number of bills directed against anarchy will be introduced at the coming session of congress, and all of them should be examined carefully to see that freedom of speech is not attacked under the guise of an attempt to extinguish anarchy. Congressman Curtis of Kansas has given out for publication a bill which he has drawn for the suppression and punishment of anarchists. The text of the bill is as follows:

Sec. 1. That every person who shall, within the United States, unlawfully and wilfully kill or assault with intent to kill the president or vice-president, a member of the president's cabinet, the chief justice or a justice of the supreme court of the United States, shall be deemed guilty of a crime against the government of the United States and upon conviction thereof shall suffer death.

Sec. 2. That if two or more persons within the United States conspire to put the president or vice-president of the United States, a member of the president's cabinet, the chief justice or a justice of the supreme court of the United States to death, each of them shall be deemed guilty of a crime against the government of the United States and upon conviction thereof shall suffer death.

Sec. 3. That every person who shall, within the United States, incite, encourage, promote or advocate an assault, with intent to kill, upon the president or vice-president of the United States, a member of the president's cabinet, the chief justice or a justice of the supreme court of the United States, shall be deemed guilty of a crime against the government of the United States, and upon conviction thereof shall suffer death. Provided, that nothing in this section shall be held or construed to prevent a candid, full and fair discussion of public events and public measures, nor to prevent just and fair criticism of any public officer.

Sec. 4. That every person who shall, within the United States, incite, encourage, promote or advance the overthrow of the government of the United States, or who shall diffuse the doctrine of anarchy, shall be deemed guilty of a crime against the government of the United States, and upon conviction thereof shall suffer death.

Provided that nothing in this section shall be held or construed to prevent a candid, full and free discussion of public events and public measures nor to prevent just and fair criticism of any public officer.

Sec. 5. That every person who shall join, organize or aid and assist in organizing or belong to an anarchist society, club or organization, or who shall join, organize or aid or assist in organizing or belong to any other society, club or organization, the object of which is to overthrow, subvert or change the government of the United States, shall be deemed guilty of a crime against the government of the United States, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by confinement at hard labor in any United States penitentiary not less than twenty years or during life in the discretion of the court.

Sec. 6. That every person who shall knowingly write, print or publish, or shall cause to be written, printed or published, any editorial, article, letter, circular, picture or cartoon, intended and designed to expose the president or vice-president of the United States, any member of the president's cabinet, the chief justice or any justice of the supreme court of the United States, to public hatred, scorn or contempt, shall be deemed guilty of a crime against the government of the United States, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by confinement at hard labor in the United States penitentiaries not more than ten years, nor less than one year. Provided that nothing herein shall be held or construed to prevent candid, full and free presentation of public events and public measures, nor to prevent just and fair criticism of any public officer.

Sec. 7. That all prosecutions under this act shall be in the United States circuit or district courts of the district wherein the crime was committed.

A federal commission is now revising the laws and has suggested a bill which provides that killing, or assaulting with intent to kill, a president, vice-president, member of the cabinet or judge of the supreme court shall be punishable with death if the assault is made upon the official for the purpose of obstructing or interfering with the administration of the government. This qualification is an essential one and should be added to Congressman Curtis' bill. The commission suggested it upon the theory that it was necessary in order to give the federal government jurisdiction, but it is defensible upon the ground of public policy as well. If the public official is attacked by one who aims to strike at the government through the official, the attack becomes an offense against the people. If, however, the assault is a personal matter, and not directed against the officer in his official capacity, it is entirely different. To protect

officials against anarchists it is not necessary to separate them from other persons in so far as the ordinary relations of life are concerned.

Section 3 of Congressman Curtis' bill contains a proviso which is open to criticism and may establish a censorship of the press. The provision "that the section shall not be held or construed to prevent a full and candid discussion of events," etc., is not necessary to that section. No one has a right to incite, encourage, promote or advise an assault with intent to kill the president or any one else. The man who does so should be held equally guilty with the man who commits the act. A clear line can be drawn between criticism, no matter whether it is fair or unfair, and the advocacy of violence of any kind, in any form or under any circumstances.

Section 5 also provides a punishment for any one who incites, encourages, etc., the overthrow of the government of the United States. That much is plain. But when the section fixes a penalty for the diffusion of "the doctrine of anarchy," it becomes obscure. The word anarchy should be defined. In the campaign of 1896 the advocates of the Chicago platform were, by some partisan republicans, denounced as anarchists. The law ought not to be such as to give the dominant party an excuse for prosecuting as criminals all the members of the opposition party. If anarchy is defined as the doctrine that the government ought to be overthrown, it is covered by the first part of the section. If it is anything else, or includes anything else, it ought to be defined so that the lawmakers will know what they are punishing.

Section 5 provides a punishment for any one who organizes or belongs to a society or club, the "object of which is to overthrow, subvert or change the government of the United States." The words "overthrow" and "subvert" are plainer than the word "change." The language is broad enough to apply to the advocates of imperialism, for they certainly want to "change" the government of the United States from a government based upon the consent of the governed to a government based upon the doctrine of brute force. But it would hardly be fair to indict and prosecute all imperialists. The word "change" might also be construed to apply to amendments proposed to the constitution. Some of the republicans say that the constitution will have to be amended before the trusts can be destroyed. While we have no assurance that an amendment is necessary, still it would be unfortunate to have a law which would enable republicans to withhold an amendment (if one is necessary)

on the ground that it would be a criminal change in our government. There is a popular demand for the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people. It is to be hoped that the republicans will not give any of the senators a chance to oppose the change on the ground that they would incur criminal liability.

Section 6 is the section most likely to be abused. It is directly aimed at the public press and it cannot be enforced without a strict censorship. Who is to decide whether an "editorial, article, letter, circular, picture or cartoon" is "intended or designed to expose the president or vice-president of the United States, any member of the president's cabinet, the chief justice or any justice of the United States, to public hatred, scorn or contempt"? It would be difficult to write a law that could be more easily used by a political party for the suppression of criticism. The provision that "nothing herein shall be held or construed to prevent candid, full and free presentation of public events and public measures, nor to prevent just and fair criticism of any public officer," would be no protection, because the administration would construe to suit itself the words "candid," "just," and "fair," and upon appeal from the lower court the members of the supreme court would have a personal interest in sustaining a law that would shield them from criticism. It is hardly possible to suppose that any congress ever elected in this country or ever to be elected would enact a law containing such a restriction upon the freedom of the press as is set forth in section 6 of Mr. Curtis' bill, but it is well for friends of a free press to be on their guard.

Let the law punish those who commit murder, who attempt murder, or who advise murder; let it restrain violence or the counselling of violence; let it discriminate between those who would reform government and those who would entirely overthrow it, but let it not attack in any way, directly or indirectly, the freedom of speech or the freedom of the press. No administration or official should be shielded from criticism. If criticism is just and fair it ought to have weight; if it is unjust and unfair it will not only be harmless to the accused, but, in the long run, helpful to him. Even if unjust and unfair criticism were harmful, the remedy proposed is more dangerous than the disease. We can better afford to subject a few men to unmerited criticism than to risk the operation of a censorship which, administered by partisans, would suppress honest criticism and silence complaint by the threat of a criminal process.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

President Roosevelt's first message to congress contains much that can be commended by members of all parties. After paying a high compliment to his predecessor he discusses the question of anarchy at some length, and proposes certain remedies which THE COMMONER will discuss hereafter when those remedies are embodied in bills presented for consideration to congress. He pays a deserved tribute to agriculture and emphasizes the importance of the preservation of the forests. His recommendations on the subject of irrigation are especially good. He seems to fully appreciate the magnitude of the subject and the limitations which he suggests are eminently wise. It is to be hoped that congress will heed his advice and in all legislation bear in mind that "the only right to water which should be recognized is that of use," and that "in irrigation this right should attach to the land reclaimed and be inseparable therefrom." His comparison between the granting of "perpetual water rights to others than the users" and the "giving away of perpetual franchises to the public utilities of cities" is just and timely. His endorsement of the Monroe doctrine is emphatic and comprehensive. His remarks on the labor question indicate that he has a clearer conception of the laborers' struggles and difficulties than some previous presidents; his plans, however, for the amelioration of the condition of the laboring man are open to discussion.

The democrats will dissent from his high tariff remedy—the laborer has been suffering from the administration of that remedy for about a quarter of a century. There is virtue, however, in the president's advocacy of the eight-hour law, and of regulations to prevent over-work and unsanitary conditions. He failed to condemn government by injunction and the blacklist, both of which have caused much injustice to the wage-earners.

The president's recommendations on the Chinese question are welcome; they will insure a prompt extension of the Chinese exclusion act. While many of the republican leaders lean to the cheap labor side of the Chinese question, there will be enough republicans ready to act with the democrats to make futile any attempt to open our doors to Chinese emigration.

The president has stated his position with clearness on the general

subject of emigration and on the subject of civil service, and he pledges his administration to make appointments in the army and navy depend upon merit and not upon personal, political or social influence. He gives considerable attention to the size of the navy, and urges a considerable increase in the naval strength of the nation.

His recommendations upon the subject of the merchant marine and on the subject of interstate commerce are not specific. He wants to see the American merchant marine "restored to the ocean," but he does not definitely indorse the ship subsidy bill, which gives the interpretation which republican leaders have placed upon the republican platform. While he favors an enlargement of the scope of the interstate commerce law in the interest of the patrons of the road, his language raises a suspicion that he is also willing to concede to the railroads the pooling privileges for which they have contended for several years.

In discussing the tariff question the president assumes what is not true, namely, that "there is general acquiescence in our present tariff system as a national policy." He recommends a limited system of reciprocity, but wants it distinctly understood that we must not concede anything that is really of any value to us. No one can read that portion of his message without being convinced that the reciprocity idea will be entirely subordinate to the interests and demands of the beneficiaries of a high tariff. In fact, he says as much when he declares that "reciprocity must be treated as the handmaiden of protection," and, therefore, like a handmaiden, subject to discharge on short notice.

The president follows the republican platform, and recommends the creation of a new cabinet position to be filled by a representative of the commercial and industrial interests. It will be remembered that the democratic platform advocated the creation of a department of labor, with a cabinet officer in charge. The difference between a representative of commerce and industry (already represented to a large extent by the secretary of the treasury, who is closely associated with the bankers, by the secretary of state, who is in contact with our consular representatives, and by the attorney general, who has for years been intimate with the great corporations) and one speaking for and representing the great wage-earning classes of the United States ought to be apparent to any one.

The president's recommendation in regard to an Isthmian canal

also follows the republican platform, and leaves out all mention of the route to be followed. There is a widespread opinion that the Panama canal project has been used by the railroads to prevent the digging of the Nicaragua canal. The message indicates that the president appreciates the importance of the canal, and this gives us some room to hope that even though he does not specifically indorse the Nicaragua route, he will not permit the railroads to further delay the inauguration of this great enterprise.

The president makes no reference to the Boer war. Whether he has been so occupied with public affairs as not to have learned of the struggle going on in South Africa; whether, having learned of it, he considers it a matter of trivial importance; whether he sympathizes with the Boers, but is prevented by allegiance to his party from giving expression to that sympathy, or whether his sympathies are with England in her efforts to extend her empire, all these are left to conjecture.

Scant attention is given to the money question; less than three hundred words are used to set forth the president's position on a question which the republican papers declared to be paramount in the last campaign. Below will be found the only reference to this important subject:

The act of March 14, 1900, intended unequivocally to establish gold as the standard money and to maintain as a parity therewith all forms of money medium in use with us, has been shown to be timely and judicious. The price of our government bonds in the world's market, when compared with the price of similar obligations issued by other nations, is a flattering tribute to our public credit. This condition it is eminently desirable to maintain.

In many respects the national banking law furnishes sufficient liberty for the proper exercise of the banking function, but there seems to be need of better safeguards against the deranging influence of commercial crises and financial panics. Moreover, the currency of the country should be made responsive to the demands of our domestic trade and commerce.

Does this mean that the president does not favor the proposed measure making the silver dollar redeemable in gold, or does it mean that he is going to adopt the plan followed by the gold standard advocates in the past and prevent as far as possible

the discussion of financial measures? He does not mention the branch bank or the asset currency? Does it mean that he does not favor them, or that he prefers to have them sprung upon congress and rushed through before the people have a chance to understand them? If measures are necessary to protect the people "against the deranging influence of commercial crises and financial panics," why not present such measures for the consideration of the people? If the currency should be made "responsive to the demands of our domestic trade and commerce," why not outline a plan so that the public generally can examine and discuss it? Everybody reads the president's message, but comparatively few people know anything about the bills presented. We shall see, as time passes, whether the currency question occupies as small a place in congressional consideration as it has in the president's message.

The president's recommendations on the postal system will be discussed at another time when they can be considered more fully.

The two subjects specially emphasized in the president's message are the trust question and the Philippine situation. On another page will be found those portions of the message which relate to these two subjects. These extracts are given in order that the readers of THE COMMONER may judge for themselves whether the comments to be made are justified. A perusal of the president's utterances on the trust question will convince any unprejudiced reader that the president has heard from the trust magnates since he made his Minneapolis speech. His famous phrase in regard to the shackling of cunning is reproduced, but it is so diluted with warnings, cautions and fears, as to be scarcely recognizable. It is evident that the president has been deeply impressed by the doleful prophecies and threatenings of the monopolists. He is willing to admit that the consolidation of capital which is going on is a process which has aroused much antagonism, but he feels it necessary to add "a great part of which is wholly without warrant." He borrows the phraseology of trust-defenders when he asserts that "the average man, the wage-earner, the farmer, the small trader, have never before been so well off as in this country and at this time." The inference is natural—that the trust evil is not really serious, if industrial conditions are as favorable as the president asserts. He borrows the epithets of the trust magnates when he warns the country against "ig-

norant violence," against "the ignorant or reckless agitator," against "crude and ill-considered legislation," and against "appeals, especially to hatred and fear." It is doubtful whether any one as badly scared as the president seems to be is in a proper frame of mind to calmly consider an effective anti-trust law. He gives the benefit of the doubt to the corporation, and nowhere expresses as much solicitude for the rights of the masses of the people as he does for the interests of the great combinations of capital which in his opinion "will take the lead in the strife for commercial supremacy among the nations of the world." To embarrass them would be, in his opinion, to "cramp and fetter the youthful strength of the nation." The only remedy suggested by him is publicity, and in discussing the subject he uses illustrations which convince one that he has no objections to private monopolies. He puts them upon the same footing as a national bank, and simply insists that they shall inform the public as to their business methods. He refers to the evils of over-capitalization, but does not suggest any specific remedy therefor. We are to have publicity first, and investigation afterward. It will take some time to get the idea into operation, then the constitutionality of the law will be attacked and prosecution will have to be suspended a few years until the case is reached in the supreme court, and that will tide the party over another presidential election. If the president is in earnest in his desire to shackle cunning, let him recommend the passage of a bill which will compel the supreme court to give immediate consideration to questions arising under laws which, like an anti-trust law, affect the entire people. The president intimates that a constitutional amendment may be necessary to authorize congress to take comprehensive action against the trusts. It is to be hoped that this suggestion will not be made an excuse for delay. The American people are losing millions of dollars every week because of the extortion of trusts, and there is no time for delay in dealing with this question.

The fatal mistake made by the president is that he fails to recognize that a private monopoly is always, and under every circumstance, a menace to the public. There can be no sufficient or satisfactory regulation of a private monopoly. It is essentially and eternally wrong. It has always been regarded as an outlaw against society; it has never been defended until recently, and it is

lamentable to learn from the president's message that he has been constrained by the trust magnates to withhold his positive and emphatic condemnation of the monopoly principle. There is nothing in his message to indicate that he has any fear of the effect of a private monopoly. When he declares "that combination and concentration should not be prohibited, but supervised, and within reasonable limits controlled," he ignores entirely the vicious principle of monopoly. No extension of foreign commerce, no development of domestic industry could for a moment justify a private monopoly, even though such monopoly could be shown to be advantageous in both respects.

On the subject of imperialism the president, without attempting to defend the principles involved, shields himself behind the force of circumstances. He assumes the patronizing air of the advocates of "destiny" and "duty" and insists that "our earnest effort is to help these people upward along the stony and difficult path that leads to self-government." And again he says: "We hope to do for them what has never before been done for any people in the tropics—to make them fit for self-government after the fashion of the really free nations." He thinks any attempt to give them independence now "such a desertion of duty on our part as would be a crime against humanity." He seems to regard a government based upon force as the best government for certain classes, and free government as only possible under certain circumstances, for he says "it is no light task for a nation to achieve the temperamental qualities without which the institutions of free government are but empty mockery," and he adds that "our people are now successfully governing themselves because for more than a thousand years they have been fitting themselves, sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously, toward this end." He declares that large portions of the Filipino race are starting "very far behind the point which our ancestors had reached even thirty generations ago." The question irresistibly rises in one's mind, if the Filipinos are a thousand years behind our people and must be governed by us because of that fact, how can they ever catch up with us unless they develop more rapidly than we do? Capacity for self-government is a relative term, that is to say, some people are capable of governing themselves better than others. We have not reached perfection in this respect and the Filipinos certainly have some capacity. If we are all making progress it will evidently be

necessary for the Filipinos to improve more rapidly than we do in order to narrow the gap between us. This doctrine is a dangerous one, because it justifies the pretensions of an imperial government wherever people can be found rich enough to invite exploitation and weak enough to be conquered.

Conscious that "destiny" and "duty" would not appeal to the commercial element of the republican party, the president proceeds to recommend legislation that will give American citizens a chance to garner up the undeveloped wealth of the Philippine islands. He says: "Of course no business man will go into the Philippines unless it is to his interest to do so, and it is immensely to the interest of the islands that he should go in." That is the argument always made in behalf of capital. It is assumed that the "inferior race" is longing to be developed by foreign speculators, and it is admitted that the speculator will not go unless it can be made profitable to him, therefore, laws must hold out inducements. Congress must take possession of the resources of the Philippine islands and offer them as a reward to Americans who will go there and develop them. The American people will furnish an army to hold the Filipinos in subjection, while the syndicates and corporations will gather all the wealth in sight. This is the Philippine question in a nutshell: Hold the islands; providence gave them to us and we must make all the money out of them we can. Show the taxpayer that it is his duty to bear the burden, and you will have no difficulty in showing the exploiter that it is his duty to reap the reward.

If the republicans in the senate and house attempt to carry out the president's recommendations on the Philippine question, the opposition will have a splendid opportunity to manufacture material for the next campaign.

MARKHAM'S POETRY.

On another page will be found Markham's tribute to Abraham Lincoln. It is reported not only because of the subject, but also because of the poet's treatment of the subject. Markham to a remarkable degree possesses the poetic faculty of embalming a beautiful sentiment in beautiful language, so that his words linger in the memory. The poem presented to-day, like Gray's *Elegy*,

idealizes the homely and familiar things that are a part of the existence of all. He ennobles Lincoln by making him one of the common people and by exalting the real elements of his greatness.

Where can we find such a collection of beautiful and appropriate similes?

The rectitude and patience of the rocks;
 The gladness of the wind that shakes the corn;
 The courage of the bird that dares the sea;
 The justice of the rain that loves all leaves;
 The pity of the snow that hides all scars;
 The loving kindness of the wayside well;
 The tolerance and equity of light.

Here are seven lines, each setting forth a virtue that would immortalize a man and all, like the parables, are suggested by the every-day things of life.

It is a rare gift to be able to see the things around us, a rarer gift to be able to utilize them in speech or prose, and still a rarer gift to be able to clothe them in the resplendent language of poesy. Markham has an equipment of head and heart that fits him to portray a character that could combine rectitude, patience, gladness, courage, equity, tolerance, pity and loving kindness.

THE PRINCE OF PEACE.

Christmas is at hand, and its coming always recalls the benediction pronounced in the presence of the shepherds who kept their flocks by night—

“On earth peace, good will toward men.”

Isaiah, the prophet, in speaking of the coming of Christ, said that he would be called among other things the “Prince of Peace,” and immediately after this prophecy as to His title follows this explanation of the title: “Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever.”

It is as true to-day as when the prophet uttered the words, that no government can be permanent or insure peace unless it is

established with justice. At this season of the year, held sacred in all Christian lands and observed even by those who are indifferent to the origin of Christmas festivities, it is well for us to ask ourselves what our nation as a nation and we as individuals are doing to promote peace by establishing justice? Until within a few years our nation has been known as a peace-loving nation; it has boasted of its small standing army and it has had no ambition to compete with foreign nations in naval expenditures. But a change has come over a portion of our people. They advocate wars of conquest which they once condemned; they justify military expenditures which they once denounced, and they clamor for a navy as big as the biggest. What is to be the end? Was the hope of universal peace a dream? Is right to be measured by might, and violence, robed in hypocrisy, to be substituted for justice?

A Kansas City minister indorses the assertion of Maxim, the gunmaker, who declares "often at the bayonet's point, trade, and even Christianity have been forced upon the savages, and upon exclusive and warlike peoples, and now Christianity, civilization and militarism, sisters of strange relation, hand in hand, embrace the world."

Is this the construction which the modern church is going to set upon the teachings of one who rebuked the doctrine of hate and preached the gospel of love?

Christmas should be more than an occasion for the exchange of presents. It should be a season for conscientious self-inspection by citizens individually and by that great family of citizens, the nation.

"On earth peace, good will toward men."

A WORD AS TO GIFTS.

The time is approaching when the Christian world indulges in that most delightful of luxuries—giving. There is a philosophy in the Biblical doctrine that it is more blessed to give than to receive, for however much we enjoy the gifts that come to us, we enjoy still more the gifts which we make, if they are made in the proper spirit. He who gives becomes a creditor, he who

receives becomes a debtor, and it is always better to lay up capital than to incur obligations.

There are two rules which ought to be observed: First, the gift should be an appropriate one. It must not only be suited to the needs of the recipient, but in expense it ought not to be out of proportion to the means of the donor. It mars the pleasure of receiving to know that the gift was a more expensive one than the donor could well afford to give. Second, the gift should be useful, and if possible of permanent value. The toy of a child gives but a fleeting pleasure—even before Christmas day closes it is often battered and broken. The parent is always glad when the child reaches an age at which it will appreciate something more lasting.

Gifts to those who cannot repay except in gratitude are better than gifts bestowed with a hope of return with interest. On another page will be found an article calling attention to a few books which have been advertised in *THE COMMONER*. The editor has advertised these books because he believes them to be books of merit, and he has felt that in advertising them he has been doing a service to the readers as well as conferring a favor upon the publisher.

And while on the subject of gifts, it may not be out of place to suggest that gifts should not be bestowed upon those who are in official position, for even when they do not suggest an ulterior motive on the part of the donor, they embarrass the recipient. A faithful public servant receives a two-fold reward; his pecuniary compensation satisfies any legal obligations he may have against the community, and the gratitude and appreciation of his constituents fully settle his account with them. Jefferson made it a rule, while he was president, to refuse gifts of pecuniary value, and on one occasion in declining to accept a present justified himself as follows:

On coming into public office I laid it down as a law of my conduct, while I should continue in it, not to accept any present of any pecuniary value. A pamphlet, a new book, or an article of curiosity, have produced no hesitation, because below suspicion, but things of sensible value, however innocently offered in the first examples, may grow at length into abuse for which I wish not to furnish a precedent. The kindness of the motives which lead to this manifestation of your esteem, sufficiently assures me that you will approve of my desire, by a perseverance in the

rule, to retain that consciousness of a disinterested administration of public trust, which is essential to perfect tranquillity of mind.

On this question, as on other questions relating to official conduct, Jefferson was eminently sound.

THE MEANING OF BIMETALLISM.

A reader of *THE COMMONER* asks for a definition of bimetallism, and specifically inquires whether the Kansas City platform demands that the government shall maintain the parity between gold and silver.

Bimetallism is the name given to the monetary system under which gold and silver are used as full legal tender money at a fixed ratio, and admitted to unlimited coinage. The Kansas City platform declared in favor of the free coinage of silver as well as its unlimited coinage, the reason being that free coinage is now accorded to gold and was formerly accorded to both metals. Under the bimetallic system the two metals are treated exactly alike. A charge sufficient to cover the cost of coinage would, however, be entirely consistent with the bimetallic system. Mr. Carlisle favored such a change in 1878, when he denounced the gold standard, but such a charge would create a difference between the coin and the bullion value of the coin. If, for instance, the government charged one cent for converting bullion into coin, the coin would necessarily lose one cent by melting and the bullion value would, therefore, remain one cent below the coinage value.

Bimetallism does not depend upon any particular ratio. We first had bimetallism in this country at the ratio of 15 to 1, and afterwards at the ratio of 16 to 1. Other nations have had bimetallism at different ratios, as, for instance, France, at the ratio of 15 1-2 to 1. The ratio of 16 to 1 was specifically named in the Chicago platform and afterwards in the Kansas City platform, first, because that was the legal ratio existing between the metals when demonetization took place; second, because it is the ratio at which the standard silver dollars and gold coin now circulate; third, because the advocates of bimetallism believe that the opening of the mints at that ratio would create a demand for silver

which would make an ounce of silver, whether melted or coined, worth \$1.29 in gold the world over; and, fourth, because, if a new ration were desired, it would be impossible to select it intelligently without first opening the mints at the present ratio in order to measure the effect that free coinage would have upon the price of silver bullion. When the Sherman law of 1890 was enacted it was thought that it would utilize all the silver available for coinage, and under the stimulus of this law-created demand silver rose to \$1.21 an ounce, not only here, but all over the world.

It was necessary to name a specific ratio because advocates of the gold standard had for several years been securing office on indefinite or ambiguous platforms, and then, when in office, had been betraying their constituents. It became necessary to make the platform specific in order to protect the voters from fraud and deception. That necessity is still present; a general demand for bimetallism would amount to an abandonment of bimetallism because gold democrats would secure nominations on such a platform, and then, if elected, would, as they have in the past, act with the republicans to maintain the gold standard.

As to the second question, namely, whether concurrent circulation of the two metals is essential to a bimetallic system? To answer this in the negative without further explanation might lead to misunderstanding. The concurrent circulation of the two metals, while desirable, is not absolutely necessary to the maintenance of the bimetallic system, but the bimetallists believe that the parity would be maintained in this country at the ratio of 16 to 1. We had bimetallism from 1792 to 1834, during nearly all of which time gold was at a premium because our mint ratio, compared with the mint ratio of France and some other countries, undervalued gold. When in 1834 the ratio was changed from 15 to 1 to 16 to 1, silver was then undervalued, as compared with the ratio of France and some other countries, and, therefore, silver went to a premium and remained at a premium until it was demonetized. During both these periods we had bimetallism, and it was possible to coin gold or silver without limit as to amount into full legal tender money at a fixed ratio of 16 to 1, and this belief is founded upon two arguments: first, that the monetary use of silver would absorb all the silver available for coinage at our mints, thus raising the bullion price of silver to \$1.29 an ounce; and, second, that no gold nation is now coining gold and silver

at a ratio more favorable to gold than ours. If any large nation opened its mints to the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at 15 1-2 to 1, it would get some of our silver and silver would go to a premium. If, on the other hand, any large nation opened its mints to the free and unlimited coinage of both metals at the rate of 16 1-2 to 1, or some higher ratio, it would be apt to get some of our gold, and gold would go to a premium. But, under existing or probable conditions, there would be no difficulty in maintaining the parity at the ratio of 16 to 1. If there was any force in the argument made for thirty years that the parity was more difficult to maintain because the production of silver was increasing more rapidly than the production of gold, the parity ought to be more easily maintained now, since the production of gold is increasing more rapidly than the production of silver.

Two ways of maintaining the parity have been suggested. One is to put silver upon an equal footing with gold, make it a legal tender equal with gold, and enable it to do all that gold can do—this is the bimetallic plan. The other plan is to make the silver dollar redeemable in gold, but this plan converts silver into a credit money and greatly impairs its usefulness. It really makes gold the standard and silver subsidiary to it. When one metal goes to a premium it does not all leave the country. It circulates at its premium value and still contributes to the volume of money just as silver did from 1834 to 1861 and just as both gold and silver did from 1861 to 1879. If under bimetallism one metal goes to a premium the people can do whichever they prefer, viz., they can either change the ratio or bear with the inconvenience of the premium.

Some bimetallicists whose devotion to the cause cannot be doubted have expressed themselves in favor of a change in the ratio, provided it is shown by experience that the parity cannot be maintained at the ratio of 16 to 1. Others have refused to discuss this proposition; first, because a discussion of other ratios might be construed (not fairly, but unfairly) as an admission that the parity could not be maintained at 16 to 1; and, second, because the power to legislate remains with the people, and they are always at liberty to make any changes which to them may seem best. Under our form of government no unchangeable system can be established. If the people try the gold standard and do not like it, they can change it; if they try the double standard and do not like it, they

can change it; if they try one ratio and do not like it, they can try another.

In answer to those who express the fear that the parity cannot be maintained, but give no reason for their skepticism, the advocates of bimetallism express the belief that it can be maintained and give their reasons for it. Neither side can prove its position by a mathematical demonstration, but experience and argument support the bimetallists.

QUESTIONS FOR DEBATE.

THE COMMONER in a recent issue suggested the propriety of organizing debating societies throughout the country for the discussion of public questions. Since the editorial appeared a number of letters have been received asking for information and inquiring about questions for debate. Such a club is not difficult to organize. All that is necessary is a brief constitution containing one article giving the name of the club, another stating the purpose and terms of membership, and a third naming the officers and describing their duties. The by-laws should fix the hour and place of meeting and dues, if dues are necessary.

In country precincts meetings can be held at the school house or at private houses. Often literary clubs meet at the houses of the members, each one taking his turn, but sometimes when one house is commodious and centrally located it is used as the regular meeting place. Where the club meets at a private house it is well for the by-laws to provide that no refreshments shall be served, because all members may not be in a position to serve refreshments, and as no one cares to do less than his neighbor, some embarrassment might be caused if refreshments were served at one place and not another.

As to questions for debate, the following are submitted by way of suggestion:

I. Resolved, That the United States should permanently hold the Philippine Islands under a colonial form of government.

II. Resolved, That the United States should permanently hold the Philippine Islands as an integral part of this country, extending to the inhabitants the protection of our constitution and giving them the promise of ultimate citizenship and full participation in elections, national and local.

These two questions present the Philippine issue and give the advocates of imperialism a chance to present a definite plan for dealing with the Filipinos.

III. Resolved, That private monopolies are beneficial to the public and should be permitted to exist, but should be placed under government supervision.

IV. Resolved, That a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.

These questions present the trust issue in such form that the principles involved may be discussed.

V. Resolved, That this nation should maintain the gold standard as long as the other leading nations do so.

VI. Resolved, That this nation should maintain the gold standard, regardless of what other nations may do.

VII. Resolved, That bimetallism, that is the use of gold and silver as standard money and the coinage of gold and silver into standard money on equal terms, would be better for this country than the single gold standard.

VIII. Resolved, That, assuming bimetallism to be desirable, silver should be coined without charge for mintage so long as gold is coined without charge for mintage.

IX. Resolved, That, assuming bimetallism to be desirable, the mints should be opened to the coinage of silver at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1.

X. Resolved, That paper money, issued by the government, is better for the people than paper money issued by national banks.

XI. Resolved, That the national banking law should be so changed as to permit banks to issue currency based on their assets rather than upon government bonds.

XII. Resolved, That the large national banks should be permitted to establish branches throughout the country.

These questions present the phases of the money question which are most discussed at present. Those who advocate the issue of paper money by the government are divided into two classes: those who believe that the greenback should be redeemable in gold or silver—the government exercising the option as to the metal to be used—and those who believe that the greenback should not be redeemable in the sense that it is a legal tender for taxes, debts, etc. This question assumes that government money is better than bank money and raises the issue of redeemability only.

XIII. Resolved, That the Chinese exclusion act should be extended and applied to similar classes of other oriental nations.

XIV. Resolved, That the Nicaragua canal should be built, owned and protected by the United States.

XV. Resolved, That an isthmian canal should be built, owned and protected by the United States.

These two questions present the isthmian canal question in the two forms that are most discussed.

XVI. Resolved, That United States senators should be elected by direct vote of the people.

XVII. Resolved, That the principle of the initiative and referendum is sound and should be applied in state and federal government as far as is practicable.

XVIII. Resolved, That provision should be made for voluntary arbitration between corporations and their employes.

XIX. Resolved, That there should be compulsory arbitration between corporations and their employes.

XX. Resolved, That government by injunction is a menace to our government and that as a means to its correction the law should provide that a person charged with contempt of court should be given a trial by jury when the contempt is committed outside of the court room.

The above questions do not present all the issues between the two leading parties, but they present the main ones and are sufficient to furnish debating societies with material for the winter's work. They are stated in such a way as to present the issue clearly so that each side will know what it is advocating. In addition to these questions there are questions presenting the government ownership of railroads, and questions presenting the municipal ownership of lighting plants, water plants and street car lines. (These can be discussed singly or grouped together.) The question between socialism and individualism can be presented as follows:

Resolved, That the government should own and operate all the means of production and distribution.

While the editor of THE COMMONER has not attempted to mention all the questions discussed to a greater or less extent in various parts of the country, he has said enough to show how wide is the field of inquiry and how imperative the necessity for investigation if one would act intelligently upon public questions.

XVII.

TOO GREAT AN ADVANTAGE.

A reader of *THE COMMONER* complains that national banks enjoy too great a privilege in being permitted to loan out five or ten times their capital stock. He shows the disadvantages of the ordinary individual as compared with the bank. While, as he points out, the bank has a great advantage in the earning of an income and in the accumulation of wealth, there is another objection, and an even more serious one, to the manner in which banking is done at present. When a bank with a capital of one million is allowed to receive and loan out deposits amounting to ten millions, the depositor does not have a sufficient margin for security. A little shrinkage in values wipes out the capital stock and leaves the depositor no security save the notes taken by the bank. In good times such a bank makes enormous profits and in bad times its failure brings disaster to depositors and is likely to cause a run on banks more wisely conducted. There ought to be a fixed relation established by law between capital and deposits, so that there would always be a safe margin for the protection of the depositors of the community. But how can banks be made safe as long as the financiers control eongress?

ADMIRAL SCHLEY.

If Admiral Schley needed a vindication he obtained it in the splendid tribute paid him by Admiral Dewey in the latter's minority report. In truth Admiral Schley did not need a vindication. In the judgment of the American people he is one of this country's great naval heroes, and this is shown to be true by the very general condemnation which the court of inquiry's report has met with on the part of the public.

Admiral Schley's detractors appear to be very anxious to drop the affair. Some of them declare that there is no need for further investigation. *THE COMMONER* is inclined to believe that further investigation is not needed. It is true, however, that something

remains to be done in order that justice should be accorded the hero of Santiago bay.

Instead of the congressional investigation into facts that are already established to the satisfaction of the American people, Schley should be restored to active service, and he should be appointed vice admiral to hold the place during the remainder of his life. Anything less would be inadequate.

If a congressional investigation is to be had it should not be an investigation of a hero; the naval officers and employes who are responsible for the assaults upon Schley should be investigated for the benefit of the service in the future.

NEW YEAR'S DAY RESOLUTIONS.

While a good resolution can be made at any season, the beginning of the New Year seems an appropriate time for "turning over a new leaf." It ought not to be difficult to give up a bad habit since an intelligent self-interest prompts one to do that which will be of benefit to himself, and yet some special stimulus is often necessary.

THE COMMONER is published primarily for the support and advancement of democratic principles. The editor desires to aid in securing those reforms which he believes would be helpful to the people generally, but he recognizes that under the most just government and the most perfect laws individual happiness would largely depend upon individual merit. Even when the government does all that it can it cannot make a wicked man happy or protect a thoughtless man from the trouble which his conduct invites.

As our lives are built upon ideals, the greatest service which can be rendered to one is to raise his ideals and give him a broader view of life. A parent does this by example and by daily precept; the teacher in the pulpit and in the school room does the same and the editor is not without responsibility. Every one, in fact, has some influence on some one and that influence ought to be exerted for good.

What is the value of an ideal? Sometimes it measures the difference between success and failure—between happiness and despair.

Instead of recommending that each reader of THE COMMONER

give up that habit which his own conscience most condemns, the editor suggests that the readers spend a part of New Year's Day considering this proposition, namely, that every one owes it to himself, to his kindred and to his country, (not to speak of the obligation to his creator), to so develop and use his body, head and heart, as to contribute the most possible to the welfare and happiness of mankind. If this proposition is sound, then it follows that each individual is in duty bound to do whatever increases, and to abstain from whatever decreases, his usefulness.

If, during 1902, the readers of *THE COMMONER* will measure life by this rule there will be less to regret at the end of the year, no matter what the administration may do.

Improvement becomes an easier task when one's conduct is regulated by a high and determined purpose. There is inspiration in the philosophy of Socrates and his words are commended to those who are earnest in their desire for self-improvement. When the illustrious Greek was about to be condemned to death, and his friends urged him to spend more time preparing his defense, he replied that he had passed his whole life in preparing his defense, for he had gone through life "doing nothing but considering what was just and what unjust, doing what was just and abstaining from what was unjust," and he rightly considered this the best preparation for his defense against any charge that could be preferred.

THE PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

On another page will be found an abstract of the Philippine tariff measure passed by the House of Representatives, practically by a party vote. It is one of the most shameless pieces of legislation ever proposed by any party and it ought to seal the political fate of any man who supports it. England, in her oppression of the American colonies, was never guilty of anything more tyrannical, and even Spain, whose despotism aroused our country to armed protest in behalf of Cuba—even Spain lacked the refined cruelty which republican leaders practice with seeming enjoyment. While the West Indies were under the rule of the Castilian they enjoyed free trade with the mother country and had representation in the imperial parliament, but the Filipinos, after co-

operating with us against Spain, were bought like chattels from a vanquished foe and placed under the control of high-priced carpet-bag officials. Now they are to be shut out from commercial intercourse with the United States by a high tariff wall constructed to enable a few American manufacturers to grow rich at the expense of the rest of the people and denied representation in the legislature which taxes them. The democrats in the house of representatives have greatly strengthened their party by their vigorous opposition to the measure. The short time given for debate in the house makes it imperative that the democrats of the senate shall present to the public through the *Congressional Record* the facts relative to colonialism as thus far developed.

SECRETARY GAGE'S REPORT.

In his annual report Secretary of the Treasury Gage has recommended a shipping subsidy; the repeal of minor war taxes; a central bank; the creation of a national clearing house of national banks; the enlargement of the limit of subsidiary silver coinage to \$120,000,000, and the asset currency plan.

Concerning the latter proposition, Secretary Gage's recommendation embodies practically the provisions of the Overstreet bill or the McCleary bill. The secretary of the treasury appears to be fully convinced as to the propriety of this plan. He thinks that at least two beneficial results would follow. He thinks that \$60,000,000 in United States bonds, now in security, would be gradually released for sale in the general market. The impounding of the greenbacks as security for the bank notes would, he thinks, relieve the government from all the burdens now incident to their redemption to an extent of \$200,000,000. For the balance of \$146,000,000 in legal tender notes which would then be outstanding, the \$150,000,000 in gold now held as a special redemption fund would soon be excessive. If this were reduced to \$146,000,000 the greenbacks would become virtually what Secretary Gage thinks they ought to be in reality, gold certificates. In reality, Secretary Gage's plan contemplates the actual retirement of the greenbacks and the substitution of a national banking currency for the government currency, giving to the national banks, in addition to the enormous power they already possess, the privilege

of doing an immense amount of business on wind. This is "sound finance"; this would be the realization of "a wise and business-like financial policy," according to the republican theory. This represents, in the most presentable form, the purpose of republican financiers. The American people have not yet begun to realize the responsibilities they were assuming when they elected and re-elected the republican party to power; but day by day the plans of republican leaders are being unfolded; and "little by little, but steadily, as man's march to the grave," the republican leaders are transforming liberty into license, and no one need be surprised if "asset currency" and branch banks, in a short time, become realities.

THE EXPORT TAX DECISION.

The federal constitution provides: "No tax or duty shall be levied on articles exported from any state." Congress levied a duty on goods going from the United States to Porto Rico. The supreme court has held this duty to be not in violation of the constitution.

It is fair to say that the court expressly disavows any inclination to sanction an export tax, and yet it is not unfair to say that this disavowal was necessary in order for the judges to seriously maintain the position they assumed.

If a tax levied upon goods going from the United States is not an export tax, then it is difficult to understand what would be an export tax. The court, however, speaking through Justice Brown, reasons that "if a tax levied by congress on articles exported from the United States to the insular possessions is an export tax, then congress can neither levy such tax nor delegate authority to do so to an insular legislature like that of Porto Rico, and congress cannot delegate a power which it does not itself possess."

That is quite clear and the students of government in this country have, for many years, been impressed with the idea that congress does not possess the power to levy upon any territory or people, subject to United States jurisdiction, a tax that does not also apply to all territory and all people under that jurisdiction. Students of government in this country have long been impressed with the idea that congress cannot delegate even to that remarkable

institution known as "insular legislature" a power which congress does not itself possess.

The court, however, insists that "the maintenance of a separate economic system in an insular country would become practically impossible so far as its commercial relations with the United States were concerned," if these strange doctrines did not prevail. And the court holds that inasmuch as Porto Rico is not foreign territory, goods shipped to Porto Rico are not exports.

This same reasoning would sustain the claim that a tax levied on goods shipped from one state to another was not an export tax because the state or territory to which the goods were billed was not foreign territory.

Chief Justice Fuller and Justices Harlan, Brewer and Peckham hold that the duty imposed is export in its character, and that the fact that it was levied for the benefit of Porto Rico does not alter the situation. It is difficult to describe judicial decisions, to sustain which the fundamental law must be twisted and distorted or abandoned altogether. It is difficult to understand how any one could consider a tax levied on goods exported from the United States as anything other than an export tax; and it is safe to say that in the fullness of time, when the new and strange doctrine is abandoned, the position taken by the chief justice and Justices Harlan, Peckham and Brewer will be vindicated by popular judgment as completely as they must now be vindicated in the mind of every student of government.

BRANCH BANKS.

In his annual report Secretary Gage recommends a great central bank. He says that the existing system does not afford "the highest assurance of protection" and does not establish "a bond of cohesion, the power of co-operative action, the ability to co-ordinate for the general good or for mutual defense," such as would be provided by a central institution with multiplied branches. Those who have carefully observed the part which the banking institutions have played in the politics of the country will obtain a hint of the enormous power a central bank, with "multiplied branches" would wield when they observe that the promoters of the proposed system believe that between the banks as organized

to-day there is no "bond of cohesion" and no "power of co-operative action." Mr. Gage says that the proposition for a large central bank with broad powers for establishment of branches "offends the common instincts of our people," and "may be looked upon at present as impossible of realization." We may accept this language, then, while giving no encouragement for the immediate present, as holding out the hope that after a while, when the people shall have become quite accustomed to republican impositions of all kinds, the "common instincts of our people" may be violated with impunity and even a central bank may be established.

If this proposition does now offend the "common instincts of our people" what manner of official is this who holds out even the smallest hope that the offense may yet be given?

The "common instincts of our people" have provided the safeguard of our liberty and have insured the perpetuation of free government. If Mr. Gage shall finally succeed in establishing this "offense" to the "common instincts of our people," he must either effect a complete change in those "instincts" or he must place the people in such a state of servitude that they will not be able to give expression to their "common instincts."

The central bank is not the only republican proposition that offends the "common instincts of our people," and yet in many other instances the republican party has ignored these "instincts" and established un-American policies without the slightest regard for public criticism. May it not be possible that Mr. Gage has some warrant in believing that the time will come when even on the question of a great central bank, the "common instincts of our people" may be defied with impunity by the republican party?

AS OTHERS SEE US.

Those who are inclined toward imperialism ought to find a warning in the views now being expressed by the eminent men of other lands. An American student at Heidelberg, Germany, sends to *THE COMMONER* the following extract from a lecture delivered by Professor Jellineck of the Heidelberg University. In discussing international law, the professor said: "The Spanish American war was of immense importance in the future development of international law. America, whose policy previously had

been to abstain, in accordance with the principles of the Monroe doctrine, from the affairs of European governments, now abandoned that position and became one of the powers. The people are divided into supporters and opponents of the present policy, and if the former, who have been called imperialists, succeed the organization of the government will inevitably become similar to that of European countries; individual liberty—the rights of each particular man—will be sacrificed in securing a strong central direction.”

The German professor is entirely correct. If the imperialists continue in authority, the organization of the government will gradually be changed and made more like that of European countries. This is the necessary result of imperialism and it is because this is the inevitable end of an imperialistic policy that such a policy is resolutely opposed by democrats who love a republican form of government and who believe that individual liberty and self-government are infinitely more important to the American people than anything that imperialism can bring.

GETTING DOWN RAPIDLY.

The *New York World*, in its issue of November 27, printed under a Washington date a statement which its correspondent attributes to a member of Mr. Roosevelt's cabinet. This cabinet member is reported to have said that “all the leading high protectionists of the country have seen the president's message, and all are satisfied with it. Undoubtedly it will strike many readers as a strong reciprocity message, but we understand that if it is subjected to analysis it will be found that the language will be susceptible to an interpretation that will give cheer to every protectionist in the country, who has been fearful that something would be done about reciprocity in the coming congress.”

It must be admitted by those who have now read the president's message that this cabinet member's statement was an accurate one. Although republican papers very generally commended Mr. McKinley's last speech at Buffalo, wherein he upheld reciprocity, not as merely the “handmaiden of protection,” but as an essential departure from the protective theory, the same papers did not hesitate to enthusiastically commend Mr. Roosevelt's mes-

sage, in which, as accurately anticipated by this cabinet member, the supporters of reciprocity obtained no encouragement.

This same cabinet member is quoted by the *World* as indulging in some very blunt statements regarding Mr. McKinley's Buffalo speech. This is what this cabinet member said:

' We cannot get down from President McKinley's position too rapidly. That would be unkind to his memory and impolitic. But we can get down, and we will, and by the end of the Fifty-seventh congress we will be just where we started, with no reciprocity of any consequence and with all our protection.

There you have it, blunt and plain. Although Mr. McKinley's last speech was said to outline the future policy of the republican party, here we have a cabinet officer making the frank and candid statement that in the repudiation of Mr. McKinley's position, in deference to his memory, republican leaders will go slow; and yet that position will be repudiated, and in spite of all the commendatory utterances of the republican press concerning the Buffalo speech, "by the end of the Fifty-seventh congress, we will be just where we started, with no reciprocity of any consequence and with all our protection."

REPUBLICANS PREVENT DISCUSSION.

Since the adoption of the Reed rules the republicans have allowed but scant time for the discussion of important questions. They often bring up a proposition, rush it through the committee at break-neck speed, adopt a rule allowing a few hours for debate and dispose of it before the people at large know what is going on. When the Reed rules were adopted they were defended on the ground that they were intended to cut off filibustering, but they are now used to prevent the deliberation necessary to intelligent action.

While the democrats are powerless to secure sufficient time for debate so long as the republicans are disposed to deny their request they ought to register a protest every time an attempt is made to summarily dispose of important measures. The democrats have a right to demand a roll call and on roll call they can vote no, thus throwing upon the republicans responsibility for any unreasonable curtailment of discussion.

The time allowed for debate on the Philippine tariff was grossly inadequate, and in view of the time wasted by adjournments and recesses, the limitation was utterly inexcusable. Other bills will be pressed involving the welfare of the whole country, and the democrats ought to see to it that there is ample time for debate or at least compel the republicans to bear the odium that must ultimately fall upon those who prevent a thorough discussion of public questions. If the democrats agree to a rule which follows too limited a debate, they then share responsibility with the republicans; when they resist the rule they compel the republicans to bear the responsibility alone. A resolute and persistent opposition on the part of the democratic minority will force the republicans to give more time to debate than will be allowed if the democrats surrender their contention on the theory that a contest is useless.

No effort is useless which calls public attention to vicious measures; no debate is profitless which informs the public in regard to those measures.

UNJUST DISCRIMINATION.

The post office department is discriminating against newspapers published in the interest of political reforms. *The Challenge*, a socialistic paper published at Los Angeles and later at New York; the *Appeal to Reason*, a socialistic paper published at Girard, Kansas; the *Farmers' Advocate*, of Topeka, Kansas, and the *Pawnee Chief*, of Pawnee City, Nebraska (both the latter antagonistic to republican policies), have recently been asked to show cause why they should not be denied second class rates. The post office department justified its action in regard to *The Challenge* on the ground that that paper was violating the following provision of the statute: Provided, however, that nothing herein contained shall be construed as to admit to the second class rate regular publications designed primarily for advertising purposes or for free circulation at nominal rates." It was asserted by the department that *The Challenge* was the personal organ of its owner and publisher; that it was a vehicle for his articles on public questions, the announcement of his lecture subjects and their places and dates; the printing of those lectures or speeches after delivery;

the printing of newspaper comment thereon, and also the printing of letters and invitations to speak and the replies of the editor thereto.

The department alleged that these things filled the columns of the publication; that it contained little or no matter which did not pertain to the editor, and that he confessed his intention to advertise himself, his sayings and his doings.

Whether the editor conducted his paper in a modest way or whether he unduly injected himself into his paper is not a question with which the post office department has anything to do. The third assistant postmaster general is not a censor in the sense that he is to supervise the editorial management of a paper. If the editor of *The Challenge* advertises himself in such a way as to make the paper offensive to his readers, the readers have their remedy; they can refuse to receive his paper.

In regard to the *Appeal to Reason* the post office department claims that it violated the ruling requiring approximately half of the circulation to be composed of subscriptions paid for by bona fide subscribers. The department resorted to the test which is customary in such cases, namely, it sent out inquiries to one hundred of the readers asking whether they were bona fide subscribers, and received answers from sixty-six. Out of sixty-six thirty-seven claimed that they were subscribers, while twenty-nine denied that they were subscribers. Thirty-four did not answer at all.

Upon this showing an order was issued denying the paper second class privileges until it could show that approximately half of its readers were bona fide subscribers. This test is not a fair one. Because a letter to a subscriber was not answered or because the answer was delayed until the department had already acted does not raise a presumption sufficiently strong to justify the department in putting the publisher to the expense of a trial. The answers received furnish information, but unanswered letters ought not to count against the publisher.

In the case of the *Appeal to Reason* a clear majority of those who answered claimed to be subscribers.

The charge made against the *Farmers' Advocate* was that it did not comply with the law requiring that a majority of the circulation be composed of bona fide subscriptions. Just how the test was made is not known, but if it was made as it was in the case of the *Appeal to Reason*, what has been said in that case will

apply to the *Farmers' Advocate*. It may be added that the *Advocate* has been put to this trouble so often that it smacks of persecution.

The charge against the *Pawnee Chief* was that it was conducted primarily for advertising purposes. As the editor has presented his proofs on the subject it is probable that the case will be decided in his favor and that he will be relieved from further embarrassment. But there is evidence of the purpose of the department to discriminate against political papers.

While it is perfectly proper that there should be a reasonable proportion between the number of actual subscribers and the total circulation (and the proportion fixed is reasonable) the department has issued an order which is unjust to papers which are published in the interest of legislative reform. According to the ruling of the department a "reasonable number" of papers can be subscribed for by others and counted among bona fide subscriptions, provided the paper is not subscribed for "because of the doctrines it advocates or because of the goods it advertises." In other words, if a man is interested in a paper because it gives the most foreign news or the most domestic news or the best report of prize fights or the most complete review of criminal doings or of divorce proceedings, it is perfectly proper to send it to a friend, but if he subscribes for the paper because it discusses political questions in which he is interested, the subscription cannot be counted in the "legitimate list of subscribers." It would be difficult to conceive of a more unfair discrimination against reform papers. It would be difficult to imagine a rule more capable of misuse and tyrannical abuse, and the present congress should immediately take such action as will be necessary to correct this ruling. To say that a paper which has no political principles shall have an advantage over a paper which has political principles is worse than ridiculous. To say that an editor who is more interested in current news than he is in the science of government should have an advantage over an editor who endeavors to make his paper instrumental in securing good government is a reflection upon the intelligence or the patriotism of the man who is responsible for the order.

At this time the rule can be used to discriminate against democratic papers, but under a democratic administration the same rule might be used to discriminate against republican papers. The

fact that it is just now used to discriminate against socialistic papers does not alter the case. THE COMMONER is not an advocate of the doctrines supported by *The Challenge* and the *Appeal to Reason*, but THE COMMONER is an advocate of free speech and of a free press, and it does insist that discussion is the only means of arriving at the truth. If an editor has anything to say in regard to political principles or public policies, let him say it. If his reasoning is sound, his cause will grow; if his argument is faulty, his cause will fail. Let him appeal to public opinion; before that court all questions are finally settled, and we must assume that under free discussion they will be settled right. If a man reads a paper and likes it, he ought to be permitted to subscribe for it for his neighbor; if his neighbor accepts the paper he is a subscriber as much as if he paid for it himself. If he does not want the paper he can refuse to receive it, and then the paper cannot be counted in the list of legitimate subscribers.

It is necessary that we should have laws defining and limiting the postal privileges, but in construing them the department should observe the spirit of the laws and not pervert them to suit the whims or prejudice of the man at the head of the department.

AN INSTANCE OF TAX DODGING.

One of the companies established to facilitate the organization of trusts has issued an interesting little pamphlet setting forth the advantages of New Jersey over New York. At the same time the pamphlet throws a side light upon the motives of the republican governor of New York. It quotes the *New York Herald* of December 6 as saying: "It was in the hope of attracting aggregations of capital to incorporate in this state that the governor had the last legislature to pass an act liberalizing the corporation laws by reducing the organization taxes from one-eighth of one per cent. to one-twentieth of one per cent. of their capitalization, besides making additional exemptions favorable to concerns which obtain their charters here."

The *Herald* complains that even these concessions were not sufficient to induce the Northern Securities company to take out a New York charter, as New Jersey was even more liberal. The pamphlet says: "The laws of New Jersey governing the formation

and management of corporations are so framed as to invite confidence and investment." In another sentence the pamphlet pays a doubtful compliment to the New Jersey courts, saying: "The judiciary of New Jersey is above reproach and corporations organized in that State are not subject to nonsensical attacks."

Any law or regulation that has for its object the protection of the public or the compelling of a corporation to bear its share of public burdens is always considered "nonsensical" by those who derive profit from favoritism shown great corporations.

As an illustration of the difference between New York and New Jersey the pamphlet says: "In the year 1899 the United Verde Copper Company as a New York corporation paid to New York city taxes to about the amount of \$34,000 on an assessed valuation of \$1,433,920, to which the court of appeals said one million more might properly have been added. In the year 1900 the United Verde Copper Company, as a foreign corporation, paid to New York city taxes to the amount of \$235 on an assessed valuation of \$10,000. In each case the capitalization, assets and business of the corporation were the same. The difference in annual charges between \$34,000 and \$235 represents the net disadvantage of a New York corporation."

Instead of making the laws of New York more favorable to corporations organized there, why not make the laws more stringent in regard to the foreign corporations doing business there? In the instance above cited the people of New York city lost nearly \$34,000 in taxes by a nominal change in the residence of the company, and the rest of the people had to pay a little more in taxes to make up for the loss.

The only remedy suggested by corporations and friends of corporations is to relieve resident corporations of nearly all taxation in order to induce them to remain in the state, notwithstanding the fact that such a policy would permanently increase the burden upon the small property holders.

When Tom Johnson wins his Ohio fight against the tax dodgers he ought to go to New York and give some lessons down there. Or, if Mr. Johnson cannot be spared from Ohio, probably Judge Owen P. Thompson of Illinois might go to the Empire State and with the assistance of a few school teachers bring the corporations to time as he has done in his own state.

MONOPOLY DEFINED.

A reader of *THE COMMONER* asks for a definition of a private monopoly. According to one of the dictionaries "monopoly" is defined as "the exclusive right, power, or privilege of engaging in a particular traffic or business, or the resulting absolute possession or control; especially, in political economy, such control of a special thing, as a commodity, as enables the person or persons exercising it to raise the price above its real value or above the price it would bring under competition."

The essential thing in monopoly is the suspension of the law of competition. If an individual, or a group of individuals acting in concert control all of a certain product, or a sufficient amount to enable them to arbitrarily fix the price of the thing produced, they have what is called a monopoly. When such a monopoly is in private hands, the public has no protection from the selfish interest and greed of those at the head of the monopoly. It is because human beings cannot be entrusted with such power that the democratic party has denounced a private monopoly as indefensible and intolerable.

The same reader asks whether there is any difference between the private monopolies complained of by the democratic party and the "private monopolies of land values." There is no analogy between the private ownership of land and the private monopolies so generally complained of. Whether there should be private ownership of land, and whether the whole people, acting through the government, should collect a tax equivalent to the rental value—these questions can be decided upon their merits, but they ought not to be confused with the question of private monopoly. If so much of the land was owned by one person, or by a group of persons acting in concert, that competition between land owners was practically suspended—in such a case there would be an analogy between the land monopoly and the private monopolies against which legislation is being considered. At present there is competition between individual owners of land, and this competition makes it possible to secure land at a price which is proportionate to the income that can be derived from it.

It has been the policy of the government to grant to inventors a limited monopoly upon their product in order to encourage invention. When an inventor brings into existence a new and

useful appliance, he has as a reward the exclusive sale of it for a period of years. The fact that this monopoly is limited, is evidence that the general principle of monopoly is objectionable. A value limit ought to be added to the time limit so that a patent would become null and void as soon as a reasonable amount, a sum to be fixed by law, is realized from the invention.

FINANCIAL LEGISLATION.

For the benefit of those who have talked so much about the money question being dead, THE COMMONER calls attention to the fact that in accordance with the plans of the bankers bills have already been introduced into congress providing for the gold redemption of silver dollars and for an asset currency. The object of the former is to start a new endless chain which will give the financiers an excuse for demanding the retirement of the legal tender silver dollars. The asset currency measure provides for the issue of guaranteed bank notes by national banks. For the first three years the bank can only issue 20 per cent. of the face value of United States bonds deposited with the government to secure bank notes already issued, and the new guaranteed notes shall not exceed 10 per cent. of the paid up and unimpaired capital of the bank. After three years the amount may be increased to 40 per cent. of the bonds deposited and 20 per cent. of the capital of the bank. After six years the bank can increase the amount to 80 per cent. of the bonds and 40 per cent. of the capital. These notes are a lien upon the assets of the bank and are secured by a guarantee fund collected from the banks and amounting to 5 per cent. of the guaranteed notes outstanding. The banks are to pay a tax of one-half of 1 per cent. on the guaranteed notes issued.

The remaining provisions are similar to those relating to the present issue of bank notes. It ought not to be necessary to point out that this new currency not only gives great advantage to the banks, but also impairs the security of depositors. If 40 per cent. of the bank's capital is represented by bank notes outstanding and any misfortune overtakes the bank, the depositor has less protection than under the present system—and he has little enough now. It will soon become evident to the plain people that

the republican financial policy not only involves the gold standard and a national bank currency, but it involves the manipulation of the treasury department and the whole financial system in the interests of the bankers, money-owners and money-loaners.

So far as the treasury department is concerned, this is to be a government of the banks, by the banks and for the banks, so long as the republican party is in power.

These financial measures will furnish the democrats of the house and senate a splendid opportunity to point out the complete subserviency of the republican leaders to the money power.

STEADFASTNESS.

Among the traits of character which distinguished Andrew Jackson, no trait was more prominent or more helpful to his country than his steadfastness. When he believed a thing, he believed it. Where duty led, he followed without questioning. When he decided that anything ought to be done, he did it, and no power could overawe him. He did not have in his veins a single drop of "anything to win" blood. When Nicholas Biddle declared that through the national bank he could make and unmake congresses, Jackson replied that that was more power than any one man ought to have in this country, and he then began his war against Biddle and his bank which resulted in the overflow of that great financier and the institution which he so autocratically controlled. Others were afraid that Biddle's influence, if antagonized, would defeat the democratic party, but Jackson saw in it a menace to his country and he did not stop to consider what effect an attack on the bank would have on himself or on his party. He won, and we revere his name and celebrate his day. Benton, in reviewing Jackson's work, said that, as Cicero overthrew the conspiracy of Cataline and saved Rome, so Jackson overthrew the bank conspiracy and saved America.

We shall observe this day in vain if we fail to gather from the life of Jackson inspiration and encouragement for the work which lies before us. To-day, the democratic party needs to learn from the hero of New Orleans the lesson of steadfastness; it needs to learn from him, not only that to be right is more important than

to be successful, but that to be right is the best way to insure success.

A party must have principles or it can have no claim upon public confidence; and how can it commend its principles better than by standing by them? Who will have faith in the creed of a party if the party stands ready to barter away its creed in exchange for the promise of patronage? A halting, hesitating, vacillating course, not only fails to invite recruits, but it alienates and drives away veterans.

Another reason for steadfastness is found in the fact that no one can tell until the attempt is made what obstacles courage can overcome. The bold and fearless triumph where the timid fail. The victories which live and light us on to noble deeds are the victories snatched from the jaws of defeat by intrepid spirits who preferred death to retreat.

There is a profound philosophy, as well as a religious truth, in the words: "He that saveth his life shall lose it." The party that has no higher purpose than to save its own life will die because it deserves to die; the party that is willing to die, if need be, for the sake of a great cause, will live because it deserves to live.

Who says that the money power is omnipotent, and that the democratic party must compromise with it or surrender to it? Not until human nature is entirely changed can the financiers be entrusted with the guardianship of the producers of wealth; not until greed becomes just can the money changers construct a system for themselves which will be fair to any one else. A top can be balanced upon the point only when it is in rapid motion, and so the financial structure designed by Wall Street for the benefit of Wall Street, will stand upright only so long as it can be kept whirling; the collapse will come when the speed is slackened.

Who says that we cannot afford to measure strength with the great monopolies which now arrogantly assume to control the domain of politics as well as the field of industry? Not until we can gather good fruit from an evil tree, and figs from thistles, can we expect a private monopoly to bring forth public blessings. The water that has been poured into the stocks of our great corporations has for the most part been drawn from the agricultural regions, and the drouth that is sure to follow will teach the farmers the meaning of the trust system.

Must we abandon the self-evident truth that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed? Must we accept imperialism as an accomplished fact and join in the shout for blood and conquest? Our republic rests upon solid rock and while its principles are revered it cannot be overthrown from within or from without; but if all the members of all parties joined together to erect an empire upon American soil they would build upon the sand and the edifice could not endure. It is a law divine in its origin, irresistible in its force and eternal in its duration, that wrong-doing ultimately destroys the wrong-doer; no nation or combination of nations is strong enough to evade or resist retributive justice.

But suppose—what no one should assume and what no one can prove—that the steadfast adherence to democratic principles would result in repeated defeat, is that any reason why we should abandon those principles and adopt others, or have none at all? Those who prefer prison fare or a servile subject's lot to the dangers of the battlefield may condemn the Boers for continuing what some describe as a hopeless struggle for independence, but those who can measure the mighty influence of great deeds know that the sturdy Dutchmen of South Africa have already conferred upon the world a benefit that cannot be measured by money. Their valor has brought greater security to all the republics of the earth; the bodies of their dead have built a bulwark behind which the friends of liberty will fight for centuries. The fact that England has been compelled to employ more than 200,000 soldiers to subjugate less than 25,000 men in arms—the fact that England has expended more than \$1,000 per Boer—the per capita wealth of the United States—and has neither been able to purchase them nor to kill them—these facts are immeasurably valuable to people everywhere who want free government for themselves and are content that others should enjoy it also.

So, the democratic party, whether in power or out of power, is serving mankind when it stands steadfastly for constitutional government and insists that that government shall be administered according to the Jeffersonian maxim, "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

The poet laureate of England has written some verses setting forth the idea that England and the United States should be united as against the world and "stand or fall together." That there should be a friendly feeling between the people of this country and the

people of England is perfectly proper. There should be a friendly feeling between the people of this country and the people of all countries. But a distinction should be drawn between the people and the government of a nation. The English government is a monarchy, limited, it is true, in so far as the people have been able to limit it, but still a monarchy. Between the English monarchy and the American republic there can be no sympathy. Can the American people consent to an alliance which will bring upon our nation either responsibility for wrongs done by the English government or a share of the punishment which must ultimately be inflicted upon wrong-doers, whether they be individuals or nations?

England is sowing the wind; she will reap a whirlwind. This nation cannot join hands with her without adopting her policies and finally sharing in the terrible retribution which will come. Washington, Jefferson, and all the other early patriots warned us against entangling alliances, even when those alliances might have strengthened us. What excuse can there be for an alliance now, when we are strong enough to protect ourselves against all comers?

We cannot afford to be "unequally yoked together" with any government which recognizes force as the basis of government or in its administration disregards the doctrine that governments are the creatures, not the masters, of the people.

HILL'S TEMPTING OFFER.

The press dispatches announce that Mr. Hill, the financial magnate who controls the Northern Pacific and Great Northern railroads, intends to meet the rising protest against consolidation by making a material reduction in rates. This adroit move on the part of Mr. Hill will deceive many of the unwary and will be immediately utilized by corporation politicians. It ought not, however, to influence any thoughtful and patriotic citizen. That a monopoly can be benevolent is true; that it may make concessions when it has something to gain thereby is probable, but that it will in the long run be safe or helpful is impossible. A king has been known to make concessions to his subjects in order to save his life, and some kings have felt a genuine interest in the welfare of all their people, but can a monarchy be defended on these grounds?

To understand a monopoly, whether it be a railroad monopoly

or some other private monopoly, one only needs to know human nature. Human nature is so constructed that arbitrary power in the industrial field, as in the domain of government, is so likely to be abused that it cannot be justified or defended. Governor Van Sant will, of course, understand that Mr. Hill will be quite a different railroad president after he secures a legal right to control the traffic of the northwest, from what he is now, when he is trying to secure this right, and the governor will be justified in quoting an old saying that has been applied to many people in the past, is applicable to many who are alive now, and will not lose its force in years to come—namely,

*When the devil was sick the devil a saint would be,
When the devil was well the devil a saint was he.*

Mr. Hill is quite saintly just now because he is sick. He is taking the people into his confidence because he needs them in his business, but when Mr. Hill is once secure in his monopoly he will not need the people as he does now, and then he will still "take them in"—but not into his confidence. And even if Mr. Hill is so good a man as to be entirely safe, it must be remembered that Mr. Hill is mortal, and when he dies—as die some day he must—he may be succeeded by a cold and selfish man, who will use the monopoly which Mr. Hill is trying to secure without any consideration whatever for the people's welfare.

Governor Van Sant ought to plant himself upon the plank of the democratic platform which declares a private monopoly to be "indefensible and intolerable." If he will take this position he can appeal with confidence to all the democrats in the northwest and these, with a few republicans, will give him a majority.

XVIII.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANARCHY.

When congress is called upon to consider measures aimed at the suppression of anarchy there will probably be some discussion of the causes which produce anarchy, and if the republican members of congress follow the example set by republican editors, they will attempt to place upon the democratic party responsibility for recent manifestations of the anarchistic spirit in the United States. If such a charge is made it must not only be met by the democrats, but it should be met with arguments which will show that the real cause of anarchy is to be found in republican politics rather than in democratic speeches.

Republican papers are in the habit of charging the democrats with arousing passions and stirring up hatred, malice and envy. Anarchy is a protest against all forms of government, and no democrat has said anything or done anything to give encouragement to that doctrine. The democrats believe in government, and they show their love of government by trying to so improve it that it will command the confidence of all the people. The physician who suggests rules for health and applies restoratives in sickness is a better friend than the one who encourages dissipation and scoffs at the approach of disease.

Republican papers are in the habit of charging democrats with stirring up class prejudice and hatred. This would be a serious charge if founded upon fact, and it raises the question: Is it wrong to criticise a public official, or to point out the evil effects of a policy? If so, how is a reform to be accomplished? Must we assume that the president not only can do no wrong, but can make no mistake? When the Wilson bill was passed republican papers all over the country claimed that mills were closed, that men were thrown out of employment, and that destitution and starvation were brought to tens of thousands of people. If some man out of work had taken a notion to kill the author of the bill, the congressmen and senators who voted for it, or the president who permitted it to

become a law and then enforced its provisions, would the republican editors have been morally responsible for the assassination?

The republican newspapers and speakers charged that the panic of 1893 was due to the agitation of the money question. That panic broke up business men, suspended enterprises and largely increased the necessity for charity. If some one who suffered by the panic had undertaken to avenge himself by killing the advocates of bimetallism, would the republican editors have been morally responsible for the act?

The New York *Sun* recently declared that the overthrow of the trusts would cause terrible industrial disasters and the same charge has been made by other republican papers. Suppose some man who has faith in the judgment of the editor of the *Sun* undertakes to prevent the predicted calamity by killing the men who are trying to exterminate the trusts, will the *Sun* be responsible for the act?

No rule is sound which is not of general application. If the democrats must abstain from criticism for fear some ignorant or vicious man may resort to force instead of the ballot to correct the wrong, the rule must apply to republicans as well, and we must suspend entirely the discussion of these questions. The republicans say that the democrats attempt to array class against class. In the first place this is untrue in the sense in which the republicans use the term, and in the second place every editor who makes this charge is more guilty than those whom he accuses. The republicans coined the phrases, "home industries" and "infant industries"; they have appealed to the manufacturers as a class and collected large campaign funds from them on the ground that they are specially interested in republican policies. They have constantly arrayed the interests of one portion of the population against the interests of another portion. In 1896 they charged that the mine owners were seeking to secure an advantage at the expense of the rest of the people, and they asserted that debtors were trying to get out of debt by the use of cheap dollars; they excited the fears of bankers; they frightened depositors; they coerced employes. They never hesitated to attack any class or any portion of the country that opposed republican policies. In the campaign of 1900 they claimed credit for better times, and said that a panic would follow a change in administration. When they appealed to the religiously inclined, they represented imperialism as a divinely appointed chance for missionary enterprise. When they

appealed to the commercially inclined, they represented it as a profitable venture, and to those with an ambition for office they held out the possibilities of foreign service. They have never hesitated to tickle the palate of the tax-eater with promises of rich reward, and yet they complain if the attention of the taxpayer is called to the fact that he must pay the bill. The republican editors cannot point to a word spoken or an act done by those who believe in democratic doctrines which has not more than its counterpart in the constant practice of republicans.

But while we are investigating the question of responsibility let us consider whether the republicans are not morally responsible for the growth of anarchy. Anarchy is not indigenous to American soil; it is of foreign origin and culture. It is the outgrowth of conditions which to the anarchists seem unchangeable. Arbitrary power suppresses all God-given instincts and arouses a resentment that always follows the disregard of natural justice. It has been the boast of our government that it differed from the governments of Europe in that it rested upon the consent of the governed. Anything which tends to obliterate or lessen this distinction cannot but create here the conditions out of which anarchy grows.

In Europe there are classes separated by birth. Some are born to rule, others are born into the aristocracy, while the masses are born to serve. These artificial distinctions naturally excite a hatred which, when long suppressed, bursts forth into hostility to the government which recognizes and enforces these distinctions. The creation of artificial distinctions in this country tends to create the same conditions, and the republican party has done more than all other parties combined to separate the people into classes. It is assumed that only the manufacturers are capable of deciding on the tariff question and the tariff law of 1890 was, according to the testimony of a United States senator, written by the beneficiaries of the tariff. It is contended that only the financiers are competent to legislate on the financial question, and that only business men have a real and vital interest in good government. Trust magnates are allowed to select the attorney general and corporations often have a controlling influence in the appointments of judges and in the action of United States senators.

The individual who is driven into bankruptcy by a great monopoly and then sees the beneficiaries of that monopoly prominent in

society, in politics, and in the councils of the nation, is in excellent condition to listen to the theories of the anarchist. Government is a great blessing when it is administered with justice, but it appears as an unspeakable evil to the helpless citizen who is forbidden by law to avenge his own wrongs and then vainly appeals to the government for protection.

The republican party is to-day engaged in an imperial policy that will do more than all else combined to cultivate the anarchistic spirit. Those who know what imperialism is in the old country can imagine what it will be in this country when fully developed. It means a centralization of the government, followed by a gradual change which will give more emphasis to the strength of the government and less to the rights of the individual. It also means a lessening of the regard shown for human life. According to the doctrines of a republic, life and liberty are priceless; under an empire liberty is measured in dollars and cents, and life is unimportant when it stands in the way of trade. We cannot wage wars of conquest in order to help our merchants without making men a matter of merchandise; we cannot give commercial reasons for the killing of the Filipinos without arousing a discussion as to the relative value of the lives of different persons and classes, and when that discussion is once started we need not be surprised if some find it difficult to distinguish between the value of the life of the Filipino and the value of the life of an American, or between the value of the life of an ordinary citizen and the value of the life of a high official.

The sympathy expressed for England in her war against the republics of South Africa tends to identify our government with European governments and to visit upon it the condemnation visited upon governments resting upon brute force.

The suggestion recently made that we join with the nations of Europe in the extermination of anarchy looks toward a still closer union between the monarchies and aristocracies of the old world and the republic of the new world. We cannot afford to do anything which will identify a government resting upon the consent of the governed with governments whose strength rests upon enormous standing armies supported by taxation levied upon the very people whom the armies are intended to overawe.

Legally, those are responsible for the assassination of the president who committed the act or advised it, but the moral respon-

sibility is far broader, and when we find the real sources of anarchy we will find that republican policies and republican practices have contributed far more to the conditions that produced a Czolgosz than anything urged or defended by the democratic party.

IS A STORM BREWING?

The president in his message to congress uses language which indicates that he recognizes the possibility of a break in the prosperity of which republicans have boasted and desires to decrease the effect of the break when it does come. "Moreover," he says, "no law can guard against the consequences of our own folly. The men who are idle or credulous, the men who seek gains not by genuine work with head or hand, but by gambling in any form, are always a source of menace not only to themselves, but to others, If the business world loses its head, it loses what legislation cannot supply."

There is evidence that the business world has to some extent lost its head, and that a part of the present prosperity is the result of speculation which may be better defined to mean the spending now of money that must hereafter be repaid with interest.

The New York *Sun* not long ago discussed the financial condition with a tremulousness in its voice. The following is an extract from the *Sun's* article:

We can no more do without banks and a great volume of credit money in excess of the quantity of real money than we can do without railroads and the telegraph. But the possibility, nay, the certainty, of financial whirlwinds in which no house is safe is the price that nature exacts for the privilege. Obviously a great share of what is called financial genius in these days consists in the ability to discern these rising storms before their fury rages, and if a set of maxims could be deduced giving scientific information on the subject, as in the case of ordinary tempests, their value would be inestimable. One or two general laws only can be laid down whose force, common sense and experience alike attest, namely, that great financial trouble need not be feared when the credit superstructure is lifted but a little way above the money foundation; and the converse of this likewise holds. Another law is that hurricanes in the financial world don't usually rapidly succeed each other. Time is needed for them to mature. After a period of years has passed without their occurrence, then the business world

in its prosperity has grown regardless of them, and the idea pervades the community that riches can easily be acquired by making figures upon paper, then this onset should most be feared.

There must be a reasonable relation between money and credit just as there must be a reasonable relation between a man's property and his debts. As the volume of actual money is lessened in proportion to the volume of credit, our financial system becomes less stable, and disturbances are likely to be not only more frequent, but more destructive. When the bank is good no one cares to withdraw his money. The moment it gets a little weak every one demands his money. The republican financial system will be found to work better in boom times than in times of industrial depression. When the gold standard is complete the credits which are nominally payable in any kind of money will finally be payable in gold coin, and the supply of gold is insufficient. The republican party is resting its whole case on prosperity, without showing how its policies have brought prosperity or can ensure it for the future. What will the party do when the threatened disturbance comes?

LAFAYETTE'S EPITAPH.

Nearly sixty years ago S. S. Prentiss, the famous southern orator, delivered an address on Lafayette. After pointing out the great service which Lafayette had rendered to the American colonies, Mr. Prentiss said:

' The lisping infant will learn to speak his venerated name; the youth of every country will be taught to look upon his career and to follow in his footsteps. When hereafter a gallant people are fighting for freedom against the oppressor, and their cause begins to wane before the mercenary bands of tyranny, then will the name of Lafayette become the watchword that will strike with terror on the tyrant's ear, and nerve with redoubled vigor the freeman's arm. At that name many a heart before unmoved will wake in the glorious cause; and many a sword rusting ingloriously in its scabbard will leap forth to battle. Lafayette need no mausoleum. His fame is mingled with the nation's history; his epitaph is engraved upon the hearts of men.

Is there not some reason to fear that Lafayette's epitaph has become crased from the hearts of men in this country? When

we are repudiating the principles which Lafayette helped our forefathers to establish, when we withhold from Kruger's men that sympathy which our forefathers so gladly accepted from Frenchmen, when we have come to sneer at the Declaration of Independence as a bit of "rhetorical generalization," is there any wonder that Lafayette's epitaph, as described by Prentiss, has become somewhat dim?

It is true, however, as it was true when Prentiss said it, that the name of Lafayette, as well as the name of Washington and of others of his time, serves as an inspiration to people fighting for freedom against the oppressor. It cannot be doubted that the names and the deeds of these men have served as an inspiration to the South Africans as well as to other people fighting for liberty in other climes. Is it not somewhat humiliating to be brought to a realization of the fact that while the deeds of our forefathers serve as an inspiration to men who aspire to liberty, our own actions not only fail to give any encouragement to those people, but, on the contrary, have been a hindrance to those who are entitled to our sympathy?

PERRY BELMONT'S DEFEAT.

The defeat of Perry Belmont in a strong democratic district ought to show the eastern democrats the folly of nominating for national positions men who are known to antagonize democratic principles. In 1896 Mr. Belmont was a conspicuous supporter of the Palmer-Buckner movement which was organized in the interest of the republican ticket. In 1900 he was one of those who gave nominal allegiance to the democratic party, not with any desire to advance democratic principles, but for the purpose of betraying the party again into the hands of the enemy. That he should ask for the honor of a seat in congress where he could misrepresent the democracy of his state shows how little respect he has for the interests of his would-be constituents. His defeat was well merited and ought to serve as a lesson to those who assume that the voters of the party will vote for any one who may happen to be nominated, even though he be a republican masquerading as a democrat.

Mr. Belmont has given no evidence of a change of heart since 1896, and until he does he ought not to expect the confidence of those who were loyal then. When he does undergo a change of

heart he will be so ashamed of his past conduct that he will be content with the position of a private in the ranks until he can prove his repentance by his works.

A CHANGE OF BASE.

Although we may deplore the lowering of ideals that has taken place in the *Outlook*, we must give its editor credit for recognizing the inconsistency between the Declaration of Independence and the Philippine policy of the republican administration. In a recent editorial he speaks of the principle that "all governments exist for the benefit of the governed." One does not have to be learned in the science of government nor far advanced in the knowledge of language to recognize the wide difference between the principle above stated and the self-evident truth that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." The principle stated in the *Outlook* is one that has been asserted by every king and potentate who claimed to rule by right divine. A man would be a monster who would defend a government upon any other theory, but while this is the theory usually put forward in defense of monarchies and aristocracies, the all important question is, Who shall decide what is for the "benefit of the governed"? Shall this question be decided by a king, or by a few, or shall it be decided by the people themselves? The trouble with one who rules by arbitrary power is that he insists upon deciding what government is best for his subjects, and then he insists upon shooting them if they do not agree with him in regard to the merits of the government which he proposes, and under which they must live. The whole difference between a government resting upon force and a government resting upon the consent of the governed is involved in the difference between the *Outlook's* idea of government and the theory of government set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

Jefferson defended the view embodied in the Declaration of Independence. In his first inaugural message he said: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he then be trusted with the government of others, or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him?" Lincoln announced the same doctrine when he said that God never

made a man good enough to govern another man without the other man's consent.

It behooves us to analyze the principles which underlie imperialistic policies, and when those principles are understood they will be found to be not new ones just discovered, but the old and blood-stained ones, trampled under the feet of the soldiers who enlisted under the banner of Washington.

THE NICARAGUAN CANAL.

The Nicaraguan canal bill passed the house January 9 by a vote of 308 to 2. Although but two votes were cast against the measure, it was evident that there was considerable opposition because of the various amendments proposed during the bill's consideration. For instance, the proposition that the president be empowered, if, in his judgment it seemed best, to purchase and complete the Panama route, providing the same could be purchased for \$40,000,000, received 102 votes, 170 votes being cast in the negative. Mr. Cannon, of Illinois, led the fight in favor of the Panama route, or rather, against the bill itself; and yet, on the final proposition as to the passage of the bill, Mr. Fletcher, a republican member from Minnesota, and Mr. Lassiter, a democratic member from Virginia, were the only members voting against the measure. It is to be hoped that the senate will, without unnecessary delay, pass the Nicaraguan bill. It is important that the construction work on this great enterprise be commenced as soon as possible. It is true that the eleventh hour offer of the Panama canal people may persuade some to the notion that, "all things considered," the Panama route would be the better one; but those who have no particular reason aside from the question of public interest for preferring one route over the other, will find it difficult to escape the conclusion that, however disinterested the offer of the Panama people may be with respect to the primary question of the canal's prompt construction, there are some interests that would take advantage of this late-day offer to delay the building of any canal across the isthmus. Senator Hanna, for instance, is, by the *Chicago Tribune*, credited with being "an outspoken opponent of the Nicaraguan canal bill."

The *Tribune* says that "Mr. Hanna spoke without reserve," and in explaining Mr. Hanna's position, the *Tribune* says:

Senator Hanna is not so much an advocate of the Panama idea as he is an opponent of the Nicaraguan route, and that he opposes only because he thinks it is not the best one geographically or financially. Mr. Hanna, indeed, is inclined to believe that the old Darien route is the one that offers the best advantage, all things considered.

About a year ago he had his attention called to the reports made upon this route at various times and talked with one of the engineers, who found in an out of the way place some maps and drawings which he brought to the attention of President McKinley, and through him to Senator Hanna. It is probable that the fact of the Darien route, which seems to have been entirely lost upon the present generation of congressmen, may be submitted to the senate committee during its consideration of the canal question and to the senate when the bill comes before that body.

This would seem to be a fairly accurate description of the attitude of those who oppose the Nicaraguan canal. For instance, according to the *Tribune*, Senator Hanna is "not so much an advocate of the Panama route as he is an oponent of the Nicaraguan route"; and, indeed, according to the *Tribune*, "Mr. Hanna is inclined to believe that the old Darien route is the one that offers the best advantage, all things considered."

What is the fair interpretation of this position? It would seem to be that Mr. Hanna and the men who stand with him in opposing the Nicaraguan route are not so much agitated because of geographical considerations, or because of economical questions, as they are by the determination that no canal shall be constructed across the isthmus until their individual or political interest in the canal becomes greater than it now is. As a matter of fact, the American people are very generally in favor of an isthmian canal. Had the Panama route been agreed upon by the commission, undoubtedly that route would now be in high popular favor. But the people seem to have settled upon the Nicaraguan route, not because of any particular prejudice in favor of that route, but because the Nicaraguan plan seems to give the best promise of an early completion of the much desired result.

Many powerful influences are at work, not particularly against the Nicaraguan route, but against any isthmian canal. One pretext and another will be resorted to in order to destroy the pri-

mary object. In the prompt passage of the Nicaraguan bill, the house of representatives has set a good example for the senate. It is also gratifying that no partisanship entered into the battle for an isthian canal in the house. Let us hope that the senate will speedily dispose of this question. The specious pleading of men who insist that they are not so much advocates of the Panama route as they are opponents of the Nicaraguan route, or that "indeed" they are inclined to believe that the old Darien route is the one that "offers the best advantage, all things considered"—let us hope that the specious pleading of these men will be ignored in the very general demand that the congress pave the way for a prompt beginning of the enterprise in which the American people have so deep an interest.

THAT POPULIST INFLUENCE.

The re-organizers are always complaining of the influence which the populists have exerted upon the democratic party in recent years. Whenever a re-organizer wants to find fault with the democratic platform or any part of it, he denounces it as populist. The fact is, most of the things which are complained of as populist were advocated by the democrats before the populist party was organized, and that which the democrats did borrow from the populist party was indorsed by practically all of the democratic party prior to the Chicago convention. Take, for instance, the question of free silver. The democratic party in congress had for years been contending for the very thing which the Chicago platform indorsed. Time and again before there was a populist party nearly all of the democrats in both house and senate had voted for the financial system indorsed by the platform. They had voted for free coinage and for unlimited coinage; they had voted for a bill opening the mints at the ratio of 16 to 1 without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation, and no national democratic platform had ever announced a different doctrine. The Chicago convention opposed the national bank of issue, but in so doing it was entirely consistent with the party record.

The Chicago platform indorsed the income tax. The principle of the income tax had been indorsed in previous populist plat-

forms, but it had also been embodied in the revenue measure passed by congress in 1894. Comparatively few of the democrats in the house and senate voted against the income tax, Senator Hill, of New York, being the most rabid of its opponents. While it was known to the democrats in congress that Mr. Cleveland did not favor an individual income tax, he allowed the bill containing this tax to become a law without his signature. The opposition to the income tax plank has not been directed so much to the principle involved as to the wording of the platform, and the wording of the platform was not suggested by anything the populist party had ever said or done.

Government by injunction was also denounced in the Chicago platform, but it will be remembered that the United States senate had already passed, practically without opposition, the bill which the democratic platform commended.

These are the propositions usually referred to as populist, and yet, while the populist and democratic party agree on these propositions, they are thoroughly democratic, and no democrat can consistently object to them merely because the populist party also favors them.

But why should men who voted the republican ticket find fault with populists who supported the democratic ticket? Should men who supported the Palmer and Buckner ticket feel aggrieved because the populists were more anxious than they to secure the reforms for which the democratic party had been working? If men are to be judged by their actions rather than by their words, the populists are much more in sympathy with democratic principles than those who spend their time criticising and carping at the populists.

WHY NOT STATE OF JEFFERSON?

Why is there so much delay in admitting the territories? The republicans have in two campaigns pledged themselves unequivocally to the admission of the territories, and yet they seem more interested in ship subsidy bills and other measures that they dared not specifically indorse, than in the measures which they so strongly advocated.

Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma, including the Indian

Territory, are ready for admission. It is to be hoped that the controversy over single or double statehood will not prevent the admission of Oklahoma. If Oklahoma and the Indian Territory cannot agree upon a name, why not drop "Indian Territory" and "Oklahoma" and substitute the name of "Jefferson" for both? The state of Indiana preserves the Indian name, and the name of Oklahoma can be preserved in some local way. The land embraced in the Indian and Oklahoma territories is the last of the Louisiana Purchase to be incorporated into a state. It would be a fitting tribute to Jefferson to thus give his name to a part of the territory purchased under his administration. It would probably require a year for the necessary formalities, so that the admission of the state and the adoption of the name would be a fitting celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the great trans-Mississippi region.

Washington's name has already been given to a state, and Jefferson stands next to Washington among the presidents and beside him in services rendered to the American people.

MANIFEST DESTINY.

One of the most interesting of the books published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., is Theodore Roosevelt's book on Thomas Benton. It appeared in the Statesman's Series and was copyrighted in 1886. In this book the president of the United States gave special attention to a phrase which was much used just before the civil war, but not much used afterwards until it was employed as an excuse for the exploitation of the Philippines. On page 40, Mr. Roosevelt said:

Among such people Benton's views and habits of thought became more markedly western and ultra-American than ever, especially in regard to our encroachments upon the territory of neighboring powers. The general feeling in the West upon this last subject afterwards crystallized into what became known as the "Manifest Destiny" idea, which, reduced to its simplest terms, was: that it was our manifest destiny to swallow up the land of all adjoining nations who were too weak to withstand us; a theory that forthwith obtained immense popularity among all statesmen of easy international morality.

At that time the author did not like the doctrine of "manifest destiny"; his conscience would not permit him to indorse a policy of swallowing up even adjoining nations merely because they were too weak to withstand us. How could he have condemned the doctrine more severely than he did when he suggested that it became immensely popular among "all statesmen of easy international morality"?

It will be seen that it contained a moral question as well as a political one. If it was then immoral to swallow up the land of adjoining nations who were too weak to withstand us, is it now moral to cross an ocean seven thousand miles wide and swallow up the land of nations that do not adjoin us, merely because they were too weak to withstand us?

On another page he spoke of this method of securing land by conquest in even harsher terms. He said: "This belligerent, or, more properly speaking, piratical way of looking at neighboring territory, was very characteristic of the West, and was at the root of the doctrine of 'manifest destiny.'" "Manifest destiny" at that time was a belligerent and piratical doctrine; can it be Christian and benevolent now? On page 266 of Mr. Roosevelt's book the author very clearly outlined the difference between the American method of expansion and the European policy of imperialism. He said:

Of course no one would wish to see these or any other settled communities now added to our domain by force; we want no unwilling citizens to enter our union; the time to have taken the lands was before settlers came into them. European nations war for the possession of thickly settled districts which, if conquered, will for centuries remain alien and hostile to the conquerors; we, wiser in our generation, have seized the waste solitude that lay near us, the limitless forests and never ending plains, and the valleys of the great, lonely rivers; and have thrust our own sons into them to take possession; and a score of years after each conquest we see the conquered land teeming with a people that is one with ourselves.

He recognized that it was contrary to the principles of a republic to incorporate unwilling citizens into the union; he recognized that people taken by conquest would "for centuries remain alien and hostile to the conquerors." If he knew this then how could he so forget his knowledge of history as to think that

the Filipinos would soon be friends to their conquerors? Are we less "wise" now than when he wrote?

Attention is called to the change that has come over the president merely as an illustration of the fact that republican policies to-day are in violation of history and of human nature, as well as in violation of the doctrines promulgated by the very same republicans before the thirst for empire overcame them?

When Mr. Roosevelt discussed the subject of imperialism seventeen years ago he used American language to defend American principles; when Mr. Roosevelt speaks as a republican president of the United States exercising in the Philippines the same power that the king of England exercises in India, he uses European language to defend European principles.

The doctrine of "manifest destiny" is merely a piece of hypocrisy used to excuse a policy which cannot be defended on principle. It would be better and more candid for the republican leaders to defend imperialism as the habitual drunkard defends his intoxication, by saying that the appetite is stronger than the will.

TRUSTS RETARD PROGRESS.

The above heading was suggested by a travelling man (and THE COMMONER entertains a high opinion of the energy and intelligence of travelling men) who gave some illustrations in support of the proposition. He called attention to a certain manufacturer who, while he was engaged in an independent industry, made great improvements in the product of his factory, and thus gave his wares a high standing among dealers. When he joined with others in forming a trust for the control of that industry, improvement stopped. After awhile this particular factory was shut down, and the trust no longer felt it necessary to improve the quality of the goods. Meanwhile, the trust raised the price of the goods about 33 per cent., thus lessening the demand for them and reducing the labor necessary to produce them. After awhile some independent factories started up, and, spurred on by the necessity which competition creates, they began improving the quality of their product. The trust reduced prices more than 25 per cent. in order to kill off the new enterprises. What the result will be remains to be seen. Whether the independent factories will be able to survive

depends partly upon the financial ability of the owners of the independent enterprises and partly upon their power to withstand temptation. After the trust has shown its power to destroy the profits of the independent enterprises it will probably offer a price sufficiently large to induce the individual manufacturers to give up the contest and pocket the profits. The trust can afford to do this, for by raising prices it can soon collect from the whole people all that it paid to destroy competition and afterwards it will have the field to itself until some new competitor has to be bought off.

The point made by the travelling man is a good one, namely, that competition results in the constant improvement of the product, while monopoly makes this constant improvement unnecessary. This is a fact to be considered by those who regard trusts as an economic development. They are not an economic development. A monopoly in private hands is not an economic development, for economy in production is more than offset by the deterioration in quality which follows when the manufacturer is relieved from the stimulus of competition and only concerned about the amount of profit he can get out of the product.

A REMARKABLE DOCUMENT.

The trial of Corporal Kreider at Manila brings to light the existence of a document which conveys a lesson more important than the one drawn from it by republican editors. Young Kreider was tried for treason because his name appeared on the following appeal circulated among the American soldiers:

To Whom It May Concern: Dear Fellow Countrymen: After many months among the Filipino people, studying their costumes and characters, we, the undersigned, have come to the conclusion that the time has arrived for us to break the silence and let you know the real truth, so that you will see the folly of continuation of fighting these people who are defending their country against the cruel American invasion in the same manner in which our forefathers did against England in those glorious days of our grand and noble liberator, General George Washington.

Since the day we were led by our conscience and presented ourselves to the Philippine authorities we have received the best of treatment, and we are enjoying a life of luxury without having to put our lives in danger as do you, who still remain in the American ranks fighting for an unjust cause, which sooner or later must

surely prove disastrous, as it did to the Spanish, notwithstanding that they knew the country and customs of the people better than the Americans do.

For above-mentioned reasons and also that the war may soon end, we ask the men of the American army stationed in these islands to present themselves to the Philippine authorities as we did, thereby showing yourselves to be true Americans upholding the policy of Washington and the Monroe doctrine against the ambitious policy of President McKinley, who for two years has carried on this cruel war, spilling the innocent blood of thousands of American soldiers, and with what object? To fill the pockets of Mark Hanna and several other American capitalists who have been for years, and are now, ruling America to-day, or, in other words, changing your blood for gold and robbing many a loving mother or wife of son or husband, thereby making many a once happy home sad and miserable.

Before we close let us tell you that near every town there are always stationed forces of Filipino troops to whom, should you so desire, you can present yourselves with or without your rifle, and to avoid danger it is best to hide it in a secure place, and after you have presented yourself inform the Filipino officer or chief of the guerrillas and they will recover it and pay you some money in return.

With this we conclude, wishing you the best of fortune. We remain yours most sincerely,

HARRY HORAL ALMAN, Company K.

JOHN BLAKE, Trumpeter, Company B, Twenty-eighth U. S. Infantry.

FRANK L. CLARK, Company F, Twenty-first U. S. Infantry.

J. THOMAS KREIDER, Corporal, Thirty-eighth U. S. Volunteers.

CHARLES BUCHANAN, Company B, Twenty-eighth U. S. Volunteers.

HARRY RICHTER, Sixth U. S. Artillery.

CHARLES WRIGHT, Hospital Corps.

FITZHUGH SMITH.

JOHN RYAN, Fourth Regiment.

Kreider's defense was that the document was drawn by Filipinos and that the Americans who signed it did so under duress. A military commission found Kreider guilty of treason and sentenced him to life imprisonment. General Chaffee refused to approve the findings of the military court and released the accused with a reprimand. The general thus admonished the offender:

While no treasonable intent or overt act is established against the accused by competent evidence, it, however, remains to be re-

marked that it is the duty of every American soldier to face impending danger of death rather than sign a treasonable proclamation, even if it is prepared, as was the one in this case, by the enemy. Nor should he do any other act that might have even a seeming of giving the enemy encouragement. The true soldier not only takes the risks of battle, but all other risks of life growing out of any and all incidents of war, and accepts the chance of life or death rather than do aught to injure his country's cause or dishonor the uniform he wears.

General Chaffee is sound in his argument. No amount of duress could justify an American soldier in signing such a document. It has been said that no one need be a slave who knows how to die, and so, it may be added, no one can be compelled to sign a treasonable appeal until he becomes afraid of death. The soldiers in the Philippines went there voluntarily and in going they assumed the risks which attend military service. The sentiments expressed by General Chaffee will be generally commended; but there is another phase of the subject which ought not to escape attention. Who wrote the remarkable document which the American prisoners were forced to sign? The Filipinos? Dare the republicans admit it? It is charitable to exonerate the Americans, but how will the republicans reconcile that document with the theory that the Filipinos are savages? The authors of that appeal seem to know something of American history; they are evidently acquainted with our struggle for independence, and they recognize that our present Philippine policy is utterly inconsistent with our traditions and our principles of government. It ought to make republican leaders blush to think that the "inferior people" who are, according to the president, a thousand years behind us, understand imperialism better than these same republican leaders understand imperialism, but pretend ignorance?

How long will honest and conscientious republicans close their eyes to the moral and political degradation involved in imperialism?

XIX.

SHORTER EDITORIALS.

INTERESTING DISCRIMINATION.—A commission should be appointed to definitely fix the amount of wealth one must possess before being classed as a kleptomaniac instead of a thief. The same commission could also fix the amount which a man must steal before becoming a Napoleon of finance instead of being a common embezzler. There is now so much leeway afforded that the public is often led to grievously wrong a man by calling him a thief or an embezzler when in truth he is either a kleptomaniac or a financier. This is because of not having a definite amount fixed from which to measure judgment. This appears to be one of the crying needs of the hour.

EXTRAVAGANCE INCREASING.—Some of the republicans are becoming alarmed at the extravagance of the present congress. The appropriations for this session will not be far from eight hundred millions. Deducting about one hundred and fifteen millions derived from postal receipts, it still leaves nearly seven hundred millions to be raised by taxation.

Senator Hale was recently led to remark: "The tide, immensely swollen heretofore, is more swollen and more turbid." "And still rising," interjected Senator Spooner. "Rising rapidly," added Senator Allison.

Why does not the administration call a halt? Because the tax eaters control the republican organization and their appetite grows with the feeding.

SECRETARY GAGE'S PROUD BOAST.—In a statement prepared for the *Chicago Record-Herald*, Secretary Gage says: "There has been a very material increase in the volume of money in circulation since March 1, 1897, as well as in the amount per capita. The volume of money on that date, outside of the treasury, was \$1,675,694,953, and the amount per capita was \$23.14. On the 1st of December last the amount of money outside of the treasury was \$2,250,256,230, and the amount per capita was \$28.73. The increase in amount, therefore, was \$574,561,277, and the increase per capita was \$5.59." Is it not strange to hear the single gold

standard champion boasting of an increase in the volume of money, when we remember that in 1896 he insisted that we had all the money we needed?

OUR ALLIES.—If the re-organizers would spend more time opposing republican policies and less time denouncing the populists they would serve the cause better. The populists came to the help of the democratic party when the re-organizers abandoned it and the latter are not in a position to boast of superior attachment to democratic principles. What is true of the populists is also true of the silver republicans, who have for four years vied with the democrats in their efforts to advance the doctrines set forth in the democratic platform. It will be an unfortunate day for the democracy if the bolting element on the outside or the corporation element on the inside is able to so alter the party creed as to make it less acceptable to our populist and silver republican allies.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS.—The deportation of Editor Rice from Manila because of his criticism of American officials ought to give the American people some idea of what is to be expected under colonialism. Free speech is not consistent with military rule or carpet-bag government. Men who exercise authority without responsibility to those whom they govern cannot tolerate criticism, and any suggestion of malfeasance or misfeasance becomes incendiary and dangerous. Human frailty makes public officials liable enough to error even when restrained by a free press and when that restraint is taken away the people have no protection whatever. There is a love of justice to be found in every human heart, and when justice is denied, those who are responsible for the denial never think it wise to have the matter discussed. Benevolent assimilation is too tender a plant to withstand the frost of criticism.

MATTER FOR INVESTIGATION.—The orbits of the planets are so well known to astronomers that they can note the slightest deviation. Whenever a planet acts queerly they know that it is due to the influence of some heretofore unknown heavenly body and they proceed to search for that body.

Democratic principles are so well understood and so easily applied that the conduct of a faithful democratic representative can

be easily predicted. Whenever, therefore, a democratic senator, a representative, or a state legislator acts queerly, it is well to investigate at once and find out what earthly body is exerting an influence over him.

He may be paying for some favor received or expected, or he may be in close proximity to some corporation. The eccentricities of a representative can always be explained when the facts are known.

THE VALUE OF INFLUENCE.—A reader of **THE COMMONER** asks for a word on the value of influence. Influence may be divided into two kinds, good and bad, and all know that both are potent. When we keep our children out of bad company we recognize that evil associations exert a corrupting influence upon all who submit themselves to such associations. We may not emphasize as much as we should the value of good influence, but we have scripture as well as observation to support the doctrine that there is nothing more powerful than the influence of an upright life. "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works," etc., is proof of the good that can be done by example. We should be as careful to give others the benefit of a good influence as to secure a benefit from theirs. The life of each person is so interwoven with the life of others that no one can be sure that any act will be without an influence, hence the importance of striving to make that influence helpful.

PLANETARY DISTURBANCES.—They talk of attempting communication with Mars as if it were something new. The fact is, the republican leaders have for years been under the influence of the planets. Mr. Hanna has been Jupiter's special representative and has ruled on republican Olympus with as much authority as was ever shown by "The Thunderer."

The various rings which encircle the republican organization prove clearly that the party's star has long been in close conjunction with Saturn; the hidden forces which are pushing the ship subsidy bill would excuse the suspicion that Neptune is at work with his trident; and what power but the blood-star Mars could have led the party of Lincoln into wars waged for conquest and the purchase of trade?

What we need is not wireless telegraphy between the earth and

the stars, but some means of insulating the republican party against planetary currents.

DOING JUSTICE TO ADMIRAL SCHLEY.—Representative John S. Williams of Mississippi has introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee to investigate the charges made by Historian Maclay that Crowninshield, Sampson and other naval officers read the proof-sheets of Maclay's bitter attack on Admiral Schley. It cannot be doubted that Mr. Williams, who is one of the forceful members of the house, will push his resolution with all possible vigor, and yet it is not likely that republicans will permit the adoption of any such resolution introduced by a democrat. They will perhaps prefer to adopt a similar resolution introduced by a republican. At all events, the American people will expect the charge that Admiral Schley has been the victim of a conspiracy, to be thoroughly investigated. There seems, also, to be a disposition in congress to prevent the creation of the grade of vice admiral unless provision is made for conferring that grade upon Admiral Schley and restoring him to active service. It required a long time for some of the politicians in the republican party to realize that injustice was being done Admiral Schley, but it is now probable in spite of the court of inquiry's decision that many of them will compete strongly with democratic members in the effort to do justice to Schley.

NOT AFRAID OF SILVER.—A Georgia paper is responsible for the circulation of a story to the effect that Mr. Bryan, when in the army, refused to accept two dollars and a half in silver as change, and demanded paper. The statement is not true, for he prefers to carry a few dollars in silver rather than in paper, but the fact that he or any one else does not care to carry many dollars in silver is no argument against silver. Because one prefers to carry one, two, three or four dollars in silver to a like value in paper is no reason why he should prefer twenty-five or fifty dollars in silver to a like value in paper. Neither gold nor silver is convenient to carry in large quantities; that is why silver certificates and gold certificates are issued. An advocate of the gold standard would rather carry a thousand dollar silver certificate than a thousand dollars in gold. More people carry and use silver every day than carry or use gold, and the most rabid gold bug would hardly refuse

the payment of a debt because it was tendered in silver. The complaint which republicans make about the weight of silver recalls a story told on a Boston man who was arguing against the white metal. He said: "No one likes to carry silver, it is too heavy. Now suppose I gave my wife fifty dollars to go down town and buy something, say a spool of thread or any article of small value, and the clerk gave her back forty-nine dollars and the change in silver, she wouldn't want to carry that much," and turning to his wife for confirmation he inquired, "Would you?" She replied, "Oh, my, if I could only get fifty dollars to spend I would be willing to carry the change in any kind of money." If any gold bug doubts the truth of this story let him try the experiment on his wife.

TORTURE INDEFENSIBLE.—The burning of another negro, this time in Kansas, again calls attention to the tendency to return to the cruelties and torture of former times. When a similar incident occurred a few weeks ago in Colorado, republican papers were quick to connect the occurrence with a fusion majority in the state. If retaliation were proper, democratic papers might refer to the republican majority rolled up in Kansas last November, but the subject is too serious to be made a theme for partisan controversy. Such atrocities are inexcusable, no matter when or where they are practiced. Lynch law must be condemned on general principles because it temporarily suspends government and its enforcement amid excitement and without a careful investigation of the evidence often leads to the doing of great injustice.

The fact that good people, aroused to frenzy by a horrible crime, sometimes take the law into their own hands, is not a justification, but simply shows that strong feeling will occasionally overmaster the reason of the best of men. Before lynching can be defended some tribunal must be authorized to decide when, under what circumstances and upon what evidence individual revenge should be substituted for the ordinary methods of administering justice. But even if lynching could be defended the addition of torture is inexcusable. It is an indulgence of passion, more hurtful to those who are guilty of it than to their victim. Instead of lessening crime, burning is apt to increase it by accustoming the people to cruelty and by lessening their respect for human life. Even those who in Kansas and elsewhere have joined in the mad cry for blood

and exulted in the agonies of a human being will, in calm and dispassionate moments, condemn the act and deplore the weakness which temporarily condoned it.

An unanswerable argument against such a form of punishment is to be found in the fact that no legislative body in Christendom would deliberately provide for burning as a penalty for any crime.

CAUGHT HIM NAPPING.—The partisan prejudice of some men was fittingly illustrated by an incident which occurred in a western city during the sad week of the presidential obsequies. While the campaign of 1900 was in progress democrats had great sport reading a speech delivered by Abraham Lincoln in 1858 and intimating that it was a portion of a speech delivered by Mr. Bryan. Republicans readily fell into the trap and denounced it as "hogwash," "copperheadism," etc. An ex-congressman stood on a prominent corner of — a few days ago and denounced the democrats, and especially Mr. Bryan, for what he termed "appeals to class prejudice." He asserted that these appeals unsettled the minds of people and made them discontented with their lot, and further declared that the language used by democratic orators in discussing political questions was indirectly, if not directly, responsible for the assassination of President McKinley. A young man standing by coincided with this view, and to prove the truth of the assertion made by the ex-congressman read the following:

"Human rights and privileges must not be forgotten in the mad race for wealth. The government of the people must be by the people, and not by a few of the people. Power, it must be remembered, which is secured by oppression and usurpation, or by any form of injustice, is soon overthrown."

"That," asserted the young man, "is the kind of talk that is continually stirring up trouble between the different elements of our population. It is the doctrine of discontent."

"That's right!" asserted the ex-congressman. "It is intended to make the poor hate the rich. It is intended to make people believe that our republic is rapidly becoming an empire. It is——"

"Oh, you ought to know better than to talk that way about this speech," interrupted the young man. "That is an extract from a speech delivered by William McKinley only a few years ago."

The republican ex-congressman looked dazed, then hastily changed the subject.

XX.

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS.

Perhaps "malevolent dissimulation" is the term meant.

Blood-bought commerce may be profitable for a time, but the average will show a preponderance of red ink entries.

Of course it would not do to send the Liberty Bell on a visit to the Philippines. It might stir the natives to "anarchy."

The attention of Signor Marconi is called to the fact that the trusts have been sending wireless messages to congress for several years.

F. P. Dunne (Mr. Dooley) has paraphrased an old epigram. He says: "Ye can lade a man up to the University but ye can't make him think."

It is a mistake to assume that people in the Philippines or in South Africa can be benefited by a carpet-bag government held in authority by armies.

It is not difficult to believe that Paul Kruger's name will be remembered long after the world has forgotten why General Roberts was made an earl.

The cost of good literature is insignificant when compared with its value in moulding character, and a good newspaper is the least expensive form of literature.

The floral tributes which greeted Mr. Quay on his re-election to the Senate recall the fact that flowers, like showers, fall alike upon the just and the unjust.

A large number of congressmen who excuse their conduct on the ground that they are filled with missionary zeal are filled only with missionary zeal.

Rousseau says, "There is in liberty as in innocence and virtue, a satisfaction one only feels in their enjoyment and a pleasure which can cease only when they are lost."

In the estimation of the gentlemen who so ably managed the republican campaign there are no bad trusts, unless it be one or two that failed to mail checks in time to be available.

The fever of speculation on Wall Street is wearing on Mr. Gage. He does not know whether he will have to sell bonds to keep the market from breaking, or buy bonds to keep the speculators from going broke.

When one reads the eulogies delivered over Senators and members of the House of Representatives he understands why it is that those who are elected to either branch of Congress want to stay there until they die.

The democratic country press is the reflex of democratic thought, and democrats must support the country of democratic papers if democratic victories are to be won. A well supported press is more than half the battle.

Some predict that Texas will rival Pennsylvania as a producer of oil; it is to be hoped, however, that she will not rival Pennsylvania in her political methods. We can use more oil, but we do not need any more Pennsylvania politics.

The bullet of an anarchist cannot overthrow our government, neither can it settle public questions. Our government rests securely upon the good will of the people, and public questions will be settled by the intelligence and patriotism of the people.

Speaking of steadfastness, it is related of an old servant of Andrew Jackson, who survived his master several years and acted as a guard at the Hermitage, that when asked whether he thought Jackson went to heaven replied: "If he sot his head that way, he did."

As we have been giving protection to manufacturers and trusting to their generosity to give to their employes a fair share of the blessings conferred by the government, why not give subsidies

to the farmers who export cotton, meat and breadstuffs and trust them to divide with the ship-owners?

As Mr. Watterson was seizing the reins and warning "the fools" to get out of the way the *St. Paul Globe*, itself a bolter in 1896, quietly pulled his coat tail and suggested to him that the passengers might feel a little nervous if he tried to drive so soon after his attempt to hold up the coach.

In view of the prominent part taken by Justices Brown and White in changing our form of government, a reader of *THE COMMONER* suggests that the national colors should be changed to Red, White, and Brown. But as Justice Gray also joined in the decision, why not make them Gray, Brown, and White?

If the Congressmen who are constantly endeavoring to raise the rate of postage on second-class mail matter would give a little attention to the compensation paid railroads for carrying the mails, they would find it possible to make such a reduction in expenses as to render an increase in postage rates unnecessary.

In forming an opinion as to the capacity of the Filipinos for self-government, General Chaffee, the military governor, is somewhat embarrassed by the fact that he cannot decide for the Filipinos without deciding against the interests of the carpet-bag officials and exploiters who find good picking in "our new possessions."

A test has at last been discovered for determining when a paper is under corporate influence. If the editor becomes violently agitated when any reference is made to the common people the chances are sixteen to one that his paper is a defender of every scheme whereby the organized few seek to obtain an advantage over the masses of the people.

Don't bet on elections. Aside from the moral principle involved it is foolish to gamble on a subject where your enthusiasm impairs your judgment. If your party wins there is joy enough in the victory. If your party loses, why give your opponents the double happiness of a party triumph and your money besides? Instead of risking your earnings on a wager contribute what you can to the campaign fund.

A Kansas paper expresses a violent dislike for the name "Commoner," and says that it is "a vile word and totally un-American." The uncommon people seem to be more worried about the name than the common people. The agitation of those who consider themselves outside of the appellation reminds one of the definition of the onion which describes it as the vegetable which makes the person sick who does not eat it.

The money already expended in a vain effort to subdue the Filipinos and grab their lands would have made tillable more land in western America than there is in the whole Philippine group. This would have created a larger market at home, provided homes for millions of people and made unnecessary the sacrifice of 3,500 American lives on the altar of "commerce." The Philippine game is not worth the candle.

In response to an invitation from Tammany to submit a sentiment to be read on the 4th of July, Mr. Bryan suggested the following:

"Liberty is not safe without a written constitution, and a constitution to be of value must be strong enough to control every public servant and broad enough to include within its protection every person who acknowledges allegiance to the flag."

The advocates of municipal ownership note with pleasure the result of the election for members of the city council of London. A majority of the members of the new council favor the municipal ownership of municipal franchises. When the largest city in the world, especially in England, can undertake this reform the republicans will have to speak respectfully of the democrats and populists, who object to bestowing valuable franchises upon private corporations in this country.

Conscience is a creature of education. Many a man who would recoil in horror at the suggestion that he waylay and rob a single individual at the muzzle of a revolver, does not hesitate to waylay and rob a community at the muzzle of an unjust law secured through corrupt influences for selfish purposes. And men who do this sort of thing sometimes give largely to public charities and receive credit for generosity. The public conscience needs to be awakened and properly schooled.

The *Manila Times*, referring to the plan of campaign in Samar, says that Lubkan's army will be "rounded up for extermination." It also asserted that "Samar island will be made a desert." If the policy of exterminating the army and making a desert of the island is carried out everywhere, what will our exploiters do? White men can't work in the Philippines. Some of the Filipinos ought to be left to act as day laborers or we shall be unable to "develop" the islands.

The trusts generally issue two kinds of stock—preferred and common. The preferred stock is intended for the preferred people and the common stock for the common people. The preferred stock has a fixed dividend, which must be paid before any dividend can be declared on the common stock; the common stock, therefore, is subject to the greater fluctuation. It might with propriety be called lamb's food, because it is most popular with young sheep before they have experienced the first shearing.

Japan looks upon the United States as its best friend. It was the United States that brought Japan into contact with the civilized world. How? Not with bullets and swords; not with rapid-fire guns and high-priced commissions living at the expense of a people impoverished by 300 years of fighting for liberty. It was accomplished by kindness, by force of example and by recognition of inalienable rights. But when Japan was reclaimed from industrial seclusion there was an absence of congressmen anxious to confer "blessings" in return for the privilege of gobbling up all of the rich concessions or holding the fat offices.

Secretary Gage would take a rosy view of the future if his hopes did not depend upon so many ifs. He says, "If a trade war does not come up, and if European nations do not engage in a tariff fight, and if no untoward accident happens, and if war does not become universal, I expect to see an era of prosperity long continued."

If Mr. Gage was a different kind of a man and if he favored a different kind of a financial system, and if he then had the power to put his policy into practice he might aid in making prosperity general and permanent, but the "ifs" are in the way.

It must be mortifying to honest and well-meaning republicans to find that some of the more partisan members of that party wagged their malicious tongues or employed their venomous pens in abuse of democrats while the President's funeral was in progress and while all patriotic hearts joined in the mourning. It was not an inspiring spectacle to see these debased representatives—or rather misrepresentatives—of the republican party sucking political comfort out of the wounds of the chief executive. Fortunately, however, the number of such was small compared with the number of those who recognized that the calamity was national and that the tributes of respect were non-partisan in their character.

The democratic party stands for definite, positive principles, and the Kansas City platform is the party creed until another national platform is written. Those who argue from the standpoint of expediency seem willing to sacrifice any principle or endorse any policy if they can thereby win. But there is no way of judging what is expedient; we can only do what we believe to be right and accept the consequences. We may deserve to win, and yet lose, but it still remains that to deserve to win is the surest road to success. If any one tells you that success can be won by a surrender of democratic principles, just remind him of the campaign of 1894 when we lost both our principles and our candidates.

The monopolists sometimes try to defend trusts by claiming that they are identical in principle with the labor organization. There is this difference, however, between the two kinds of organization which ought to be apparent to every one. Labor organizations have not yet secured for their members more than a fair compensation for work done—and in many branches of industry they have not secured what is fair, while many of the trust magnates have within a few years amassed fabulous fortunes. When labor organizations reach the point where the wage-earners are able to spend their summers in the north, their winters in the south, and the autumn months in Europe, it will be time enough to class such organizations with the trusts.

A reader of THE COMMONER asks for an explanation of the term "government by injunction." It is a phrase used to describe a process of the court which has been more and more frequently

abused of late, whereby the court, at the instance of a corporation, enjoins the striking employes from doing some act described in the order. The object of the writ is to suspend the right of trial by jury and give the judge an opportunity to punish for contempt of court in case the order is violated. The democratic platforms of 1896 and 1900 condemned government by injunction. If the court prohibits the doing of an act already unlawful the order is unnecessary because those who violate the criminal law can be prosecuted in the ordinary way. If the court prohibits the doing of an act which is not prohibited by law, then it is guilty of creating law, which is not the province of the court.

XXI.

WHETHER COMMON OR NOT.

Articles in this department are written by Will M. Maupin.

I AIN'T TH' LITTLEST GIRL NO MORE.

My papa called me sweetheart till it came,
 An' jus' played with me nearly all th' time;
 But now he's jus' forgot my baby name
 'Cause there's another baby now, an' I'm
 Told 'at I mustn't run an' sing an' play
 'Cause it might wake it up an' make it cry.
 An' 'stead of bein' petted ev'ry day
 I'm tol' I'm such a bother when I'm nigh,
 That's why I'm feelin' so drefful poor—
 I ain't th' littlest girl no more.

'Fore baby came my papa used t' say
 'At I wus jus' th' sweetest girl in town;
 An' 'at he'd ruther sing an' romp an' play
 Wif me 'an any little girl aroun'.
 An' he would sing me sleepy songs at night
 An' tuck me in my little cradle bed;
 But 'at wus all before he caught a sight
 Of 'at new baby's little fuzzy head.
 An' now I's feelin' so mighty poor—
 I ain't th' littlest girl no more.

It's so drefful hard for a girl like me
 'At ain't no bigger 'an a pint o' sand
 'T have t' stan' aroun' t' wait an' see
 A baby gettin' pats from mamma's hand.
 I can't see why they wanted 'nothèr one
 While I wus here an' jus' a-wishin' I
 Could see my papa so 'at I could run
 An' s'prise him till he had to say, "O, my!"
 But baby come an' I's drefful sore—
 I ain't th' littlest girl no more.

TWO SEATS.

He gave his gold with lavish hand
 And spread his fame throughout the land.
 He builded here and builded there,
 And as he wrought things passing fair
 His face with conscious pride did glow.
 Then, when at last his time had come
 And he had gone to his long home,
 He stepped within and proudly said:
 "Of course I shall be quickly led
 To the best seat in the front row."

St. Peter smiled and shook his head,
 And to the new arrival said:
 "We manage this place on a plan
 That may seem rather strange to man,
 But 'tis a plan we know is right."
 Then leading him to second place,
 St. Peter smiled and turned his face.
 "Who has first place?" the proud man cried.
 St. Peter turned and quick replied:
 "A widow—and she gave a mite."

 WRITING TO SANTA CLAUS.

With infinite care and many a pause
 She's writing a letter to Santa Claus.
 Her pink cheeks are dimpled, her brown eyes shine,
 Her fingers are guiding the pen aright;
 And a wish she writes in every line
 That must go by post in the fire to-night,
 For the note that is signed with baby's name
 Will haste away on the dancing flame.
 Postage is free
 To girls and boys
 Who send their notes
 To Land o' Toys.

The Commoner Condensed.

She's making a curve for a waxen doll,
 And a big, black blot for a parasol.
 She knows that old Santa will understand
 Each mark she is making upon the sheet;
 And she changes her pen from hand to hand,
 While over her cheek chase the dimples sweet.
 Writing to Santa—God grant he gives
 An answer to every sweet tot that lives.

Over the snow
 Without a pause
 The sweet notes go
 To Santa Claus.

And Santa awaits in his north retreat
 For the postman's knock and the missives sweet.
 And he smiles and chuckles the while he reads
 The marvelous writing of boys and girls—
 Quaint and curious are the blotted screeds
 Of dashes and dots, and of quirks and curls.
 But all are as plain as your A, B, C's
 To Santa who reads with the utmost ease,
 For baby marks
 In polar glint
 To Santa Claus
 Are plain as print.

 A BOYISH NIGHTMARE.

When the load of life is heavy and I bend beneath its weight;
 When I think my luck has left me, and I mourn and rail at fate;
 When I long for days of boyhood, for the days when life was gay—
 As I picture it in fancy, now my hair is tinged with gray—
 It is then a mem'ry rises till I fully realize
 That e'en in the days of boyhood clouds oft hid the azure skies;
 For what woe e'er comes to manhood that is half as hard to bear
 As those cut-down pants of father's that my mother made me wear?

I can see them yet, in fancy, always short, with ample slack
 That would puzzle as to whether I was gone or coming back;

Built on plans of architecture that were certainly unique,
With the nap well brushed and dusted till the cloth was thin and
sleek.

And when manhood's cares beset me I recall those days of yore,
Full of second-hand apparel and a heart with anguish sore—
For no matter what my sorrows, none as great can ever be
As those cut-down pants of father's that my mother made for me.

Stocks and bonds may lose their value; markets wobble till they
burst;

But a moment's thought convinces that long since I passed the
worst

Of life's trials and afflictions, so I smile and try again,
Knowing that the "now" is better than the mournful days of "then."
For the man that strives the hardest never gets the ridicule
That was heaped upon me when I wore those awful pants to school.
So I grin and bear the burdens, and am thankful as can be
That no cut-down pants of father's will again be put on me.

MAN, POOR MAN.

Trusts in cradles and bottles and milk,
Trusts in wool and in cotton;
Trusts in needles and pins and threads—
Cursed by trusts when begotten.

Trusts in headgear and clothing and shoes,
Trusts in physic and lighting;
Trusts in everything he must eat—
Life is a strenuous fighting.

Taxed by the trusts while a babe in arms,
Taxed late, early and often;
Taxed on the comforts of youth and age—
Taxed at last in his coffin.

Taxed on the marble that marks his rest
And tells the world "Hic Jacet";
This will explain why a man don't need
A shroud that has a pocket.

IF OL' HICK'RY WUS ALIVE.

I see Nick Ridgeley's grandson is a-cuttin' quite a swell
 Down at th' seat o' government, an' makin' free t' tell
 What he knows 'bout finances, an' what he thinks is best
 F'r t' keep our circulation a-workin' without rest.
 Says he thinks like his grandpa, Nick Biddle's right-hand man,
 A bank o' th' United States is jus' th' proper plan;
 An' that he'd institoot it an' he'd warrant it to thrive—
 But I bet he couldn't do it if Ol' Hick'ry wus alive.

They've got the people locoed with their system o' finance.
 The banks git all th' money and they never miss a chance.
 They buy some bonds an' put 'em in our Uncle Sammy's vault,
 An' th' int'rest keeps a-comin' with na'ry hitch or halt.
 Then th' banks git notes upon 'em, which notes are always lent
 T' 'commodate th' people—at th' rate o' ten per cent.
 Th' banks git double int'rest, an' law-makers all connive—
 But I bet they couldn't do it if Ol' Hick'ry wus alive.

They tax us till our money is piled up in Washington,
 An' Gage, he tells th' papers that some action must be done.
 Then he loans th' banks th' money an' no int'rest he'll assess,
 But th' people pay ten f'r it—which, of course, relieves distress.
 When th' people git th' money from th' banks they straightaway
 Hunt up th' tax collector an' once more their taxes pay.
 It's a never endin' circle, goin' 'round from year t' year—
 But I bet 'twould soon be busted if Ol' Hick'ry wus here.

 THE HOUSEHOLD PHYSICIAN.

It tickles me almost t' death t' see th' doctors fight,
 Each one declarin' t'other's wrong an' only him is right;
 When allypath an' homypath forever disagree,
 Exceptin' when they j'ine t' fight 'gainst ostyopathe.
 Th' allypath will dope his sick th' pharmacopy through;
 Th' homypath will jim along with numbers 1 and 2,
 Th' ostypath will knead y'r frame an' loosen ev'ry bone,
 An' then th' Scientis' declares you're saved by faith alone.

An' some folks listen to th' talk each school has got t' make,
 An' dope themselves with pi'zen drugs f'r ev'ry pain an' ache.
 They choose a school o' medicine an' help along th' fuss,
 Each one a gulpin' physic down an' growin' wuss an' wuss.
 It tickles me t' hear 'em talk, an' hear 'em argify,
 An' see 'em pay th' doctor bills that figger mighty high.
 Th' remedies my mother made are good enough f'r me—
 Some goosegrease on a flannel rag an' lots o' boneset tea.

In spring when feelin' torpid an' my liver's out o' plumb,
 Malary in my system an' each j'int a-feelin' numb;
 When blood is out o' kelter an' each bone begins t' ache,
 I fall back on th' remedies my mother used t' make.
 She didn't call no doctors in t' feed her folks on pills
 An' feel their pulse while lookin' wise, an' sendin' in big bills.
 She kept us all a-feelin' fine an' well as we could be
 With goosegrease on a flannel rag and quarts o' fennel tea.

Th' trouble with most men to-day is each has got a fad,
 Each boastin' of an ailment that our fathers never had.
 Appendycetus is th' talk, bacilly's all th' rage;
 Th' men who have diskivered germs are heroes of th' age.
 But I'm content with old-time ways, an' you kin bet y'r life
 No modern doctor ever gets t' carve me with his knife.
 I'll just keep doctorin' myself, while doctors disagree,
 With goosegrease on a flannel rag and quarts o' sass'frass tea.

A LITTLE FABLE.

A Benevolent Assimilation walking along the Public Highway
 met a Deep Longing mournfully wending its Way.

"How now!" exclaimed the Benevolent Assimilation. "Why this
 Pensive air?"

"Alas, I have in my Possession something I treasure Highly,
 but which I am in Danger of Losing."

"What can it Be?" asked the Benevolent Assimilation.

"It is my Right to Live."

Thereupon the Benevolent Assimilation seized the Deep Longing
 by the Nape of the Neck and felled it to the Ground.

"Why am I thus Assaulted?" wailed the Deep Longing.

"I am merely seizing your Right to Live so that I can make you my servant," said the Benevolent Assimilation.

"Alas and alack!" moaned the Deep Longing. "I was deceived by Your Appearance."

"Perhaps," said the Benevolent Assimilation. "That's why I'm called by that Name."

Moral: But there is nothing Moral about It.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY EDUCATION.

"Good morning, gentlemen," said Professor Twiggem, mounting the rostrum of the lecture-room and facing the multitude of students gathered from all parts of the earth. "I am proud to see so many of you this morning."

A ripple of applause swept over the lecture-room as Professor Twiggem drew from his pocket a roll of manuscript and adjusted his glasses.

"We are here this morning, gentlemen, for the purpose of discussing the subject of 'Industrial Combination,'" said the professor. "We are to discuss it with reference to its effects upon free—"

"Pardon me, professor," interrupted the Academic Censor, "but has your manuscript been passed upon by the manager of the Yardstick Oil Company?"

"It has, sir."

"And has the superintendent of the Consolidated Embalmed Beef Promotion Syndicate carefully scrutinized it?"

"He did that last night, sir."

"And has the third vice-president of the Amalgamated Steel, Iron, Brass and Copper Company placed his official 'O. K.' upon your remarks?"

"He has, sir."

"Then, sir, may I ask if the Ancient and Accidental Society of Possible University Donors has properly examined your manuscript?"

"It has, sir. All possible interests have been consulted and pacified."

“Then, sir,” said the Academic Censor, “here is your ticket which entitles you to proceed with your remarks.”

A few moments later Professor Twiggem was reading from his manuscript and the assembled students were paying as little attention as possible.

BRAIN LEAKS.

True faith never worries over small things.

The religion that costs nothing is worth it.

Slander is the weapon of the weak-minded.

He laughs best who is cheerful all the time.

Where contentment is love sits in the window.

A word of cheer costs nothing but is beyond price.

A good character is not to be builded on hate or envy.

Nothing succeeds like water when properly marketed.

Destiny is only duty well done. Fate is duty unperformed.

Satan uses numerous agents, but always shirks responsibility.

True love forgives much, but true love never needs forgiveness.

The foolish man prepares to die. The wise man prepares to live.

The good time of yesterday is too often the headache of to-day.

Prayer is not ordering what you want, but asking for what you need.

Jealousy is the hope that what you are looking for does not exist.

The good in a dollar should be measured by the motive of the giver.

Well earned glory will last much longer than unearned prize money.

Kind words are ball bearings that make the wheels of life run smoothly.

Patriotism, like charity, begins at home, but takes an early start into the country.

Investigation is the mother of agitation, therefore the grandmother of reformation.

Charity does not consist in giving what you do not need. It means sacrifice for the good of others.

The difference between try and cry is so small that the wonder is anybody ever wastes time at the latter.

The Commoner Condensed.

PAPA GOOSE RHYMES.

(With proper apologies to his good wife.)

Hickery, dickery, dock.
 He took a flyer in stock.
 The market went broke
 And left him in soak,
 And he couldn't survive the shock.

Old Father Hubbard went to the cupboard
 To get his poor dog a crust.
 When he got there the cupboard was bare,
 For bread was controlled by a trust.

Little Jack Horner
 Worked up a corner
 In sugar and steel and wheat.
 When the proper time came
 Some checks bore his name,
 And he captured a senator's seat.

The Man in the Moon came tumbling down
 And asked for the right way to Wheeling,
 He went to the East and his wealth increased
 By a subsidized method of stealing.

There was a man in Pittsburg town,
 And he was wondrous wise,
 He piled up wealth by tariff laws
 Enacted by poor guys.
 And as he saw his wealth increase
 He posed in manner chaste,
 And built a block or two for books
 So he'd not die disgraced.

Old King Coal was a jolly old soul,
 A jolly old seeker of mirth.
 He called for wire and also some posts,
 And built a neat fence 'round the earth.

Hi diddle doodle
The trusts have got boodle;
The taxes are paid by the toil.
The syndicates laughed
At their profitable graft
In sugar, steel, railroads and oil.

XXII.

POEMS.

TO A WATERFOWL.

BY WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT.

Whither, midst falling dew,
 While glow the heavens with the last steps of day,
 Far, through their rosy depths, dost thou pursue
 Thy solitary way?

Vainly the fowler's eye
 Might mark thy distant flight to do thee wrong,
 As, darkly seen against the crimson sky,
 Thy figure floats along.

Seek'st thou the plashy brink
 Of weedy lake, or marge of river wide,
 Or where the rocking billows rise and sink
 On the chafed ocean-side?

There is a power whose care
 Teaches the way along the pathless coast—
 The desert and illimitable air—
 Lone wandering, but not lost.

All day thy wings have fanned,
 At that far height, the cold, thin atmosphere,
 Yet stoop not, weary, to the welcome land,
 Though the dark night is near.

And soon that toil shall end;
 Soon shalt thou find a summer home, and rest,
 And scream among thy fellows; needs shall bend,
 Soon, o'er thy sheltered nest.

Thou'rt gone, the abyss of heaven
 Hath swallowed up thy form; yet on my heart
 Deeply has sunk the lesson thou hast given,
 And shall not soon depart.

He who, from zone to zone,
 Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
 In the long way that I must tread alone,
 Will lead my steps aright.

THE LIGHT OF JEFFERSON.

BY HOWARD S. TAYLOR.

With bare, bowed heads and standing up
 We lift a loyal loving cup
 And give the name of one
 Who was the light of Freedom's host,
 Our father's pride, our country's boast,
 A name we love, the name we toast,
 The patriot Jefferson!

He came like Moses, sent of God,
 His pen, the wave-dividing rod
 That opened Freedom's way
 Out of the ancient, dark domain
 Of violence and fear and pain,
 Where bigots rage and tyrants reign,
 Into the better day!

Wide-minded, wise, and wisely good,
 His lucid spirit understood
 The villainy of spoil;
 That God Almighty never gave
 One man, however wise and brave,
 The right to call another SLAVE
 And fatten on his toil!

The Commoner Condensed.

He leveled up, he leveled down;
 The beggar's clout, the monarch's crown,
 He held as equal things;
 The children, playing by the door
 Where dwell the unknown, humble poor,
 He knew might do and count for more
 Than any line of kings!

His reverent eyes could always trace
 God's image in the human face;
 And each man, great or small,
 He judged, alone, by moral worth
 And claimed for each, by right of birth,
 A chance to live on God's green earth
 And share the hopes of all!

He knew the bulwarks of the State,
 The things that guard and make it great
 Lie not in brutal might;
 But in the force of free consent
 And honest statutes—framed and meant
 To foster labor, peace, content,
 Equality and right!

Thus from his heart he sagely drew
 In lines of light, forever true,
 Our Nation's august Chart.
 Tyrants and robbers hate and fear
 That beacon thought so bright and clear,
 That time and trial make it dear,
 To every freeman's heart!

And so, we lift the loving cup
 With bare, bowed heads and standing up
 We give the name of one
 Who is our democratic boast,
 The Moses of our marching host,
 Whose name we love, whose name we toast,
 The name of Jefferson!

JACKSON'S DAY.

BY HOWARD S. TAYLOR.

What shall we say
Of Jackson's Day?

Across the chasm of eighty years
We hear a roar of British cheers
Where Pakenham in vain assails
Old Hickory's fire-fringed cotton bales!
Full three to one the redcoats come
With bellowing volleys charging home;
Come like a tide—then break as if
That tide had struck a granite cliff!

What shall we say
Of that red day?

Why, this—and say it like a prayer—
“Thank God we had a Jackson there!”

Heaven built the man
Upon a plan

So simply yet so largely drawn
He looms like Athens' Parthenon
When fondling sunbeams stoop to kiss
The temple-crowned Acropolis.
So plain he was, yet stately, too,
So rugged, strong and staunchly true,
The muse of history stops to scan
The homely greatness of the man

And softly say,

On Jackson's Day,

“He was of common life begat,
The new world's full-typed democrat.”

On Jackson's Day

The world can say

He was a patriot true and tried,
And one who rather would have died
Than plead with any foreign throne
For liberty to rule our own!

Our Declaration, freedom's chart,
 Was stamped upon his fearless heart,
 And, live or die, or sink or swim,
 It was the voice of God to him!

 His country's right,
 His country's might,
 Twin thoughts together, side by side
 Dwelt in his soul until he died!

 This, too, we'll say
 On Jackson's Day,
 He learned from men in ragged jeans
 Who fought with him at New Orleans
 To hold the great, plain people dear
 And trust to them without a fear!
 He knew the genius of our land
 Comes not from mansions rich and grand,
 But has its humble, potent birth
 At Freedom's fane—the cottage hearth.

 And this he knew
 Forever true—
 The common people's hearts must be
 The ramparts of our liberty!

 And now we say,
 On Jackson's Day,
 Till Jackson's grave shall be forgot
 And bramble hide the holy spot;
 Till all he did with sword and pen
 Shall cease to move the hearts of men,
 Till then, in times of doubt and fear,
 Our eyes shall see, our ears shall hear
 A countless host with hope unspent
 Walk in the ways where Jackson went.

 And men shall kneel
 And deeply feel
 The truth of what they simply say:
 "The good God gave us Jackson Day."

BEN BOLT.

BY THOMAS DUNN ENGLISH.

Don't you remember sweet Alice, Ben Bolt—
Sweet Alice whose hair was so brown,
Who wept with delight when you gave her a smile,
And trembled with fear at your frown?
In the old church-yard in the valley, Ben Bolt,
In a corner obscure and alone,
They have fitted a slab of the granite so gray,
And Alice lies under the stone.

Under the hickory-tree, Ben Bolt,
Which stood at the foot of the hill,
Together we've lain in the noonday shade,
And listened to Appleton's mill.
The mill-wheel has fallen to pieces, Ben Bolt,
The rafters have tumbled in,
And a quiet which crawls round the walls as you gaze
Has followed the olden din.

Do you mind of the cabin of logs, Ben Bolt,
At the edge of the pathless wood,
And the button-ball tree with its motley limbs,
Which nigh by the doorstep stood?
The cabin to ruin has gone, Ben Bolt,
The tree you would seek for in vain;
And where once the lords of the forest waved
Are grass and the golden grain.

And don't you remember the school, Ben Bolt,
With the master so cruel and grim,
And the shaded nook in the running brook
Where the children went to swim?
Grass grows on the master's grave, Ben Bolt,
The spring of the brook is dry,
And of all the boys who were schoolmates then
There are only you and I.

There is change in the things I loved, Ben Bolt,
 They have changed from the old to the new;
 But I feel in the deeps of my spirit the truth,
 There never was change in you.
 Twelvemonths twenty have passed, Ben Bolt,
 Since first we were friends—yet I hail
 Your presence a blessing, your friendship a truth,
 Ben Bolt of the salt-sea gale.

THE PENALTY.

BY J. A. EDGERTON IN "THE RAM'S HORN."

We are mad—grown mad in the race for gold.
 We are drunk with the wine of gain;
 The truths our fathers proclaimed of old
 We spurn with a high disdain.
 But while the conqueror's race we run,
 Our rulers should not forget
 That the God who reigned over Babylon
 Is the God who is reigning yet.

Would we tread in the paths of tyranny,
 Nor reckon the tyrant's cost?
 Who taketh another's liberty,
 His freedom hath also lost.
 Would we win as the strong have ever won,
 Make ready to pay the debt.
 For the God who reigned over Babylon
 Is the God who is reigning yet.

The ruins of dynasties passed away
 In eloquent silence lie;
 And the despot's fate is the same to-day
 That was in the days gone by.
 Against all wrong and injustice done
 A rigid account is set,
 For the God who reigned over Babylon
 Is the God who is reigning yet.

The laws of right are eternal laws,
The judgments of truth are true;
My greed—blind masters, I bid you pause
And look on the work you do.
You blind with sheckels your fellow man,
Your hands with his blood are wet,
And the God who reigned over Babylon
Is the God who is reigning yet.

LITTLE BOY BLUE.

BY EUGENE FIELD.

The little toy dog is covered with dust,
But sturdy and stanch he stands;
And the little toy soldier is red with rust,
And his musket moulds in his hands.
Time was when the little toy dog was new
And the soldier was passing fair,
And that was the time when our Little Boy Blue
Kissed them and put them there.

“Now don’t you go till I come,” he said,
“And don’t you make any noise!”
So toddling off to his trundle-bed,
He dreamed of the pretty toys.
And as he was dreaming, an angel song
Awakened our Little Boy Blue—
Oh, the years are many, the years are long,
But the little toy friends are true.

Ay, faithful to Little Boy Blue they stand,
Each in the same old place,
Awaiting the touch of a little hand,
The smile of a little face.
And they wonder, as waiting these long years through,
In the dust of that little chair,
What has become of our Little Boy Blue
Since he kissed them and put them there?

AMEN.

BY REV. F. S. BROWNING.

I cannot say,
Beneath the pressure of life's cares to-day,
I joy in these;
But I can say
That I had rather walk this rugged way,
If Him it please.

I cannot feel
That all is well, when dark'ning clouds conceal
The shining sun;
But then, I know
God lives and loves; and say, since it is so,
"Thy will be done."

I cannot speak
In happy tones; the tear-drops on my cheek
Show I am sad;
But I can speak
Of grace to suffer with submission meek,
Until made glad.

I do not see
Why God should e'en permit some things to be,
When He is love;
But I can see,
Though, often dimly, through the mystery,
His hand above!

I do not know
Where falls the seed that I have tried to sow
With greatest care;
But I shall know
The meaning of each waiting hour below,
Sometime, somewhere!

I do not look
 Upon the present, nor in Nature's book,
 To read my fate;
 But I do look
 For promised blessings in God's Holy Book;
 And I can wait.

I may not try
 To keep the hot tears back, but hush that sigh—
 "It might have been"—
 And try to still
 Each rising murmur and to God's sweet will
 Respond, "Amen!"

NEARER HOME.

BY PHŒBE CARY.

One sweetly solemn thought
 Comes to me o'er and o'er—
 I'm nearer home to-day
 Than I ever have been before;

Nearer my Father's house,
 Where the many mansions be;
 Nearer the great white throne,
 Nearer the Jasper sea;

Nearer the bound of life,
 Where we lay our burdens down;
 Nearer leaving the cross,
 Nearer wearing the crown!

But lying darkly between,
 Winding down through the night,
 Is the silent unknown stream
 That leads at last to the light.

Closer and closer my steps
 Come to the dread Abyss;
 Closer Death to my lips
 Presses the awful chris.

Father, perfect my trust!
 Strengthen my feeble faith!
 Let me feel as I would, when I stand
 On the shore of the river of Death!

Feel as I would, when my feet
 Are slipping over the brink;
 For it may be I'm nearer home,
 Nearer home, than I think.

THE CREED OF THE FLAG.

A reader of THE COMMONER has asked for the publication of a poem written by Dr. Howard S. Taylor, of Chicago, and read at the Jackson Day Banquet given by the Bryan League of Chicago, in 1899. It is a literary gem and presents a patriotic sentiment especially appropriate for consideration at this time. In beautiful language it emphasizes the fact that the flag is sacred, not because of its color, or because of the material of which it is made, but because of the spirit which it has represented. The decision of the Supreme Court, if upheld by the people, will rob the flag of its peculiar excellence and make it represent the same brutal and barbarous doctrine for which the flags of European empires stand.

“Who will haul down the flag?”

—President McKinley.

“Who will haul down the flag?” quoth he;
 And no man an answer gave.
 But who will haul up the flag, ask we,
 Where the flag ought never wave?
 Over an arrogant mission of spoil
 That takes, as a matter of course,
 A subject race and a conquered soil
 And a government based on force!
 Answer us!—answer us! true and fair,
 Who will haul up Old Glory there?

“Who will haul down the flag?” quoth he;
 Nay, think how it first went up
 When War astride of the land and sea
 Poured wrath from his brimming cup;
 When brave men died and left in bequest
 One pledge for the great and the small,
 Not stars for a few and stripes for the rest,
 But the flag of our country for all!
 Answer us, truly and plainly, we pray;
 Was that not its meaning in Washington’s day?

From Washington’s day to Jackson’s time,
 From Yorktown to New Orleans,
 Did any man follow that flag sublime
 And doubt what the symbol means?
 Free self-ruled States, each one as a star
 Fixed fast in a field of blue,
 Fenced in by the blood-red stripes of war
 To preserve them for me and you!
 Answer us, now—do you dare to drag
 The old faith out of our fathers’ flag?

“Who will haul down the flag?” quoth he;
 Why, no hand of flesh and bone
 Can lower that flag, on land or sea,
 Till the faith of the flag is gone!
 Till a few shall rule and cunningly keep
 The bunting to garnish their greed;
 Till dollars are dear and humanity cheap
 By the force of a tory creed!
 Then will it fall!—but answer us, clear,
 Do you fancy that hour is drawing near?

Did our Liberty Bell ring in vain?
 Was our Declaration a lie?
 Must we turn to the Old World, again,
 With the penitent prodigal’s cry?
 Must we arm us and march in the van
 Of Europe’s barbaric parade
 And boom out a gunpowder gospel to man
 To open a pathway for trade?

The Commoner Condensed.

Shall we strut thro' the world and bluster and brag
With the dollar-mark stamped on the brave old flag?

Nay, haul up the flag—raise it high—

Not yet is its spirit spent!

Let it sing to the wind and the sky

The truth that it always meant!

Let it sing of the birthright of man—

Of progress that never can lag;

Let it sing that trade may go—where it can,

But liberty follows the flag!

Yea, haul up Old Glory—but, comrades, take heed

That no man part the old flag from the creed!

THE MAN WITH THE HOE.

BY EDWIN MARKHAM.

(Written after seeing Millet's World-Famous Painting.)

“God made man in His own image,
in the image of God made He him.—Genesis.

Bowed by the weight of centuries he leans
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,
The emptiness of ages in his face,
And on his back the burden of the world.
Who made him dead to rapture and despair,
A thing that grieves not and that never hopes,
Stolid and stunned, a brother to the ox?
Who loosened and let down this brutal jaw?
Whose was the hand that slanted back this brow?
Whose breath blew out the light within this brain?

Is this the Thing the Lord God made and gave
To have dominion over sea and land;
To trace the stars and search the heavens for power;
To feel the passion of Eternity?
Is this the dream He dreamed who shaped the suns
And pillared the blue firmament with light?

Down all the stretch of Hell to its last gulf
There is no shape more terrible than this—
More tongued with censure of the world's blind greed—
More filled with signs and portents for the soul—
More fraught with menace to the universe.

What gulfs between him and the seraphim!
Slave of the wheel of labor, what to him
Are Plato and the swing of Pleiades?
What are the long reaches of the peaks of song,
The rift of dawn, the reddening of the rose?
Through this dread shape the suffering ages look;
Time's tragedy is in that aching stoop;
Through this dread shape humanity betrayed,
Plundered, profaned and disinherited,
Cries protest to the Judges of the World,
A protest that is also prophecy.

O masters, lords and rulers in all lands,
Is this the handiwork you give to God,
This monstrous thing distorted and soul-quenched?
How will you ever straighten up this shape;
Touch it again with immortality;
Give back the upward looking and the light;
Rebuild in it the music and the dream;
Make right the immemorial infamies,
Perfidious wrongs, immedicable woes?

O masters, lords and rulers in all lands,
How will the Future reckon with this Man?
How answer his brute question in that hour
When whirlwinds and rebellion shake the world?
How will it be with kingdoms and with kings—
With those who shaped him to the thing he is—
When this dumb Terror shall reply to God
After the silence of the centuries?

Mr. Sibley. I would like to ask you (perhaps not entirely connected with the matter under discussion) what objection there could be to having the option of redeeming either in silver or gold lie with the treasury instead of the note holder?

Secretary Carlisle. If that policy had been adopted at the beginning of resumption—and I am not saying this for the purpose of criticising the action of any of my predecessors, or anybody else—but if the policy of reserving to the government, at the beginning of resumption, the option of redeeming in gold or silver all its paper presented, I believe it would have worked beneficially, and there would have been no trouble growing out of it, but the Secretaries of the Treasury from the beginning of resumption have pursued a policy of redeeming in gold or silver, at the option of the holder of the paper, and if any secretary had afterward attempted to change that policy and force silver upon a man who wanted gold, or gold upon a man who wanted silver, and especially if he had made that attempt at such a critical period as we have had in the last two years, my judgment is, it would have been very disastrous. There is a vast difference between establishing a policy at the beginning, and reversing a policy after it has been long established, and especially after the situation has been changed.

It will be seen that Mr. Carlisle thought it a mistake to commence paying in gold but considered it dangerous to interfere with the custom after it was once established. By the same logic it can be argued that we should not establish the custom of redeeming the silver dollars in gold.

The measure recommended by the committee gives to the financiers absolute control over the national debt. They can increase it at any time by presenting silver dollars for redemption and compelling an issue of bonds to replenish the gold reserve. They can in the same way contract the volume of money in circulation, since money drawn into the treasury by an issue of bonds cannot go out again unless it is used to meet current expenses (and that is only possible when the expenditures exceed the receipts) or loaned out to favorite banks.

Second, The conversion of standard silver dollars into subsidiary coin is equivalent to the retirement of silver as standard money, and this is the last act in the program instituted some twenty-seven years ago and persistently pursued ever since. If this plan is completed, gold will be the only legal tender money and bank paper the only credit money. Bank notes not being a general legal tender and gold not being in circulation among the people, the masses will then be doing business with money which will not legally discharge their debts.

To convert a standard money into a credit money is to narrow the foundation of our financial system and at the same time

enlarge the superstructure. Such a course weakens the system and both hastens catastrophe and intensifies it when it comes.

It is estimated that ninety-five per cent. of the business of the country is done with substitutes for money, but as all these substitutes are convertible into money on demand there must be a proportion between the substitutes and the money beyond which it is not safe to go. If, as at present, a large part of the money in circulation is not a legal tender, the proportion between the volume of legal tender money and substitutes for money is even greater. The proposed measure, by decreasing the money of ultimate redemption and increasing the volume of promises to pay money, still further enlarges the proportion between money and its substitutes; this necessarily adds to the risk of the business man and lessens the security of the general public.

If, at any time, foreign complications or panics compel a considerable exportation of gold, the proportion between money and its substitutes will be still further increased or an immense reduction will be necessary in the volume of business.

Respectfully yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

THE MAN WITH THE HOE.

On another page will be found Edwin Markham's famous poem, entitled "The Man with the Hoe." Below will be found Mr. Bryan's comment thereon, written for the *New York Journal*:

It is not strange that Edwin Markham's poem entitled "The Man with the Hoe" created a profound sensation. It is a sermon addressed to the heart, and its lesson is not limited to any nation, race or clime. It voices humanity's protest against inhuman greed. There is a majestic sweep to the argument, and some of the lines pierce like arrows:

Is this the Thing the Lord God made and gave
 To have dominion over sea and land;
 To trace the stars and search the heavens for power;
 To feel the passion of Eternity?
 * * * * *
 Through this dread shape the suffering ages look;
 Time's tragedy is in that aching stoop;
 Through this dread shape humanity betrayed,
 Plundered, profaned and disinherited,
 Cries protest to the Judges of the World.
 * * * * *
 Is this the handiwork you give to God?

How feeble, in comparison, have been the answers to it!

The poem deals with the condition, the cause, the remedy and the warning.

The condition is set forth in the lines:

Down all the stretch of Hell to its last gulf
 There is no shape more terrible than this—
 More tongued with censure of the world's blind greed—
 More filled with signs and portents for the soul—
 More fraught with menace to the universe.

It is not answer to the indictment to say that the poet selects his type not from the middle classes, but from the lowest level. He is dealing with the mill which takes in, as raw material, the man made in the image of his Creator and, if it is allowed to complete its work, turns out as the finished product—

A thing that grieves not and that never hopes.

Sometimes it is a tyrant who oppresses for the benefit of himself, his family and the warriors upon whom he relies to enforce his authority; sometimes it is an aristocracy which gathers in the fruits of power and throws upon the masses the burdens of government; sometimes it is a plutocracy which openly exalts money and debases flesh and blood; but everywhere it is the same brutal spirit which ignores the brotherhood of man and violates the commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

The extremes of society are being driven further and further apart. Wealth is being concentrated in the hands of a few, and tenancy is on the increase. At one end of the scale luxury and idleness breed effeminacy; at the other end of the scale want and destitution breed desperation.

Civilization cannot be measured by the refinements and the enjoyments of the rich; the toilers who produce the nation's wealth in time of peace, and constitute the nation's strength in time of war, must participate in every forward movement of the race. In fact, they are so important a factor that the real advancement of the race is measured by their advancement. Improved machinery and inventive genius have multiplied the productive power of the individual, but the producers have not received their share of the increase. The capitalistic class

and the speculating class have enjoyed, and are enjoying, too large a part of the proceeds of labor.

What is the cause?

Who made him dead to rapture and despair?

The literary sycophants who strew rhetorical flowers in the pathway of the successful, without inquiring into the methods employed for securing success, complacently throw the responsibility for failure in life upon God, or Nature, or upon the man himself. Is it the fault of God or of Nature that children are driven into factories at so early an age that their bodies are stunted, their minds dwarfed and the strength and usefulness of future generations lessened? Is God or Nature responsible for the laws which permit this impairment of the man-power and woman-power of the nation? The labor organizations have done much to mitigate the evils of child labor and to shorten the hours of adult labor, but what encouragement have they received from those who favor government by injunction, oppose arbitration and denounce as disturbers of the peace all who criticise existing conditions?

Is it the fault of God or of Nature that our tax laws are so made and our tax systems so administered that the poor man pays more than his share of the taxes and the rich man less than his share?

Is God or Nature to blame for the substitute-system, which raises the purchasing power of the dollar in the hands of the money changer, while it increases the burden of debt to the man who owes and decreases the value of property in the hands of the wealth producers?

Is God or Nature responsible for a paper money trust that makes the people at large the victims of private individuals entrusted with the control of the volume of currency?

Is God or Nature responsible for private monopolies which corner the markets, extort from the people and disburse the proceeds among the holders of watered stock?

Is God or Nature to blame for the substitution of force for reason and might for right in government?

Is God or Nature responsible for the nation's entrance upon a career of conquest, entailing upon the many the burden and menace

How feeble, in comparison, have been the answers to it!

The poem deals with the condition, the cause, the remedy and the warning.

The condition is set forth in the lines:

Down all the stretch of Hell to its last gulf
There is no shape more terrible than this—
More tongued with censure of the world's blind greed—
More filled with signs and portents for the soul—
More fraught with menace to the universe.

It is not answer to the indictment to say that the poet selects his type not from the middle classes, but from the lowest level. He is dealing with the mill which takes in, as raw material, the man made in the image of his Creator and, if it is allowed to complete its work, turns out as the finished product—

A thing that grieves not and that never hopes.

Sometimes it is a tyrant who oppresses for the benefit of himself, his family and the warriors upon whom he relies to enforce his authority; sometimes it is an aristocracy which gathers in the fruits of power and throws upon the masses the burdens of government; sometimes it is a plutocracy which openly exalts money and debases flesh and blood; but everywhere it is the same brutal spirit which ignores the brotherhood of man and violates the commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

The extremes of society are being driven further and further apart. Wealth is being concentrated in the hands of a few, and tenancy is on the increase. At one end of the scale luxury and idleness breed effeminacy; at the other end of the scale want and destitution breed desperation.

Civilization cannot be measured by the refinements and the enjoyments of the rich; the toilers who produce the nation's wealth in time of peace, and constitute the nation's strength in time of war, must participate in every forward movement of the race. In fact, they are so important a factor that the real advancement of the race is measured by their advancement. Improved machinery and inventive genius have multiplied the productive power of the individual, but the producers have not received their share of the increase. The capitalistic class

and the speculating class have enjoyed, and are enjoying, too large a part of the proceeds of labor.

What is the cause?

Who made him dead to rapture and despair?

The literary sycophants who strew rhetorical flowers in the pathway of the successful, without inquiring into the methods employed for securing success, complacently throw the responsibility for failure in life upon God, or Nature, or upon the man himself. Is it the fault of God or of Nature that children are driven into factories at so early an age that their bodies are stunted, their minds dwarfed and the strength and usefulness of future generations lessened? Is God or Nature responsible for the laws which permit this impairment of the man-power and woman-power of the nation? The labor organizations have done much to mitigate the evils of child labor and to shorten the hours of adult labor, but what encouragement have they received from those who favor government by injunction, oppose arbitration and denounce as disturbers of the peace all who criticise existing conditions?

Is it the fault of God or of Nature that our tax laws are so made and our tax systems so administered that the poor man pays more than his share of the taxes and the rich man less than his share?

Is God or Nature to blame for the substitute-system, which raises the purchasing power of the dollar in the hands of the money changer, while it increases the burden of debt to the man who owes and decreases the value of property in the hands of the wealth producers?

Is God or Nature responsible for a paper money trust that makes the people at large the victims of private individuals entrusted with the control of the volume of currency?

Is God or Nature responsible for private monopolies which corner the markets, extort from the people and disburse the proceeds among the holders of watered stock?

Is God or Nature to blame for the substitution of force for reason and might for right in government?

Is God or Nature responsible for the nation's entrance upon a career of conquest, entailing upon the many the burden and menace

of militarism and conferring upon the few the benefits of exploitation?

The United States supreme court has coined the phrase, "larceny by law," and compared with ordinary stealing this form of theft may be called grand larceny; and yet wholesale wrongdoing is never taken into account by those who assume that all who are poor deserve their poverty, and that all who are rich earn their riches. If one employs another to commit robbery he is as guilty as if he commits the act himself; does it change the moral character of the act because the injury is done indirectly instead of directly? Does it change the moral character of the act because the injury is done through legislation which he has secured or in the absence of some righteous law the passage of which he has prevented?

The accumulation of wealth by honest means is to be encouraged, but the line must be drawn between honest wealth—the reward of brain service or muscle service rendered—and predatory wealth which defies the law or turns government itself into a machine for the plunder of the public.

The indolent cannot expect plenty under any just form of government, neither can the vicious expect happiness, but under bad laws those who work the hardest may enjoy the least, and those who labor least may have the most.

But the remedy:

How will you ever straighten up this shape,
Touch it again with immortality?

Give justice to every creature—justice in the methods of government, justice in the distribution of the burdens of government, justice in the making of the laws, justice in the interpretation of the laws, justice in the execution of the laws. Justice first and charity afterwards.

Justice will not eliminate distress entirely, but it will greatly reduce the number of those who come within the description of the poet. There will still be some poor, some destitute, some desperate. Generations of vice will transmit tendencies toward vice, which must be reformed.

Some will be victims of unavoidable misfortunes—they will need the aid of the more fortunate. The orphan will need a foster-

parent, the widow will need a friend, the aged without relatives will need a benefactor. The weak must be encouraged by the strong; those who fall must be lifted up.

Love is the antithesis of greed; it will inspire both justice and mercy. Love and love alone can regulate the relations between man and man and plant a hope in the breast of every child born into the world.

When every man-made wrong is remedied there will still be suffering enough to enable every person to prove his love toward God by manifesting his compassion toward his fellows.

But the poet presents also a warning:

How will the future reckon with this man,
 How answer his brute question in that hour
 When whirlwinds of rebellion shake the world?
 How will it be with kingdoms and with kings—
 With those who shaped him to the thing he is—
 When this dumb terror shall reply to God
 After the silence of the centuries?

In monarchies revolution is the only weapon of the oppressed; under our form of government wrongs are righted by the ballot; but even here the longer a necessary reform is delayed the more disturbance its accomplishment causes.

Victor Hugo has described the mob as "the human race in misery." We cannot afford to make people miserable. Life is secure and property rights are respected in proportion as the people find life worth living. Happy will be the lot of all when each member of society makes to society a just and adequate return for that which he receives from society. Happy will be the lot of all when each member of society recognizes the indissoluble tie that binds together the highest and the lowest, the strongest and the weakest, the richest and the poorest—when each member of society aids according to his ability to give back to the poet's subject:

* * * the upward looking and the light;
 Rebuild in it the music and the dream;
 Make right the immemorial infamies,
 Prefidious wrongs, immedicable woes.

RATIFY THE TREATY. DECLARE THE NATION'S
POLICY.

I gladly avail myself of the columns of the *Journal* to suggest a few reasons why the opponents of a colonial policy should make their fight in support of a resolution declaring the nation's purpose rather than against the ratification of the treaty.

The conflict between the doctrine of self-government and the doctrine of alien government supported by external force has been thrust upon the American people as a result of the war. It is so important a conflict that it cannot be avoided, and, since it deals with a question now before congress, it must be considered immediately. It is useless to ask what effect this new issue will have upon other issues. Issues must be met as they arise; they cannot be moved about at will like pawns upon a chess board.

The opponents of imperialism have an opportunity to choose the ground upon which the battle is to be fought. Why not oppose the ratification of the treaty?

First, because a victory won against the treaty would prove only temporary if the people really favor a colonial policy.

That a victory won against the treaty would depend for its value entirely upon the sentiment of the people is evident. A minority can obstruct action for a time, but a minority, so long as it remains a minority, can only delay action and enforce reflection; it cannot commit the nation to a policy.

When there seemed some probability of the rejection of the treaty the friends of the administration began to suggest the propriety of withholding the treaty until the new senate could be convened in extra session. As the new senate will have a considerable republican majority it would be quite certain to ratify the treaty. Thus an effort to prevent the ratification of the treaty would be likely to fail in the very beginning. But let us suppose it possible to defeat ratification in both the present and the next senate—what would be the result? Would the imperialists abandon the hope of annexing the Philippines so long as they could claim the support of the president and a majority of both houses? Could a minority of the senate prevent the annexation of Hawaii? As we are now in possession of the Philippine Islands the advocates of a colonial policy might secure an appropriation sufficient

to pay the twenty millions agreed upon and leave the rest of the treaty for future consideration. In other words, if the opponents of imperialism have a majority in both houses they can declare the nation's policy; if the imperialists have a majority in both houses they cannot be permanently thwarted by a minority in the senate.

A resolution declaring the nation's policy recognizes that the destiny of the United States is in the hands of all the people and seeks to ascertain at once the sentiment of the people as reflected by their representatives.

If that decision is in harmony with the policy which has prevailed in the past the question will be settled and the people will return to the consideration of domestic problems. If, however, the advocates of imperialism either postpone consideration or control the action of congress an appeal will be taken to the voters at the next election. So great a change in our national policy cannot be made unless the authority therefor comes directly and unequivocally from that source of all power in a republic—the people.

In answer to those who fear that the question of imperialism, if discussed, will draw attention away from other questions, it is sufficient to say that the people cannot be prevented from considering a question which reaches down to the foundation principles of the republic. Instead of avoiding the issue it is the part of wisdom to deal with it at once and dispose of it permanently.

Second, the rejection of the treaty would be unwise because the opponents of the treaty would be compelled to assume responsibility for the continuance of war conditions and for the risks which always attend negotiations with a hostile nation.

The rejection of the treaty would give the administration an excuse for military expenditures which could not be justified after the conclusion of peace, and the opponents of the treaty would be charged with making such appropriations necessary. It must be remembered that in case the treaty is rejected negotiations must be renewed with an enemy whose ill-will is not concealed. Who is able to guarantee the nation against new dangers and new complications? In order to form an estimate of the risks which would thus be incurred, one has only to recall the unexpected things which have happened since war was declared. Is

it wise to so make the attack as to assume all the risks when the same end can be gained by a plan which throws the risks upon our opponents? If the imperialists vote down a resolution declaring the nation's policy or postpone its consideration, they become responsible for any loss of life or expenditure of money which may follow as a result of such action.

I suggest below a few reasons in support of a resolution declaring it to be the nation's purpose to establish a stable government in Cuba and the Philippines and then to give the inhabitants independence under an American protectorate which will guard them against molestation from without.

First, such a course is consistent with national honor.

Our nation owes it to the nations with which we have dealings, as well as to the inhabitants of Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines, to announce immediately what it intends to do respecting the territory surrendered by Spain.

The president has said that the only purpose our nation has in taking possession of Cuba is to assist the inhabitants to establish a stable and independent government. It can do no harm for congress to reaffirm this purpose, and it may do much good. The Cubans, having fought for independence for many years and against great odds, are naturally jealous of the liberty which they have won and no doubt should be left as to the sincerity and good faith of our government in its dealings with them. Such a declaration would not only be harmless, but it is almost made necessary by the flippant, if not contemptuous, tone in which some United States officials speak of the intelligence and patriotism of the Cubans and of their right to independence.

The duty of declaring our national policy in regard to the Philippines is even more imperative. The Filipinos were fighting for independence when the United States declared war against Spain. In the formal protest filed with the peace commissioners in Paris the representatives of Aguinaldo assert that they received friendly assurances from United States officials and acted upon those assurances in co-operating against the Spaniards. Whether or not such assurances were given, frankness and honesty should characterize our dealings with them.

If we announce to the world that we hold the Philippines Islands, not for pecuniary profit, but in trust for the inhabitants; **if we**

declare that our only purpose is to assist the Filipinos to establish a stable and independent government, friendly relations will be maintained and there will be little need of troops. If, on the other hand, the Filipinos are not to have independence, but merely a change of masters we should break the news to them at once and send over a large army to instruct them in the principles of a government which, in one hemisphere, derives its just powers from the consent of the governed and in the other derives its authority from superior force.

While our nation is not prepared to draft a complete code of laws suited to the peculiar needs of the Filipinos we ought to be able to decide at once whether we intend to deal with them according to the principles of our own government or according to the customs prevailing among European monarchies. Even a republican congress ought to be able to choose without hesitation between a policy which establishes a republic in the Orient and a policy which sows the seeds of militarism in the United States.

The trade relations possible under a protectorate would be of more value to the United States than any which could come as the result of forcible annexation.

The people of Porto Rico have not manifested any desire for political independence and would in all probability favor annexation, yet it is only right that they should have an opportunity to choose. The resolution authorizing intervention recognized the right of the Cubans to independence. To be consistent we must also respect the wishes of the inhabitants of Porto Rico. The resolution could, without impropriety, offer annexation to Porto Rico.

In a recent interview I suggested that the United States should retain a harbor and coaling station in the Philippines and in Porto Rico in return for services rendered and added that Cuba should be asked to make a similar concession on the same ground.

Second, a resolution declaring the nation's purpose presents a plain and clear-cut issue between the theory of self-government and the colonial policy. It presents a positive, affirmative method of dealing with the question. In opposing the treaty we would be on the defensive; in outlining a policy we shall be aggressive. The strongest arguments which could be used in support of the treaty will lose their force entirely when Spain is eliminated and the

American people are able to dispose of the question according to their own ideas and interests.

: Third, it secures, by easier means, every end that can be secured by a rejection of the treaty.

· If an officer of the law arrests a person in possession of stolen goods he can either compel the return of the goods to the owner or he can first rescue them and then return them himself. We find Spain in the possession of a title to a part of the Philippines. She has not yet conquered all the native tribes, but the title which she has was acquired by force and has been held by force. We can either compel her to surrender her title to the Filipinos, as we compelled her to surrender Cuba to the Cubans, or we can accept possession and then of our own accord turn over the islands to the inhabitants. The peace commissioners might have demanded independence for the Filipinos as they did for the Cubans; if they did not properly interpret the wishes of the people of the United States the blame must fall upon them and not upon the people. Certainly seventy millions of citizens are under no obligations to abate their devotion to the ideals which they have cherished for a century in order to indorse the work of a peace commission or to approve of the instructions of an executive.

If it is urged that the ratification of the treaty imposes upon us an obligation to pay twenty millions of dollars to Spain, I answer, first, that this amount can probably be secured from the Filipinos in return for independence, and, second, that, if it cannot be secured from them, it is better to lose the amount entirely than to expend a larger sum in securing a modification of the treaty.

It is better to regard the amount paid as a contribution to liberty than to consider it the market price of land, improvements or people.

To terminate the war upon the same high plane upon which it was inaugurated is worthy of a great republic; to descend from a sublime beginning to the purchase of sovereignty (for our own profit) from a nation whose title we disputed in Cuba would lay us open to the charge of Punic faith.

INDUSTRIAL COMBINATIONS.

Below will be found an article written by Mr. Bryan recently for *Collier's Weekly* and reproduced by the courtesy of that paper:

In considering industrial combinations, the subject naturally divides itself into the condition to be considered, the probable result of present tendencies, and the remedy.

The word "trust" used to designate large corporations, does not accurately describe the thing complained of. In the beginning combinations in restraint of trade were formed by an agreement between separate companies, whereby the stock was held in trust by an association which controlled several corporations. At present there is no deposit of stock in trust, but in place of the old system we find a great corporation owning and controlling a number of plants. A distinction should be made between a corporation, however large, and a monopoly. In fact, it is impossible to consider what is known as the trust question without keeping in mind the proportion which the output of the corporation under discussion bears to the total output of all factories in the United States. For instance, if we have one hundred woollen factories scattered over the country, producing together the total amount of domestic woollens manufactured in the United States, a combination whereby two, or five, or even ten, were joined under one management would present a very different situation from that which would be produced by the consolidation of all of them into one corporation. The monopoly feature appears whenever a corporation is sufficiently powerful to control the market. The fundamental question to be considered, therefore, is whether competition is desirable or undesirable. I shall speak of this later in discussing remedies, but it must always be borne in mind that the elimination of competition is, temporarily at least, beneficial to the man who has the monopoly. This cannot be doubted, but is it not detrimental both to the consumer and to the laborer?

RIGHTS OF THE LABORER.

The consumer has certain needs which must be supplied; under competition, he is protected from extortion by the opportunity which he has to purchase the article offered him at the lowest price. Under monopoly he has no choice, but must take what is offered him at the price fixed by the seller. A skilled laborer has a right to demand from his employer full value for his services.

When there are many employers, each pecuniarily interested in securing the best service, the laborer is better protected than he is when there is but one employer. The labor organization is an aid to the laboring men in securing reasonable hours, just compensation, and fair conditions. At present the labor organization

is practically the only protection the wage-earner has, but the labor organization, however perfect and complete, is no match for an absolute industrial monopoly. Workmen with families dependent upon them could not live long without work, neither could they afford to engage in another line of work where their special training would be of no advantage. The pressing every-day needs of the body make a contest of endurance between flesh and blood on the one side and capital on the other very unequal.

IMPOSSIBLE COMPETITION.

The man who attempts to manufacture an article in competition with a thoroughly established monopoly has before him a difficult, if not an almost impossible task. To recur to the above illustration, if all the woollen mills now in existence should be gathered under the control of one corporation with a capital of half a billion, who could compete with it successfully? If a person amply supplied with capital to conduct under ordinary conditions a successful mill were to compete with a monopoly, such monopoly would be able, at a very small expense to itself, to undersell him in his particular field, while maintaining prices in other parts of the country. If an organization of equal capital attempted rivalry, it would first have to overcome the advantage which the established industry had secured by the advertisement of its wares, and then, if it were successful, the country would have more woollen plants than necessary to supply the demand, and more skilled laborers than would be required for the work.

SAGE'S NOTE OF WARNING.

Private monopolies have always been regarded as unlawful, and there are numerous instances where the people have overthrown them when their exactions become intolerable. Mr. McKinley has condemned the trusts, although, it must be confessed, with ever diminishing emphasis. Organized capital has been making such gigantic strides toward the control of industry during the last few months that even those who have been in the habit of belittling reformers, and accustomed to regard all criticism of corporations as evidence of discontent, are becoming alarmed. Mr. Russell Sage has never been considered a demagogue, neither has he shown himself unduly hostile to capitalists as a class; his note of warning, therefore, is the more significant. In a recently published article in the *North American Review* he thus describes the industrial situation as it appears to him:

“The chief owners of the Standard Oil business have grown so enormously wealthy that, in their individual as well as in their corporate capacity, they dominate wherever they choose to go. They

can make or unmake almost any property, no matter how vast. They can compel any man to sell them anything at any price."

He fortifies his own observations by quoting the language of Henry Clews, another Wall Street operator. This presents one phase of the question. When combinations of capital "can make or unmake almost any property, no matter how vast," and when they can "almost compel any man to sell them anything at any price," then they cease to be private affairs and become matters of public concern. The question is not whether the public has a right to interfere with the manner in which these combinations use their own property, but whether the public will allow them to appropriate or destroy the property of other people.

Of the new steel company, Mr. Sage says:

"The consolidations of to-day begin at the very outset with capitalizations that cast all past experiences into the shade, and that almost stagger the imagination. The steel combination now forming we are told, is to start off with a capitalization of \$1,000,000,000. This is more than one-half of the national debt. It is one-seventieth of the entire wealth of the United States. The total money circulation in the United States, according to the treasurer's statistics, is \$2,113,294,938. It will be seen, therefore, that this company's issue of securities will represent practically one-half of the entire volume of money in America. In a year or two, if precedents count for anything, this capitalization will be very largely increased, and that in spite of the fact that stockholders in the steel company, which was the basis of the new combination, got three shares of stock in the new company for one in the old—scores of millions being thus added to the interest-earning securities in the United States, by merely the stroke of a pen. When wealth is created in that way, what security is there for the whole scheme? Not another furnace added to the plant; simply a lifting process, and what was one million before is three millions now. The great experience and strength of the men who produced this change will make us accept the new valuation, and that is all there is in it.

If any of the men in whom we very properly have this confidence should die suddenly, everything would be disorganized. Even as it is, things may break at a critical period, and then we shall have to find a new level with considerable trouble and agitation to ourselves. Just at present, no one can say, with anything like accuracy, where we stand.

UNDERESTIMATED CAPITALIZATION.

This corporation was being formed when Mr. Sage's article was written, and he underestimated the capitalization, but his remarks in regard to the watering of stock are in point; the illustration

used to set forth the magnitude of the corporations is apt, and his comment upon the effect of the death of a trust manager is certainly worthy of consideration.

The watering of stock is not only indefensible, but it contradicts the arguments made by interested parties in defense of trusts. The favorite contention of promoters is that consolidation makes production more economical, and, therefore, tends to lower prices. But nearly every corporation that attempts a monopoly proceeds to capitalize the expected savings, thus giving to the stockholders the advantage promised to the consumers.

If a corporation plans to control any product, and estimates a saving of one million by the discharge of travelling salesmen, it figures that that amount will pay 5 per cent. interest on twenty million dollars, and it immediately increases the stock to that extent. A prospectus issued by the International Steam Pump Company shows that the properties bought were estimated at less than twelve million dollars, while the company was capitalized at twenty-seven and a half millions. The earnings for the preceding year were estimated at one million two hundred thousand. The prospectus adds, in conspicuous type: "A conservative estimate of the advantages derived from consolidation is believed to be one million three hundred thousand over the present earnings, which would make a total of future net earnings, with the estimated earnings based on ten months of the year's business, of two million five hundred thousand, or six per cent. on the preferred stock, and over eleven per cent. on the common stock of the new company."

THE MANY CANNOT INFLATE VALUES.

The farmer is not able to inflate the value of his farm; the merchant is not able to inflate the value of the goods upon his shelf; the laboring man cannot put a fictitious value upon his services. But a monopoly is able to collect dividends upon watered stock, and to secure interest upon money never invested in the business. Why should it be tolerated? Why should a fictitious person, called a corporation, be granted privileges or be permitted to enjoy immunities denied to the natural citizen? It is inevitable that the ordinary individual, whether customer, merchant, or employe, must feel the evil effects of over-capitalization. If a farmer realizes only a small profit when he sells, but is compelled when he buys to pay the manufacturer a large profit, it is evident that he will fall behind in the race for a competency. If the merchant must sell at a profit fixed by competition, and buy at a price fixed by monopoly, and upon terms regulated wholly in the interests of the manufacturer, he will have to bear all the vicissitudes of trade, and will find himself at a great disadvantage. The managers of the corporations will be

interested in keeping the stock at par, and in dull times there will be a perpetual contest between wages and watered stock.

The same number of the *North American Review* which contains Mr. Sage's article contains replies thereto by Mr. Hill of the Great Northern, Northern Pacific and Burlington Railroad combination, Mr. Schwab of the Steel Trust, Mr. Flint of the Rubber Trust, and Mr. Logan of the Envelope Trust. But the testimony given by these gentlemen must be taken with that allowance which is always made for the testimony of witnesses pecuniarily interested.

APPLICATION OF EVERY-DAY RULE.

In discussing the result to follow from the establishment of industrial combinations for the suppression of competition, one can only apply the rules which are seen in operation every day. Human nature does not change much from generation to generation; selfishness is as potent an influence to-day as it was a century ago. Advancement is not secured by the elimination of selfishness, but by restraining excessive manifestations of it.

First, extortionate prices to the consumer will prevail. The same greed which leads trust magnates to issue stock in excess of the money invested will lead them to make the dividends as large as possible, and the same greed which leads them to increase the dividends will lead them to repeat stock inflation indefinitely.

Second, industrial monopoly is likely to result in lessening wages and in increasing friction between employers and employes. The larger the corporation the more complete the separation of the employe from the manager of the corporation, and the less the sympathy between those who toil and those who fix the wages.

Third, the enhancement of the price of trust-made articles must in the long run lessen the demand for the product by lessening the ability of the consumers to purchase. This in turn means curtailment of production and a diminished demand for labor.

Fourth, under a system of monopoly all loss can be thrown upon the laborers. Under competition the factory often runs at bare cost, or even below cost, because suspension of work might mean the scattering of the employes to other centres of industry. But when a corporation has control of the market, it can close down without loss and leave the employes in idleness until the surplus is worked off at a high price. Thus a high wage per day, when there is employment, may mean a small annual income.

Fifth, monopoly is likely to result in deterioration of the product.

Sixth, the opportunity to make enormous profits by market fluctuations is apt to lead the managers of monopolies to speculate

at the expense of the ordinary stockholders, and suggests a method of influencing public officials far more potent than any form of direct bribery.

Seventh, monopoly provides a few places with excessive salaries, but denies to a multitude of competent and deserving men the possibility of industrial and financial independence. It crowns a few with laurels, and condemns the masses to hopeless servitude.

Eighth, as imperialism substitutes a sullen subject for a bold and self-assertive citizen, so an industrial monopoly converts the ambitious and progressive artisan into a timid and servile dependent.

Ninth, with a complete monopoly we may expect that the control, descending with the stock from father to son, will create an industrial aristocracy, as hostile to liberty as the landed aristocracy which was overthrown by our forefathers.

Whether a remedy needs to be applied depends upon the answer given to the inquiry in regard to competition. If competition is desirable, a private monopoly is indefensible. If, on the other hand, the suppression of competition is a thing to be desired, some plan must be devised to make the suppression complete. It would be obviously unfair for one portion of the community to be protected from competition while another portion was subjected to it. No principle can be accepted as sound which is not susceptible of general application. If the people decide that competition should be suppressed, they must choose between private monopoly and socialism. I do not mean that system of socialism now called extreme, which would place the government in control of all the forces of production and distribution, but a still more complete system, which would make the state the beneficiary of all service rendered and the distributor of all compensation.

EXTINCTION OF PRIVATE MONOPOLY.

Extinction of private monopoly is, in my judgment, both desirable and possible. The corporation is the institution through which the monopoly develops, and, as a corporation is purely a creature of law, the people can place on it such limitations as may be necessary for public welfare and protection. The state has power to prevent the creation of any corporation within its limits, or to fix the conditions upon which a corporation may exist. It also has the power, or should have, to prescribe the terms upon which a foreign corporation may do business in the state. The distinction between the natural man and the corporate person is so great that the state should have the power, if it has not now, to give its citizens any necessary protection from corporations organized elsewhere. But the state is not able to

furnish a complete remedy, and, without taking away the rights which the state now has, congress should give additional protection. The Sherman anti-trust law prohibits contracts entered into by separate persons or corporations for the limiting of production, fixing of price, or division of territory. While this law has not, according to the belief of many, been enforced as it should have been, it is not broad enough to reach a monopoly attempted by a single corporation. According to the constitution, congress has power to regulate interstate commerce, and under this power it certainly has a right to define a monopoly, and to prevent such a monopoly from engaging in interstate commerce. It can deny to a monopoly the use of the mails as it does to the lottery. It can also deny to it the use of the interstate telegraph lines or railroad system. It can require a corporation to establish to the satisfaction of the interstate commerce commission, or of some other commission created for the purpose, the fact that there is no water in the stock, and that it is not attempting to monopolize any branch of business, and it can provide for a revocation of the permit or license if the conditions are violated. It can fix a maximum proportion between the business which any corporation engaged in interstate commerce shall be permitted to do, and the total business done in that line. It can fix the maximum capitalization of corporations engaged in interstate commerce, or the maximum dividends which they may earn. It can require a corporation to sell to all customers at the same price and on the same terms, and it can remove the tariff from trust-made articles. These are a few of the remedies that have been discussed.

While congress cannot interfere with a domestic corporation, it has supreme power over commerce between the states. The failure of congress to pass necessary laws, and of officials to enforce existing laws, is due to the fact that members of congress and executive officers are under obligations to the trusts and monopolies for campaign assistance. The people can put an end to private monopolies as soon as they undertake it in earnest—and not before.

BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

Justice Brown in delivering the opinion of the court in the Downes case said:

“Grave apprehensions of danger are felt by many eminent men—a fear lest an unrestrained possession of power on the part of congress may lead to unjust and oppressive legislation, in which the natural rights of territories, or their inhabitants, may

be engulfed in a centralized despotism. These fears, however, find no justification in the action of congress in the past century, nor in the conduct of the British parliament toward its outlying possessions since the American revolution."

It marks an epoch in American history when the highest court of the land uses the experience of England to support an attack upon written constitutions. It is the most audacious and unblushing surrender of fundamental principles which has occurred in this country. As Justice Brown invites us to consider and admire the conduct of an unrestrained parliament it may not be out of place to look at English rule in India. Below will be found a discussion of this subject prepared for and published in the *New York Journal*:

In the discussion of a colonial policy for the United States frequent references will be made to England's government of India. The imperialists are already declaring that Great Britain's policy has resulted in profit to herself and benefit to her Asiatic subjects.

The opponents of imperialism, on the other hand, find in India's experience a warning against a policy which places one nation under the control of another and distant nation.

In 1600 the first East India company was organized. Its charter was for fifteen years, but a new and perpetual charter was granted in 1609. Under the reign of Charles II. the company obtained another charter, which continued former privileges and added authority "to make peace or war with any prince or people (in India) not being Christian."

The affairs of the company were managed with an eye single to gain, and intervention in the quarrels of native princes resulted in the gradual extension of its influence. Money was the object, and the means employed would not always bear scrutiny. There was, however, no hypocritical mingling of an imaginary "philanthropy" with an actual "five per cent."

In 1757 Lord Clive, by the battle of Plassey, made the company the dominant power in Indian politics, and under Clive and Hastings the income of the East India company reached enormous proportions.

The history of the century, beginning with the battle of Plassey and ending with the Sepoy mutiny in 1857, was written under headlines like the following: "The First War With Hyder Ali," "The Rohilla War," "The Second War With Hyder Ali," "The War With Tippoo Saib," "The War With the Mahrattas," "Suppression of the Pindaris," "The Last of the Peshwas," "The First Burmese War," "The First Afghan War," "The Conquest of Scinde," "The Sekh Wars," "The Conquest of Punjab," "The

The Commoner Condensed.

Annexation of Pegu," "The Annexation of Oudh," "The Outbreak of Meerut," "The Seizure of Delhi," "The Siege of Lucknow," etc., etc.

This brief review is not given because it is interesting, but to acquaint the reader with the imperialistic plan of solving the problem of civilization by the elimination of unruly factors.

In 1858 parliament, by an act entitled an act "for the better government of India," confessed that the management of Indian affairs could be improved and placed the control in the hands of a Secretary of State for India and a council.

In 1877 Queen Victoria assumed the title of Empress of India.

Even if it could be shown that England's sovereignty over India had brought blessings to the Indian people and advantage to the inhabitants of Great Britain, we could not afford to adopt the policy. A monarchy can engage in work which a republic dare not undertake. A monarchy is constructed upon the theory that authority descends from the king and that privileges are granted by the crown to the subjects. Of course the ruling power recognizes that it owes a duty to the people, but while the obligation is binding upon the conscience of the sovereign it cannot be enforced by the subject.

Webster presented this idea with great force in his speech on the Greek revolution. After setting forth the agreement between the allied powers, he said: "The first of these principles is, that all popular or constitutional rights are holden no otherwise than as grants from the crown. Society, upon this principle, has no rights of its own; it takes good government, when it gets it, as a boon and a concession, but can demand nothing. It is to live in that favor which emanates from royal authority, and if it have the misfortune to lose that favor, there is nothing to protect it against any degree of injustice and oppression. It can rightfully make no endeavor for a change, by itself; its whole privilege is to receive the favors that may be dispensed by the sovereign power, and all its duty is described in the single word, submission. This is the plain result of the principal continental state papers; indeed, it is nearly the identical text of some of them."

The English people have from time to time forced the crown to recognize certain rights, but the principle of monarchy still exists. The sovereign has a veto upon all legislation; the fact that this veto has not been used of late does not change the governmental theory and, in India, the application of the theory has deprived the Indian people of participation in the control of their own affairs.

A nation which denies the principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed can give self-government to one colony and deny it to another; it can give it to colonies strong enough to exact it by force and deny it to

weaker ones; but a nation which recognizes the people as the only sovereigns, and regards those temporarily in authority merely as public servants, is not at liberty to apply the principle to one section of the country and refuse it to another.

But, so far from supporting the contention of the imperialists, British rule in India really enforces every argument that can be made against a colonial system of government. In the first place, to authorize a commercial company "to make peace or war with any prince or people (not Christian)," according to its pleasure, was to place the pecuniary interests of a few stockholders above the rights of those with whom they had dealings. Clive and Hastings seem to have acted upon this authority. When the former was called to account he confessed that he had forged a treaty and his conduct was such that parliament was compelled to vote that he "had abused his powers and set an evil example to the servants of the public," but, as he had increased the power of England in India, his condemnation was accompanied by the declaration that he had, "at the same time, rendered great and meritorious services to his country."

The prosecution of Hastings for wrongs inflicted upon the people of India occupies a conspicuous place among the political trials of history. The speeches made against him recall the orations of Cicero against Verres, who, by the way, was also charged with plundering a colony.

Cicero said that Verres relied for his hope of escape upon his ability to corrupt the judges of his day, and it appears that the East Indian company was also accused of polluting the stream of justice only a century ago.

In his speeches on the Nabob of Arcot's debts, Burke said: "Let no man hereafter talk of the decaying energies of nature. All the acts and monuments in the records of peculation; the consolidated corruption of ages; the pattern of exemplary plunder in the heroic times of Roman iniquity, never equalled the gigantic corruption of this single act. Never did Nero, in all the insolent prodigality of despotism, deal out to his praetorian guards a donation fit to be named with the largess showered down by the bounty of our chancellor of the exchequer on the faithful band of his Indian sepoys."

How little human nature changes from age to age! How weak is the boasted strength of the arm of the law when the defendant possesses the influence purchased by great wealth, however obtained, and the accusation comes from a far-off victim of oppression!

Those who expect justice to be exercised by officials far removed from the source of power—officials who do not receive their commissions from, and cannot be removed by, the people whom they govern—should read Sheridan's great speech portraying the effect of the Hastings policy upon the people of India.

Below will be found an extract:

“If, my lords, a stranger had at this time entered the province of Oude, ignorant of what had happened since the death of Sujat Dowlah, that prince who, with a savage heart, had still great lines of character, and who, with all his ferocity in war, had with a cultivating hand preserved to his country the wealth which it derived from benignant skies, and a prolific soil; if observing the wide and general devastation of fields unclotted and brown; of vegetation burnt up and extinguished; of villages depopulated and in ruin; of temples unroofed and perishing; of reservoirs broken down and dry, this stranger would ask, What has thus laid waste this beautiful and opulent land; what monstrous madness has ravaged with widespread war; what desolating foreign foe; what civil discords; what disputed succession; what religious zeal; what fabled monster has stalked abroad and, with malice and mortal enmity to man, withered by the grasp of death every growth of nature and humanity, all means of delight, and each original, simple principle of bare existence? The answer would have been: Not one of these causes! No wars have ravaged these lands and depopulated these villages! No desolating foreign foe! no domestic broils! no disputed succession! no religious superserviceable zeal! no poisonous monster! no affliction of Providence, which, while it scourges us, cut off the sources of resuscitation!

“No. This damp of death is the mere effusion of British amity! We sink under the pressure of their support! We writhe under their perfidious grip! They have embraced us with their protecting arms, and lo! these are the fruits of their alliance!”

No clearer case was ever made against a prisoner at the bar, and yet after seven years' trial before the house of lords, Hastings was acquitted, not because he was guiltless, but because England had acquired territory by his policy.

Lord Macaulay, in describing the crimes perpetrated at that time against a helpless people, gives expression to a truth which has lost none of its force with the lapse of years. He says: “And then was seen what we believe to be the most frightful of all spectacles, the strength of civilization without its mercy. To all other despotism there is a check, imperfect indeed, and liable to gross abuse, but still sufficient to preserve society from the last extreme of misery. A time comes when the evils of submission are obviously greater than those of resistance, when fear itself begets a sort of courage, when a convulsive burst of popular rage and despair warns tyrants not to presume too far on the patience of mankind. But against misgovernment such as then afflicted Bengal, it is impossible to struggle. The superior intelligence and energy of the dominant class made their power irresistible. A war

of Bengalese against Englishmen was like a war of sheep against wolves, of men against demons."

"The strength of civilization without its mercy!"

The American people are capable of governing themselves, but what reason have we to believe that they can wisely administer the affairs of distant races? It is difficult enough to curb corporate power in this country, where the people who suffer have in their own hands the means of redress; how much more difficult it would be to protect the interests of the people where the people who do the governing do not feel the suffering and where the people who do the suffering must rely upon the mercy of alien rulers!

True, Macaulay argues that English morality, tardily but finally, followed English authority into the Orient, but, as a matter of fact, the bleeding of India has continued systematically during the present century. Polite and refined methods have been substituted for the rude and harsh ones formerly employed, and the money received is distributed among a larger number, but the total sum annually drawn from India is greater now than it was when England's foremost orators and statesmen were demanding the impeachment of notorious malefactors.

Sir J. Strachey, an Englishman, in a history recently published, is quoted as saying that "the confiscation of the rights of the ryots (in Bengal) has reached vast proportions." He then shows that through the action of the English government the Zemindars, or middle men, have been able to enormously increase their income at the expense of the tillers of the soil, the increase being from four hundred thousand pounds in the last century to thirteen million pounds at the present time.

On the 28th of December, 1897—only a year ago—a meeting of the London Indian society was held at Montague Mansions and strong resolutions adopted. Below will be found an extract from the resolutions:

"That this conference of Indians, resident in the United Kingdom, is of opinion—

"That of all the evils and 'terrible misery' that India has been suffering for a century and a half, and of which the latest developments are the most deplorable, famine and plague, arising from ever-increasing poverty, the stupid and suicidal frontier war and its savagery, of the wholesale destruction of villages, unworthy of any people, but far more so of English civilization; the unwise and suicidal prosecutions for sedition; the absurd and ignorant cry of the disloyalty of the educated Indians, and for the curtailment of the liberty of the Indian press; the despotism—like that of the imprisonment of the Natus, and the general insufficiency and inefficiency of the administration—of all these and many other minor evils the main cause is the unrighteous and un-British

system of government which produces an unceasing and ever-increasing bleeding of the country, and which is maintained by a political hypocrisy and continuous subterfuges unworthy of the British honor and name, and entirely in opposition to the wishes of the British people, and utterly in violation of acts and resolutions of parliament, and of the most solemn and repeated pledges of the British nation and sovereign.

“That unless the present unrighteous and un-British system of government is thoroughly reformed into a righteous and truly British system destruction to India and disaster to the British empire must be the inevitable result.”

Mr. Naoroji, an Indian residing in England, in supporting the resolution, pointed out the continuous drain of money from India and argued that the people were compelled “to make brick, not only without straw, but even without clay.” He insisted that England’s trade with India would be greater if she would allow the people of India a larger participation in the affairs of their own government and protested against the policy of sending Englishmen to India to hold the offices and draw their support from taxes levied upon the inhabitants. He complained that British justice is one thing in England and quite another thing in India, and said: “There (in India) it is only the business of the people to pay taxes and to slave; and the business of the government to spend those taxes to their own benefit. Whenever any question arises between Great Britain and India there is a demoralized mind. The principles of politics, of commerce, of equality which are applied to Great Britain are not applied to India. As if it were not inhabited by human beings!”

Does any one doubt that, if we annex the Philippines and govern them by agents sent from here, questions between them and the people of the United States will be settled by the people of the United States and for the benefit of the people of the United States? If we make subjects of them against their will and for our own benefit are we likely to govern them with any more benevolence?

The resolutions quoted mention efforts for the curtailment of the liberty of the press. Is that not a necessary result of governmental injustice? Are we likely to allow the Filipinos freedom of the press, if we enter upon a system that is indefensible according to our theory of government?

Mr. Hyndman, an English writer, in a pamphlet issued in 1897, calls attention to English indifference to India’s wrongs, and, as an illustration of this indifference, cites the fact that during the preceding year the India budget affecting the welfare of nearly three hundred millions of people was brought before parliament on the last day of the session when only a few members were

present. He asserts that "matters are far worse than they were in the days of the old East India company," and that "nothing short of a great famine, a terrible pestilence, or a revolt on a large scale, will induce the mass of Englishmen to devote any attention whatever to the affairs of India."

To show how, in the government of India, the interests of English office-holders outweigh the interests of the natives, I give an extract from the pamphlet already referred to:

"First, under the East India company, and then, and far more completely, under the direct rule of the crown of the English people, the natives have been shut out from all the principal positions of trust over five-sixths of Hindostan, and have been prevented from gaining any experience in the higher administration, or in military affairs.

"Whenever it was possible to put in an Englishman to oust a native an Englishman has been put in, and has been paid from four times to twenty times as much for his services as would have sufficed for the salary of an equally capable Hindoo or Mohammedan official. * * * At the present time, out of 39,000 officials who draw a salary of more than 1,000 rupees a year, 28,000 are Englishmen and only 11,000 natives. Moreover, the 11,000 natives receive as salaries only three million pounds a year; the 28,000 Englishmen receive fifteen million pounds a year. Out of the 960 important civil offices which really control the civil administration of India 900 are filled with Englishmen and only sixty with natives. Still worse if possible, the natives of India have no control whatsoever in any shape or way over their own taxation, or any voice at all in the expenditure of their own revenues. Their entire government—I speak, of course, of the 250,000,000 under our direct control—is carried on and administered by foreigners, who not only do not settle in the country, but who live lives quite remote from those of the people, and return home at about forty-five or fifty years of age with large pensions.

"As I have often said in public, India is, in fact, now governed by successive relays of English carpet-baggers, who have as little sympathy with the natives as they have any real knowledge of their habits and customs."

The *Statesman's Year Book* of 1897, published by Macmillan & Co., London, contains some interesting statistics in regard to India.

It seems that there are but two and a quarter millions of Christians in India—less than one per cent.—after so many years of English control.

It appears, also, that in 1891 only a little more than three millions out of three hundred millions were under instruction;

a little more than twelve millions were not under instruction, but able to read and write, while two hundred and forty-six millions were neither under instruction nor able to read or write. Twenty-five millions appear under the head "not returned."

The European army in India amounts to seventy-four thousand and the native army to one hundred and forty-five thousand. In the army the European officers number five thousand and the native officers twenty-seven hundred. One-fourth of the national expenditure in India goes to the support of the army. Nearly one-third of India's annual revenue is expended in Great Britain. The salary of the governor-general is 250,000 rupees per annum.

The Year Book above mentioned is also responsible for the statement that the act of 1893, closing the Indian mints to the free coinage of silver, was enacted by the governor-general and council upon the same day that it was introduced. Mr. Leech, former director of the United States mint, in an article in the *Forum*, declared that the closing of the mints of India on that occasion was the most momentous event in the monetary history of the present century. It will be remembered that this act was made the excuse for an extra session of our congress and for the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law.

One can obtain some idea of the evils of irresponsible alien government when he reflects that an English governor-general and an English council changed the financial system of nearly three hundred millions of people by an act introduced and passed in the course of a single day.

No matter what views one may hold upon the money question, he cannot defend such a system of government without abandoning every principle revered by the founders of the republic. Senator Wolcott, of Colorado, one of the president's commissioners, upon his return from Europe, made a speech in the senate in which he declared that the last Indian famine was a money famine rather than a food famine. In that speech Mr. Wolcott also asserted that the closing of the India mints reduced, by five hundred millions of dollars, the value of the silver accumulated in the hands of the people. If Mr. Wolcott's statement contains the smallest fraction of truth the injury done by the East India company during its entire existence was less than the injury done by that one act of the governor and his council. If the famine was, in fact, a money famine, created by an act of the governor and his council, then indeed is English rule as cruel and merciless in India to-day as was the rule of the East India company's agents a century ago.

English rule in India is not bad because it is English, but because no race has yet appeared sufficiently strong in character to resist the temptations which come with irresponsible power.

We may well turn from the contemplation of an imperial policy and its necessary vices to the words of Jefferson in his first inaugural message: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be

trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern them? Let history answer this question."

WILLIAM J. BRYAN.

ADDRESS AT MCKINLEY MEMORIAL.

Memorial services were held throughout the country. At Lincoln, Neb., the largest Auditorium in the city and two neighboring churches were filled to overflowing. Below will be found the address delivered by Mr. Bryan at the principal meeting:

As monuments reared by grateful hands to the memory of heroes testify to the virtues of the living as well as to the services of the dead, so the sorrow that has overwhelmed our nation, obliterating the distinctions of party, race and religion, is as complimentary to the patriotism of our people as to our departed chief magistrate. But it is not strange that the people bow as one man over the bier of their illustrious fellow-citizen—not strange that the solemn stillness is broken only by the chanting of the sacred hymns which he was wont to sing—not strange that all hearts turn in sympathy to the husbandless home at Canton.

Neither is it strange that all view with equal abhorrence the foul and bloody deed that robbed the nation of its executive, nor that all demanded with equal earnestness the speedy punishment of the offender and of any others who may have aided or counselled the commission of the crime. It would be more than strange—it would be a reproach to our people—if there were differences among us so radical that they could not be softened by the tragedy of death. It would, indeed, be a disgrace to our nation if the murder of a president concerned only the members of the dominant party. While no recent campaigns have aroused deeper feeling than those through which Mr. McKinley passed, yet in no contests did the minority more cheerfully acquiesce in the will of the majority as expressed at the polls. He was the president of all the people and their dignity and sovereignty were attacked when he was assaulted.

We are all so linked together in this world and our joys and sorrows are so interwoven with the joys and sorrows of others that no one liveth unto himself or dieth unto himself. Even the humblest citizen cannot withdraw from earth without bringing grief to some heart and the number of those who mourn is increased as the circle of acquaintance and influence is enlarged.

The president's position made him a part of the life of all his countrymen and the circumstances which attended his taking off

added indignation to grief—indignation that even one murderous heart could be found in all the land and grief that the wicked purpose of that heart should have been consummated against one so gentle in spirit and so kind in word and deed.

This is neither the time nor the place for a discussion of remedies for anarchy. It can have no defenders in the United States. Government is a necessity and the delusion that society can exist without it is harmful even when no violence is advocated, for it is the duty of every citizen of a republic to strive to make his government perfect in every detail and this purpose is not only weakened, but entirely destroyed by the doctrine that all governments are bad and should be overthrown. He is a friend of the government who seeks to reform every abuse and make the government an unalloyed blessing, but he is a public enemy, and should be treated as such, who weakens the authority of the law by denying that government is desirable or necessary.

If to theoretical opposition to all forms of government is added the counselling of murder, as a means of removing officials, then the adviser becomes equally guilty with the assassin.

I yield to none in my appreciation of the private character and public virtues of William McKinley; I rejoice that his career so fully demonstrates the possibilities of American citizenship. The young men of the country can find inspiration and encouragement in the fact that he made his own way from obscurity to fame. Those who are nearing the boundary of life can find consolation and example in the superb manner in which he fought his final battle—his courage and fortitude in the closing hours recalling the bravery which he displayed as a soldier. Domestic happiness has never been better illustrated than in his home life and Christian faith and trust never better exemplified than in the way he met death.

Few, if any, of our public men have been more approachable and his generous conduct and genial ways held to the last the friends whom his genius attracted. His associates early recognized his qualities of leadership and no statesman has exerted greater influence upon his party or upon the politics of his generation. He possessed rare ability in presenting and defending his views and has made a profound impression upon the history of his time.

The universality of the respect shown for the deceased and the genuineness of the good will manifested toward him teach a lesson that should not be forgotten, namely, that the best things in life are above and beyond the domain of politics. In campaigns the points of difference between citizens are emphasized and oftentimes exaggerated, but the points of similarity are really more numerous, more important and more permanent. In stature and in strength, in plans and in purpose, in love, in hope, in fear and in all human needs we are much the same. A man's party affiliations may depend upon environment or even upon inheritance, but his

character depends upon his own conduct and his morals are within his own keeping. It is not possible that all good should be confined to one party and all evil to another. It would be a sad day for the country if all the virtue, all the intelligence and all the patriotism were to be found in one political organization; if there were another organization of any considerable size having the allegiance of all the vicious, ignorant and unpatriotic. It is unfortunate that in the heat of political controversy partisanship sometimes becomes so strong as to cause injustice to be done to the motives of political opponents, and it should be our constant aim to place our campaigns upon so high a plane that personalities will be eliminated and the issues made to turn upon the principles involved.

Let us hope that this national affliction which unites all factions in a common sorrow will result in a broader charity and a more liberal spirit among those who by different policies and through different parties seek to promote the welfare and increase the glory of our common country.

MORAL COURAGE.

Speech delivered by Mr. Bryan at banquet tendered ex-Senator Charles A. Towne on the eve of his removal from Duluth to New York:

Buckley says that civilization is measured by the mastery of the human mind over the forces of nature. In elaborating this proposition he declares that the moral element in civilization is insignificant as compared with the intellectual element. The reason which he gives is that the same moral principles have been generally accepted throughout the ages, and he argues from this that the difference between races, nations, and civilization must be accounted for by differences in mental development. His error, for I believe that he errs, is due to the fact that he confuses the acceptance of a moral principle with living up to a moral principle, whereas nations are to be measured, not according to the moral principles admitted to be true, but according to the moral principles which govern the lives of the people. If you will take the worst thief that can be found in the penitentiary and place him beside the best man you know, and then question the two, you will find that both admit the binding force of the Ten Commandments. What is the difference, then, between them? It is this, that one puts his moral principles into every-day practice and is known as an honest and upright man, while the other suspends his moral principles in moments of temptation and becomes a criminal.

A careful study of the causes that have led to the decline of nations and to the decay of races will, I think, convince an impartial student that the moral element is not only important, but para-

mount in a nation's life. Take, for instance, the fall of the Roman empire—it was not due to lack of intellect or to lack of the physical qualities. It was the Roman heart, not the Roman head, that went astray; and it is as true to-day as it ever has been in the past that there can be no real or permanent national growth unless that national growth is accompanied by the development of national conscience and national character.

The nation is but a collection of individuals and reflects the character of the people. As the moral element is essential to a nation so it is to an individual. There is no danger of our becoming indifferent to physical excellence, nor is it likely that we shall place a low estimate upon the development of the mind, but in our rush for wealth and material advantage there is danger that we shall ignore the most important part of man—the heart.

Plutarch said that men entertained three sentiments concerning the gods; that they feared them because of their strength, admired them for their wisdom, and loved them for their justice. Men entertain towards their fellows the same sentiments which, according to Plutarch, the ancients entertained towards their deities. Force may excite fear and genius may arouse admiration, but we only love the heart that loves. Justice—the fruit of love, is the element which gives strength and permanence to organized government. So important is the moral element in the individual that no man has ever won a lasting place in the affections of the people who has not in his life given evidence of a broad and deep affection for his fellows. It may be truthfully written upon every monument reared by grateful hands to the memory of a great man: "We loved him because he first loved us."

Of the qualities of the heart, moral courage is one of the most essential; it is the shield that protects the other virtues; it is the fortress that guards integrity. The image of the Creator is never seen more clearly stamped upon the brow of man than when God's creature stands erect, proclaiming the conviction of an honest heart, and ready either to live for them or to die for them. There is strength and inspiration in the presence of such an one.

It is sometimes difficult to select a subject for an after-dinner speech, but when I received an invitation to participate in the farewell banquet tendered by the people of Duluth to their distinguished townsman and my friend, the sentiment, "Moral Courage," at once occurred to me, for he has given signal evidence of the possession of that manly quality which makes him welcome defeat rather than surrender that which to him seems right. We admire the physical vigor and the attractive graces of our guest; we admire the clearness of his intellect, the force of his logic, and that fund of information which enables him to fortify his arguments by illustrations drawn from history and from nature's book; we listen with lingering delight to the magic of his voice and are led captive by his persuasive oratory; but far above our admiration for his

other qualities we place our admiration for the moral courage which has made him conspicuous among the members of his generation.

We need this moral courage for the protection and preservation of our government to-day. We need it among public officials, that they may prize above pecuniary rewards and above the flattering whisperings of ambition, the honor that comes from faithful service and a clean record. Whether a man is serving his fellows as an official in the city, in the country, in the state, or in the nation, he needs moral courage to enable him to withstand the pressure that is brought upon him by the great corporations that are clamoring for favors and are able to richly compensate those who will consent to turn public office to private advantage.

Moral courage is needed among our private citizens, that they may be as bold to punish unfaithful officials as they are ready to commend the faithful. In times of war the individual is ready to give his life, if need be, in the service of his country; the demands of peace are equally imperative. The nation is entitled to the brain and heart as well as to the body; it claims the best thought and the best conscience of its citizens.

Great issues are at stake; great interests are involved—aye—even our civilization itself, and through us the civilization of the world. This nation is a world power; it has not acquired its influence by recent wars, but for a century its ideas have been permeating the world. Every citizen is a factor in our civilization, and by his conduct raises or lowers the level of that civilization. He cannot expect his neighbor to be more conscientious than himself; he cannot rely upon some one performing the duty that he ought himself to discharge. He owes it to his country, as well as to his generation and to posterity, to throw the weight of his influence upon the right side of every public question. For the proper discharge of his duties he will require the highest form of moral courage.

Some may be disposed to stamp the word "failure" upon the political career of Charles A. Towne. I hope that the future may have in store for him a reward that will be worthy of his high merit, but, even if he were to die to-night, he would not have lived in vain. He has set an example that must weigh heavily on the side of civic virtue. He has faced without flinching a fire as hot and hellish as ever came from cannon's mouth and he has won a victory greater and more glorious than ever crowned the life of one who fawned at the feet of power or bartered away his manhood to secure an office.

Because he forgot himself in his devotion to duty he will be remembered by the people when time-servers and self-seekers have disappeared.

IMPERIALISM.

Extract from an address made by Robert G. Ingersoll:

A little while ago I stood by the grave of the old Napoleon—a magnificent tomb of gilt and gold, fit almost for a dead deity—and gazed upon the sarcophagus of black Egyptian marble, where rest at least the ashes of that restless man. I leaned over the balustrade and thought about the career of the greatest soldier of the modern world.

I saw him walking upon the banks of the Seine, contemplating suicide. I saw him at Toulon—I saw him putting down the mob in the streets of Paris—I saw him at the head of the army in Italy—I saw him crossing the bridge of Lodi with the tri-color in his hand—I saw him in Egypt in the shadow of the Pyramids—I saw him conquer the Alps and mingle the eagles of France with the eagles of the crags. I saw him at Marengo—at Ulm and Austerlitz. I saw him in Russia, where the infantry of the snow and the cavalry of the wild blast scattered his legions like winter's withered leaves. I saw him at Leipsic in defeat and disaster—driven by a million bayonets back upon Paris—clutched like a wild beast—banished to Elba. I saw him escape and retake an empire by the force of his genius. I saw him upon the frightful field of Waterloo, where Chance and Fate combined to wreck the fortunes of their former king. And I saw him at St. Helena, with his hands crossed behind him, gazing out upon the sad and solemn sea.

I thought of the orphans and widows he had made—of the tears that had been shed for his glory, and of the only woman who ever loved him, pushed from his heart by the cold hand of ambition. And I said I would rather have been a French peasant and worn wooden shoes. I would rather have lived in a hut with a vine growing over the door, and the grapes growing purple in the rays of the autumn sun. I would rather have been that poor peasant with my loving wife by my side, knitting as the day died out of the sky—with my children upon my knee and their arms about me. I would rather have been that man and gone down to the tongueless silence of the dreamless dust than have been that imperial impersonation of force and murder.





REFERENCE INDEX.

- Adams, President John Q., 310, 311.
Adams, Samuel, Letter to, 15.
Aguinaldo, 91, 188, 316.
Allen, John, 172.
Allies, Our, 390.
Allison, Senator William B., 389.
Alman, Harry Horal, 387.
American Anti-Trust League, 233.
American Bar Association, 236.
Anarchy, 257, 261.
Anarchy, Responsibility for, 371.
Anarchy, The Cure for, 251.
Anarchy, Unconscious, 274.
An Example of Partisanship, 264.
An Inquiry Answered, 279.
Anti-Anarchy Bills, 330.
A Partial Remedy, 34.
Appeal to Reason, 359, 360, 362.
Appendix, 426.
Aristocracy, Is this, 53.
Armour & Co., 154.
Army Increase, 25.
Ashbridge, Mayor, 199.
Assassination of President McKinley, 240.
Bacon Resolution, 144, 145.
Baker, Judge Frank, 154, 156.
Baker, Judge John H., 238.
Banking, Unsafe, 187.
Banks, Branch, 355.
Bayard, Senator, 427.
Bayston, J. H., 263.
Belmont, Perry, 377.
Benevolent Assimilation, 297.
Benton, Thomas, 366, 383.
Biddle, Nicholas, 366.
Bimetallism, 344.
Blacklisting, 154.
Blake, John, Trumpeter, 387.
Blaine, James G., 271, 273.
Boers, 318, 368.
Boers, God Bless Them, 7.
Boers, Our Duty to, 308.
Bolters Denounced, 302.
Branch Banks, 355.
Brewer, Justice, 74, 161, 355.
British Empire, 124.
Brown, Captain James, 291.
Brown, Justice, 161, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 171, 174, 175, 177, 183, 184, 185, 186, 237, 354, 397.
Brown, President Charles, 126, 127.
Browning, Rev. F. S., 420.
Bryan, Mr., 24, 38, 110, 116, 135, 136, 144, 150, 158, 188,

- 192, 196, 199, 200, 207, 208,
222, 223, 225, 239, 240, 244,
245, 246, 266, 270, 271, 274,
275, 282, 283, 305, 312, 392,
394, 398, 429, 439.
- Buchanan, Charles, 387.
- Buckle, 23, 137.
- Burns, John, 142.
- Campaign Speeches, No Pay
for, 207.
- Campbell-Bannerman, Sir
Henry, 142.
- Canal, 74.
- Canal, Nicaragua, 278.
- Canby, Cashier E. L., 126, 127.
- Cannon, Mr., 379.
- Capital, Topeka, 270, 272.
- Carey, Phœbe, 421.
- Carlisle, John G., 130, 224, 230,
271, 427, 428.
- Caught Him Napping, 394.
- Chaffee, General, 316, 387,
388, 397.
- Challenge, 282, 359, 360, 362.
- Chicago Platform, 44, 116, 229,
344, 381.
- Chicago University, 181.
- Chief, Pawnee City, Nebraska,
359, 361.
- Children not Burdensome,
227.
- Chili, 124.
- Chinese Atrocities, 29.
- Chinese Exclusion Act, 321,
322.
- Chinese Immigration, 48.
- Choate, Joseph, 104, 105.
- Christian Advocate, 277.
- Christianity Applied, 59.
- Christianity *vs.* War, 6.
- Chronicle, Chicago, 44, 229,
230, 231, 236, 312, 313, 314,
315.
- Chronicle, La Crosse, 157.
- Clark, Frank L., 387.
- Clay, Henry, 180.
- Cleveland, President Grover,
14, 71, 72, 129, 130, 132, 141,
193, 210, 224, 258, 259, 266,
267, 268, 269, 382.
- Clews, Henry, 441.
- Combinations, Industrial, 439.
- Commoner, The, 1, 2, 113, 116,
126, 135, 143, 144, 161, 171,
176, 189, 196, 208, 209, 211,
223, 236, 239, 240, 265, 266,
268, 272, 273, 274, 281, 286,
298, 304, 312, 321, 323, 327,
334, 337, 344, 347, 349, 350,
351, 352, 356, 362, 364, 365,
385, 397, 398, 400.
- Common People, The, 1, 2.
- Congress, The Fifty-sixth, 58.
- Congressional Record, 318,
353.
- Conquest by Ideas, 329.
- Conquest, Said the President,
88.
- Constitution, Atlanta, 158.
- Correspondence Club, Letter
to, 37.
- Courier - Journal, Louisville,
109, 135, 229, 230, 231, 312.
- Creelman, James, 19.
- Criminal Aggression, 297.
- Crowder, Colonel, 108, 109.
- Crowninshield, Admiral, 392.
- Cuba, 35, 55, 90, 144, 283, 436,
438.

- Cuban Constitution, 20.
 Cummins' Error, Candidate,
 278.
 Curtis, Congressman, 330, 331,
 332, 333.
 Czolgosz, Leon, 251, 270, 297.

 Dahlsten, Mr., 106.
 Daniels, Senator, 138.
 Danish West Indies, 260.
 Davis, J. McCan, 291.
 Davis, Senator Cushman K.,
 89.
 Davis, Webster, 211.
 Day, Commissioner, 88.
 Death without Hope, 297.
 Deaver, D. Clem, 217.
 Debating Societies, 301.
 De Lima, Señor, 161.
 Democracy, Emasculating,
 229.
 Democrat and Chronicle,
 Rochester, 274, 275, 276.
 Democratic Duty, 317.
 Denmark's Good Example, 98.
 Depew, Chauncey M., 39.
 Despair, No Time for, 265.
 Destiny, 109.
 Dewey, Admiral George, 109,
 350.
 Dick, Chairman, 253.
 Diet, Effect of, 148.
 Dietrich, Senator Charles, 217.
 Dillon, John, 142.
 Dingley Law, 162, 163.
 Discussion, Republicans Pre-
 vent, 358.
 Dollar, A Stable, 327.
 Dolliver, Senator J. P., 261,
 262.

 Dooley Discusses Candidates,
 254.
 Dougherty, Chairman, 253,
 254.
 Douglas, Stephen A., 291.
 Downes Case, 161.
 Dred Scott Decision, 156.
 Dunn, Peter F., 254, 395.
 Durbin, Governor, 303, 304.
 Duty, Executive, 124.
 Duty, Representative's, 119.
 Duty, Roosevelt on, 134.

 Economist, London, 115.
 Edgerton, J. A., 418.
 Editorial Paragraphs, 395.
 Education, Plutocracy in, 147.
 Elections at Hand, 284.
 Elections of, 299.
 Emasculating Democracy, 229.
 Emperor, The President an,
 51.
 Emperor William, 219.
 Endless Chain, Another, 11.
 English, Thomas Dunn, 417.
 Erasmus, 6.
 Executive Duty, 124.
 Export Tax Decision, 354.

 Fairbanks Canning Co., 154.
 False Charge, 196.
 Farmer's Advocate, Topeka,
 359, 360, 361.
 Field, Eugene, 419.
 Financial Legislation, 365.
 Finley, Mr., 192.
 Fletcher, Mr., 379.
 Flint, Mr., 443.
 Foraker Law, 162.
 Foraker, Senator Joseph B.,
 132.

- Forcible Annexation, 297.
 Fountain, A Living, 3.
 Francis, Mr., 224.
 Franklin, Benjamin, 136, 151.
 Freedom of Press, 390.
 Freedom of Speech, 257.
 Fuller, Chief Justice, 161, 355.
 Fusion, Open and Secret, 217.

 Gaffney, Senator, 171.
 Gage, Secretary Lyman J., 11,
 353, 355, 356, 389, 396, 399.
 Gaines, Congressman, 86.
 Gambling, 30, 126.
 George, Henry, 206.
 Gettysburg Speech, Lincoln's,
 149.
 Gifts, 342.
 Giving, The Best Form of,
 180.
 Globe-Democrat, St. Louis, 295.
 Globe, St. Paul, 302, 303, 397.
 Goebel, Governor William,
 110, 303, 304.
 Gold, Production of, 62.
 Gold, Stronghold Captured,
 312.
 Gorman, Mr., 300.
 Gould, George, 324.
 Gray's Commissioner Protest,
 75.
 Gray, Justice, 161, 397.
 Greeley, Horace, 264.

 Hadley, President, 70.
 Hale, Senator, 389.
 Hanna, Senator Mark, 132,
 195, 379, 380, 387, 391.
 Hardware Dealer's Magazine,
 3.

 Harlan, Justice, 161, 166, 167,
 183, 355.
 Harmon, Ex-Attorney Gen-
 eral, 34.
 Harmony, A Sample of, 66,
 128.
 Harrison, Benjamin, 69, 83,
 124, 125.
 Hawksby, L. G., 263.
 Hay, John, 89.
 Hayes, Rutherford B., 14, 259.
 Hepburn, Congressman Peter,
 283.
 Herald, Boston, 169.
 Herald, New York, 362.
 Herron, Professor, 178, 179.
 High Tariff Doomed, 255.
 Hill, David B., 80, 130, 132,
 211, 225, 266, 269, 382.
 Hill, James J., 224, 369, 443.
 Hill's Coinage Bill, 426.
 Hill's Tempting Offer, 369.
 Hindman, Dr. W. M., 59.
 Hirshheimer, President A.,
 157.
 Hoar, Senator George F., 296.
 Hobart, Vice-President, 312.
 Hollenbeck, Judge Conrad,
 263.
 Holmes, George K., 282.
 Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 383.
 Howard, Professor, 17.
 Hudson, Professor, 18.
 Hugo, Victor, 252, 433.
 Hill, Congressman, J. A. T.,
 60.

 Ideas Should Conquer, 329.
 Imperialism, 13, 14, 86, 143,
 154, 225, 227, 450.

- Income Tax, 225, 381, 382.
 India, 185, 186.
 Indian Territory, 216, 383.
 Industrial Combinations, 439.
 Ingersoll, Robert G., 450.
 Interesting Discrimination, 389.
 International Steam Pump Co., 442.
 Interviews, Fake, 210.
 Jackson, Andrew, 14, 86, 152, 158, 159, 230, 243, 366, 396, 415, 416, 422.
 Japan, 185.
 Jefferson, Thomas, 10, 15, 16, 92, 111, 136, 137, 139, 140, 152, 171, 176, 177, 195, 213, 226, 230, 252, 275, 279, 280, 343, 344, 368, 378, 413, 414.
 Jefferson, Why not State of, 382.
 Jellineck, Professor, 356.
 Johnson, J. G., 211.
 Johnson, Tom L., 26, 191, 202, 363.
 Jones, Senator James K., 196, 197, 198.
 Jones, Senator J. P., of Nevada, 324.
 Journal, Lincoln, 107.
 Journal, New York, 145, 199, 434.
 Judicial Tyranny, 238.
 Jury System, 74.
 Jury, Trial by, Denied, 13.
 Kansas City Platform, 8, 44, 116, 191, 192, 194, 206, 209, 210, 221, 223, 231, 263, 285, 305, 317, 318, 321, 344, 400.
 Kier-Hardie, Mr., 142.
 Kilbourne, James, 209, 286, 305.
 Knox, Attorney-General, 233, 234, 235.
 Koob, Cashier Frank, 126.
 Kreider, Corporal J. Thomas, 386, 387.
 Kruger, Mrs. Paul, 219.
 Kruger, Paul, 219, 220, 395.
 Labor Day, 242.
 Lafayette, Marquis, 377.
 Lafayette's Epitaph, 376.
 Lassiter, Mr., 379.
 Laughlin, Professor, 327.
 Libby, McNeil & Libby, 154.
 Liberty, A Lover of, 281.
 Liberty, A Supreme Good, 23.
 Liberty, Constitutional, 174.
 Lincoln, Abraham, 27, 98, 104, 137, 144, 149, 152, 153, 156, 157, 195, 213, 289, 291, 292, 316, 340, 394.
 Little, Professor, 18.
 Littlefield, Charles E., 236, 237, 238.
 Logan, Mr., 443.
 Louisiana Purchase, 150.
 Louisville-Nashville R.R., 111.
 Love of Money, 44.
 Lubkan, General, 399.
 Lynch, George, 29.
 MacArthur, General Arthur, 196, 232.
 Macaulay, Lord, 120.
 McCartney, Mr., 142.
 McClay, Historian, 392.
 McCleary, Bill, 353.
 McClure, Phillips & Co., 291.

- McEnery Resolution, 96.
 McKenna, Justice, 161.
 McKinley Association, 240.
 McKinley Memorial, Address at, 446.
 McKinley, Mrs., 250.
 McKinley, William, 51, 75, 88, 114, 153, 157, 161, 217, 219, 221, 224, 249, 250, 251, 255, 264, 271, 272, 278, 299, 304, 312, 315, 357, 358, 387, 394, 422, 440, 446.
 McLaurin, Senator, 122, 171, 172, 173.
 McLean, John R., 193.
 MacNeill, Swift, 142.
 McSweeney, Governor, 172.
 Madison, James, 176, 280.
 Manifest Destiny, 383, 384, 385.
 Marconi, Signor, 395.
 Markham, Edwin, 424, 429.
 Markham's Poetry, 340.
 Marriage System, 178.
 Marshall, Chief Justice, 164, 167, 183, 237.
 Matter for Investigation, 390.
 Maupin, Will M., 402.
 Maxwell, Bank Examiner, 126, 127.
 Mexico, 185, 186.
 Mexico, Politics in, 79.
 Miles, General Nelson A., 162, 170.
 Militarism against Pensions, 5, 25, 38.
 Millard, Senator James H., 217.
 Miller, Ex-Attorney-General, 34.
 Minister's Lament, 211.
 Misrepresentations, 222.
 Mistaken Identity, 24.
 Money Problem in the Philippines, 232.
 Money Question, The, 113.
 Monopoly Defined, 364.
 Monroe Doctrine, 274, 320, 387.
 Monroe's, President, Message, 306, 309, 311.
 Moral Courage, 447.
 Morgan, Charles, The Gunner, 53.
 Morgan, J. Pierpont, 224, 248.
 Moses, Adolph, 236.
 Motion, Not Progress, 143.
 Mount, Governor, 303.
 Munger, Judge William, 140, 141.
 Napoleon, 450.
 Nation, New York, 282, 283.
 Nebraska Democrats Firm, 263.
 Neeley, 16.
 Negro Question, The, 288.
 New Year's Day Resolution, 351.
 Nicaraguan Canal, 379.
 North American Review, 440, 443.
 Oaths of Allegiance, Two, 96.
 Ohio Campaign, 209.
 Ohio Platform, 191, 202.
 Oklahoma, 383.
 One Eye Open, 286.
 One Term for President, 258.
 Organization, The Party, 8.
 Outlook, The, 378.

- Palmer and Buckner, 131, 298,
312, 313, 377, 382.
- Panama Route, 379, 380.
- Pan - American Conference,
273.
- Parliament, 142, 174, 187, 188.
- Peace Manual, 6.
- Peckham, Justice, 161, 355.
- Pensions, Militarism against,
5.
- Pericles, 253.
- Personal, 116.
- Phelan, Mayor, 311.
- Philippines, 33, 55, 64, 76, 96,
114, 137, 144, 145, 146, 150,
223, 230, 232, 288, 294, 315,
317, 318, 347, 385, 386, 387,
388, 395, 436.
- Philippine Tariff, 352
- Plagiarism, 121.
- Planetary Disturbances, 391.
- Plutocracy in Education, 147.
- Political Science Quarterly,
282.
- Politics in Business, 117.
- Pomeroy, Eltweed, 282.
- Populists, Justice to, 84.
- Porto Rico, 161, 162, 163, 170,
171, 174, 187, 288, 354, 355,
436, 437.
- Post-Dispatch, 188.
- Post, Louis F., 203, 204, 205,
206.
- Post, Washington, 207, 208,
209, 283.
- Prentiss, S. S., 376, 377.
- Presidential Term, The, 14.
- President's Message, 334.
- Press, Freedom of, 390.
- Press, Influence of, 37.
- Prince of Peace, 341.
- Producer's Share, 282.
- Prophecy that Failed, 315.
- Public, Chicago, 203.
- Quay, Senator Matthew S.,
199, 395.
- Questions for Debate, 347.
- Quincey, Mr., 285.
- Railroad Passes, 31, 140.
- Ram's Horn, 418.
- Ratify the Treaty, Declare the
Nation's Policy, 434.
- Reciprocity, 357.
- Record-Herald, Chicago, 389.
- Reemelin, Dr., 209.
- Reorganization, 44.
- Reorganizers, 101, 102, 133,
285, 298, 381, 390.
- Republic, St. Louis, 102, 103.
- Republican and Leader, La
Crosse, 157.
- Republican, Springfield, 116.
- Representative's Duty, 119.
- Reservation Opening Day, 216.
- Rice, Editor George T., 107,
108, 109, 390.
- Richter, Harry, 387.
- Rockefeller, John B., 180, 181,
182, 224.
- Roosevelt, Theodore, 4, 134,
135, 195, 198, 244, 245, 246,
255, 258, 259, 260, 263, 288,
292, 293, 308, 334, 357, 383,
384, 385.
- Ross, Professor, 17.
- Rousseau, 396.
- Ryan, John, 387.
- Sage, Russell, 440, 441, 443.

- Sampson, Admiral W. T., 51,
 53, 54, 200, 201, 392.
 Schley, Admiral W. S., 51, 200,
 201, 350, 392.
 Schwab, Charles, 100, 147, 148,
 233, 443.
 Secret Influence, 10.
 Senatorial Wit, 39.
 Senators, Popular Election of,
 21, 32, 77.
 Sewall, 312.
 Shaffer, President, 198.
 Sherman Law, 295.
 Sherman, Senator John, 115,
 129, 267, 271, 325, 427.
 Shiras, Justice, 161.
 Shorter Editorials, 389.
 Sibley, Congressman, 428.
 Silver, 392.
 Silver, Free Coinage of, 224.
 Silver Republicans, 98, 218.
 Simon, Solomon, 134.
 Sin, the Wages of, 16.
 Smith, Fitzhugh, 387.
 Smith, Postmaster General,
 175.
 Socrates, 352.
 South, Not Excluded, 194.
 South African Republics, 124.
 South Africa, War in, 114.
 Southard, Hon. J. H., 426.
 Spain, 144, 145, 146.
 Spanish Treaty, Ratification
 of, 144.
 Spencer, Professor, 18.
 Spooner Resolution, 33.
 Spooner, Senator, 389.
 Stable Dollar, 327.
 Standard Oil Co., 32, 180, 181.
 Stanford, Mrs. Leland, 17.
 Stanford University, 17.
 Star, Kansas City, 244, 245,
 246, 247.
 Star, San Francisco, 107.
 Steadfastness, 366.
 Steel Strike, 198.
 Steel Trust, 198, 199, 233.
 Storm Brewing, 375.
 Strikers, 248.
 Strong, Hon. W. J., 155.
 Subsidized Instruction, 17.
 Sulu Treaty, 189.
 Sun, New York, 201, 372, 375.
 Tariff Concessions to Cuba,
 283.
 Tariff, How Aids the Trusts, 3.
 Tariff, The Philippine, 352,
 359.
 Tax Dodging, 362.
 Taxation, Equality in, 202.
 Taylor, Ex-Governor William,
 303, 304.
 Taylor, Howard S., 413, 422.
 Taylor, President Zachariah,
 310, 311.
 The Man with the Hoe, 429.
 Thompson, Judge Owen P.,
 133, 134, 363.
 Thrones, the Doctrine of, 180.
 Tillman, Senator Benjamin F.,
 122.
 Times-Herald, Chicago, 316.
 Times, Kansas City, 196, 223.
 Times, Manila, 399.
 Times, Richmond, 138, 158,
 159.
 Times-Star, Cincinnati, 24.
 Tolstoi, Count, 123.
 Torture Indefensible, 393.

- Towne, Charles A., 19, 39, 210, 211, 447.
- Trades Unions, 7.
- Tribune, Chicago, 305, 326, 327, 379, 380.
- Tribune, New York, 264.
- Trust, Envelope, 443.
- Trust, Rubber, 443.
- Trust, Steel, 443.
- Trusts, 263.
- Trusts, Christian Advocate on, 277.
- Trusts, Democratic Remedy for, 203.
- Trusts, How Tariff Aids, 3, 32, 34, 48, 157.
- Trusts Retard Progress, 385.
- Union Stock Yards Co., 154.
- Unjust Discrimination, 359.
- Van Wyck, Mayor, 198.
- Vest, Senator George G., 224, 225, 226, 227.
- Vice-Presidency, The, 4.
- Victoria, Queen, 104.
- Vigilance, 187.
- Virginia's Temptation, 138.
- Walsh, John R., 314.
- War *vs.* Christianity, 6.
- Ward, Thomas F., 126.
- Warnings of a Parting Friend, 39.
- Washburn, Mr., 286, 287.
- Washington, Booker T., 288, 293.
- Washington, George, 39, 151, 383, 386, 387.
- Watterson, Henry, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 135, 136, 150, 151, 152, 397.
- Weaver, Mr., 222.
- Webster, Daniel, 187.
- Wellington, Senator, 146.
- Wells, Rolla, 66, 101.
- Wentz, Alderman and Mrs., 227, 228.
- West Indies, 288.
- White, Justice, 161, 397.
- Whitewashing, 105.
- Whitmore, Mr., 106.
- Whitney, William C., 131, 224.
- Wilkinson, Representative, 105, 106, 107.
- Wilson, William L., 267.
- Wise, Mr., of Australia, 7.
- Wolcott, Senator, 304.
- World, New York, 188, 222, 223, 229, 230, 266, 268, 269, 312, 357, 358.
- World Power, 281.
- Wright, Charles, 387.
- Wright, Rev. W. B., 46.
- Young Man's Chances, 100.
- Yellow Peril, 321.

The Commoner,

ISSUED WEEKLY,

W. J. BRYAN, Editor and Proprietor.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE \$1.00 PER YEAR.

The Commoner is a weekly journal, which, while devoted in its editorial department to the discussion of political, economic, and sociological questions, furnishes its readers each week a supply of general literature of the highest order. It is hoped that the discussion of political events as they arise from time to time will interest those who study public questions, regardless of their party affiliations. Subscriptions can be sent direct to **The Commoner**. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents.

Advertising rates furnished upon application.

Send for free sample copy and clubbing offer. Address all communications to

The Commoner,

Lincoln, Nebraska.



044DM

00

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 996 504 7

