

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 08179047 3



WILL M. MAUPIN

MEMBER OF THE COMMONER'S EDITORIAL STAFF

The Commoner

Condensed

BY

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

VOLUME VI.

Published by
THE HENNEBERRY COMPANY
Chicago
1907



241

INDEX BY TITLES

	Page.
The Commoner's Sixth Year.....	1
Resigns His Trusteeship.....	2
Honolulu Newspaper Comment on Mr. Bryan.....	3
At the American Legation, Japan.....	8
Mr. Bryan in Japan.....	14
Mr. Bryan at Kagoshima.....	20
Mr. Bryan's Reception in Japan.....	23
Mr. Bryan in Japan.....	26
Impression Made by Mr. Bryan.....	28
Mr. Bryan in the Philippines.....	30
Perpetual Franchises in the Philippines.....	51
Individualism vs. Socialism.....	54
How the Banks Filled Hanna's War Chest in 1896.....	61
Mr. Bryan's Reception in India.....	65
Mr. Bryan's London Interview.....	72
Fourth of July Address at American Society Banquet, London.....	73
Mr. Bryan's Speech Before the Irish Club.....	83
A Great Gathering in London.....	93
Mr. Bryan's Amendment.....	97
Long Strides Towards Permanent Peace.....	98
Mr. Bryan's Speech Before the Inter-Parliamentary Union.....	102
European Newspapers and the Peace Amendment.....	106
The Homecoming of Mr. Bryan.....	114
The Arrival in New York City.....	116
Madison Square Garden Meeting.....	118
Speech of Harry W. Walker.....	119
Speech of Gov. Jos. W. Folk.....	119
Speech of Augustus Thomas.....	123
Speech of Tom Johnson.....	125
Mr. Bryan's Speech in New York City.....	126
In New Haven, Connecticut.....	147
Mr. Williams' Speech.....	148
After New York.....	151

	Page.
Address of William Jennings Bryan at Newspapermen's Dinner at Healy's Restaurant, New York City, September 1, 1906.....	151
The Sullivan Case.....	161
In Nebraska.....	165
Mr. Bryan's Reception at Lincoln.....	167
Mayor Brown Speaks.....	171
Address of Welcome.....	171
The Reception at Normal.....	180
A Few Words with Commoner Subscribers.....	183
A Wall Street Confession.....	186
Mr. Bryan and Government Ownership.....	187
Mr. Bryan at St. Louis, Louisville and Cincinnati.....	192
The St. Louis Reception.....	192
The Louisville Reception.....	194
At Cincinnati.....	197
The Cincinnati Reception.....	198
Is it True?.....	204
The Admissions of a Standpatter.....	204
Dangerous	210
Railroad Influence.....	211
Railroad Question in the South.....	213
Chas. Duncan M'Iver.....	220
Prayer Meeting or Primary?.....	221
Yet it Must End.....	221
Democracy is Growing.....	222
Sam Jones.....	225
Not Centralization.....	226
Menace of the Multi-Millionaire.....	226
A Divided House.....	229
Mr. Roosevelt and Government Ownership.....	229
The Elections of 1906.....	232
Suggestions for First Voters.....	236
To the Democratic Members of Congress.....	238
Vigilance the Price of Liberty.....	239
More Tom Johnsons.....	242
Keep an Eye on This Bill.....	242
Some of the Dreamers of History.....	244
Education vs. Trust Magnates.....	249

	Page.
The Thanksgiving Season.....	250
Peace and Trust Resolutions at Kansas City.....	252
No Federal Incorporation.....	257
Comment on the Message.....	257
Constitution Following the Flag.....	266
Democracy Must Move Forward.....	267
Down With the Silver Trust.....	269
The President Sustained by the Facts.....	270
The Money Question.....	271
Communism Fails in Russia.....	272
Governor Davis' Program.....	273
A Word of Encouragement.....	274
The President's Message and the Madison Square Speech.....	277
Suggestions for Oklahoma's Constitution.....	292
Christmas	302
The Peace Prize.....	303
Root on Centralization.....	304
Elks' Memorial Address at Lincoln.....	305
No Pay for Political Speeches.....	310
The Job Session	311
The Income Tax.....	312
More Money.....	314
Massachusetts' Railroad Experience.....	315
Bankers Push Asset Currency.....	316
Solicitude for the Public Weal.....	318
Root on Fundamentals.....	319
A Sample.....	321
The Beveridge Bill.....	322
Is This Prosperity?.....	323
The Postal Deficit.....	324
Olney on Labor Unions.....	324
The Philippine Assembly.....	327
A Moral Issue.....	328
Money in Blocks.....	330
A Word of Warning.....	330
A Precedent for Disarmament.....	331
State and Nation.....	335
China Awakening.....	337

	Page.
The Ship Subsidy.....	338
Civil Pensions.....	340
Sagacity	340
Did Not Say It.....	342
James Bryce, Ambassador.....	343
Reform in Austria.....	344
Mr. Bryan on Issues of the Day.....	344
Mrs. Jefferson Davis.....	370
The Practical vs. The Ideal.....	371
Federal and State Authority.....	374
A Philippine Estimate.....	376
Criticism of the Courts.....	378
The Real Politicians.....	381
Democratic Gains in Indiana.....	382
An Unusual Report.....	383
An Object Lesson	384
Daniel B. Shipman.....	384
Root Explains.....	385
A Child Labor Bill.....	386
Popular Election of Senators.....	387
Charles Fremont Cochran.....	388
John W. Kern on Government Ownership.....	389
That Little Brown Baby.....	393
British Rule in India.....	394
Income Tax in 1900.....	405
Work of the 59th Congress.....	406
Mr. Rainey's Kindergarten for Standpatters.....	410
Some Facts About the So-called Panic of 1893.....	413

The Commoner Condensed

THE COMMONER'S SIXTH YEAR

In the first issue of THE COMMONER, published in January, 1901, it was said: "THE COMMONER will be satisfied if, by fidelity to the common people, it proves its right to the name which has been chosen."

With this issue THE COMMONER enters upon its sixth year. Thanks to the generous co-operation of those readers who believe that THE COMMONER has established its right to the name it bears, the beginning of this year seems to be full of great promise—promise not only for the continued co-operation of those readers whose kind words and substantial aid have been so helpful, but promise of enlarged opportunities for THE COMMONER to do battle for the people and to wage war against those who would oppress the people.

It would be too much to say of any publication, as of any man, that its ideal had been realized. In language with which the readers of this publication are familiar, "the ideal must be far enough above us to keep us looking up toward it all the time, and it must be far enough in advance of us to keep us struggling toward it to the end of life." But every publication and every individual can do his best and when one, ever keeping in view a lofty ideal, does his best, he does all that may be expected of him. While it would be too much to say that THE COMMONER has realized its ideal in the field it has chosen, it is not too much to say that it has proved its right to the name it bears, provided it has shown fidelity to the common people and has exerted its best efforts along that line.

It is for the faithful readers of THE COMMONER to say whether this paper has discharged its duty; and the kind words and generous co-operation of which THE COMMONER has been the grateful beneficiary have greatly encouraged THE COMMONER's editor and all the members of its working force. For 1906 it can be promised, as

was promised of former years, that the efforts of this publication will be ever exerted in support of that doctrine wherein the people are recognized as the source of power, where the government is required to respond to the desires and conform to the character of its people, and where "the greatest good to the greatest number" is the end ever to be kept in view by the public servant.

RESIGNS HIS TRUSTEESHIP

A dispatch to the *Chicago Record-Herald* under date of Jacksonville, Ill., Feb. 12, follows: "William J. Bryan, who is president of the board of trustees of Illinois college of this city, has written from Hong Kong, China, tendering his resignation, to take effect at once, and it was accepted tonight by that body. Mr. Bryan refuses to serve as a trustee because the board wishes to take advantage of the offer made by Mr. Carnegie to extend aid to western colleges. He says that colleges that accept are selling out to 'the plutocrats of the land who are seeking to strangle economic truth.' 'The issue presented,' writes Mr. Bryan, 'seems to me to be a vital one, and even if Carnegie refuses, the same question will likely arise if some other trust magnate invites requests. Our college cannot serve God and Mammon. It cannot be a college for the people and at the same time commend itself to the commercial highwaymen who are now subsidizing the colleges to prevent the teaching of economic truth. It grieves me to have my alma mater converted into an ally of plutocracy, but having done what I could to prevent it, I have no other recourse than to withdraw from its management. I regret that the action, if it must be taken, was not taken before I gave my notes, for I regard the money given as worse than wasted, if the college is to be under the shadow of a great monopoly.' After the reading of the letter to the trustees they voted unanimously to accept Mr. Bryan's resignation. A month ago Judge Owen P. Thompson and M. F. Dunlap, both prominent Illinois democrats, who were trustees of this college, resigned from the board because Mr. Carnegie was to be asked to assist the institution in its

finances. Illinois college was established in 1830, and is the oldest educational institution west of the Alleghany mountains. It is a small college, and in a straitened financial condition. Mr. Bryan was elected chairman of the board of trustees about a year ago, and at that time pledged \$2,500 to the school.”

HONOLULU NEWSPAPER COMMENT ON MR. BRYAN

Immediately prior to Mr. Bryan's arrival at Honolulu the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* printed the following editorial:

“Mr. Bryan may hold certain views which are not acceptable to a majority of his countrymen, but the country recognizes him for what he is, and for what he has done, and acknowledges the part he has played in promoting a better understanding between the east and the west, by setting the nation so actively at work studying great economic and social problems that petty and sectional differences have been, in a measure, forgotten.

“The country sees in him a man who believes in a ‘square deal’ as firmly as does President Roosevelt; a man who loves his fellowmen; a man with a fine spirit, a large heart, a nature simple and serene; a man who, with true western ardor and enthusiasm, stands fearless, calm, insistent—sometimes almost alone—in opposing the policy or traditions of his party, when such opposition seems to him right; a man who accepts defeat in such a spirit that it seems like victory.

“Mr. Bryan would have every democrat ‘use his influence to secure a clear, honest and straight-forward declaration of the party's position on every question upon which the voters of the party desire to speak.’ This is his scheme for the re-organization of his party. He is fully aware that platforms are not made that way, and he could appreciate the force of David B. Hill's remark at the St. Louis convention last year, when he said: ‘Platforms are like sausages; the more you know about how they are made, the less respect you have for them.’

“Who can suggest a truer foundation for the platform of any party than Mr. Bryan has enunciated for the future conduct of the democratic party?”

“Whether as the ‘peerless leader,’ twice candidate for the highest office within the gift of the American people, and a factor to be reckoned within all councils of his party, or, as the plain citizen who is attempting, with all the force of a strong mind, the pen of a ready writer, and an unusual gift of oratory, to aid in the solution of the problems that confront us as a nation, let us welcome Mr. Bryan to Honolulu.

“The committee on arrangements should see to it that the reception accorded Mr. Bryan is planned on broad lines, and without regard to party affiliations. The good will of the community toward the distinguished guest may then find expression in a manner that will be most pleasing to him, and at the same time, productive of that fellowship which should exist among all good citizens.”

After Mr. Bryan’s arrival at Honolulu the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* printed the following editorial:

“Mr. Bryan made a fine impression in Honolulu. Since the days when he was the Boy Orator of the Platte and vied with the populists in radicalism, he has broadened into a statesman; and if he ever becomes president he will probably be glad that the office did not become his in early life. Age, experience, study of men and travel are doing for him what every publicist needs before he undertakes the first responsibilities.

“It is only of recent years that the great public men of America have realized the value of travel as a means of political education. Many American presidents were never beyond the sea in their lives. Andrew Jackson, one of the first of them, only knew a small part of his own America. Abraham Lincoln was never out of sight of land or in sight of the Rocky mountains. President Grant only saw the world after he had forever passed from office. Grover Cleveland never crossed an ocean, and we believe, Mr. McKinley was a stranger to foreign lands. Of statesmen below the rank of president who have wandered far afield the number is now increasing; and it is often said that American legislation would be

far wiser than it is, if the stated preliminary to high office were a trip around the globe. Evidently, from what Mr. Bryan said in his speech yesterday, he realizes this advantage and means to make the most of it, particularly in Australia and New Zealand, the land of sociological experiment.

“Now that the eminent American has gone on his way, local interest will center on what he shall write about us in *THE COMMONER*. It is understood that he will describe his journey and recount his observations in that paper. That the latter will be virile and acute and the former vivid and picturesque may be predicted of the man.”

The following editorial appeared in the *Honolulu Evening Bulletin*:

“William J. Bryan is a man among millions. Hawaii is not alone to congratulate itself that he has taken the time for a trip to this part of the expanding American domain. The American people will follow his movements and listen attentively to the conclusions resulting from his observations. The nation should profit from his tour. He'll do the whole country good, if by no other means than letting the people know that there is another side of the question, and it is not as bad as sometimes represented.

“Every public man of our country who visits this territory and the possessions in the orient furnishes a valuable leading string to draw the attention of our mainland fellows to the really vital national problems that must be approached in a broad American spirit if the prestige of our country is to be maintained.

“We have been honored with secretaries and governors and congressmen and senators. It is probable that Mr. Bryan will exercise as much influence as any one of them in shaping public opinion. He is one of those men, unusual in the history of the world, who can be killed off politically every other day by his enemies, but just as frequently comes to the front again in a manner that proves that he has the steadfast confidence of a large body of the people. Though the majority has been against him in the great national political battles he has fought, Mr. Bryan has proved that a man can bear no more distinguishing title than Mister and still exercise

a power with the people, second only to that of the highest officer.

“The time was when it was said that Bryan could not change his mind. Experience has also shown that it isn't safe to believe all that his opponents have said of him. He has made a much greater success of keeping in touch with the spirit of the people than his special opponents within the ranks of his own party. Mr. Bryan did not enthuse over the annexation of Hawaii. Thus far he has seen little virtue in the retention of the Philippines. In dealing with Hawaii it is not probable, however, that Mr. Bryan will support any other plan than a well rounded scheme of American development. He cannot fail to be pleased with much that he sees here during even a brief stay. He will have an opportunity to see for himself that Americanism in Hawaii does not necessarily represent degeneracy for Hawaii or Americanism, and seeing, he cannot fail to be inspired with a desire to put his American shoulder to the wheel and help the thing along.

“Mr. Bryan will doubtless encounter conditions here that will grate on his Nebraskan-American nerves. The oriental and the semi-feudal conditions on large plantation properties sometimes arouse a spirit of revolt in the minds of men fresh from the mainland. This condition is one not built up under the American system of government. It cannot be revolutionized in a day or possibly a decade. The assistance of such men as Bryan is needed to aid in promoting changes in a manner that will not destroy the industrial structure during the reformation period. Hawaii wants him on its list of workers, not for selfish reasons only, but because America's position in the Pacific must be maintained and Hawaii is the great outpost of peace and war.

“There are lines of operations that call for Americanism before partisanship. Hawaii is the first station along that line in this part of the American world. Mr. Bryan has never shirked any responsibilities placed upon him as an American citizen. That is why Hawaii anticipates his active friendship.”

The Hawaiian Star printed the following editorial:

“Honolulu today entertains one of the foremost

Americans of his time—William Jennings Bryan. Mr. Bryan occupies and has occupied a somewhat unique position. The only high office he has ever held has been that of congressman, and he held that before he had come into national prominence. He has twice been a candidate for president of the United States, and though twice defeated it was only after campaigns unexampled in the supreme effort made by the marshalled elements and interests which through varied and sometimes contradictory influences, had been arrayed against him. After each defeat he stood forth a larger figure in public estimation. His defeats were in no sense personal, except as a great leader invests any cause he champions, with his personality, and every great cause invests the personality of its leader with some of its own importance and distinction. He has been not only the leader of a great party, but a great leader of men. By the magic of a single speech on a great occasion, he sprang at once into leadership, not only of his party but of another great party, and he is one of the few men who have ever been the enthusiastically supported candidate of two great national parties.

“As the years have passed the asperities and the prejudices of bitter campaigns have softened, and William Jennings Bryan has secured a deeper and stronger hold on the respect and admiration of the American people as a great American.

“Mr. Bryan is now on a tour of the world, studying political and economic problems as he goes. We have much in Hawaii that would be of interest to him, aside from our climate and our scenery, if he had time to examine it in detail. But even in the hurried way in which he must see things during his short stay, and the effort of his entertainers to enable him to see as much as possible, he will get ideas and conceptions that will aid him in giving proper proportion and perspective to what he may learn hereafter from varying sources and in more academic way about us. His visit here, we trust, will give him pleasure and do him good. It certainly cannot fail to do us good. It is a good thing to have visits from the men who influence the world. There is a vitalizing influence about it. They get to know us in that personal way that means so much. Subjectively and

objectively there is a benefit. The people of Honolulu also welcome with island hospitality and cordiality, Mrs. Bryan. She has been the helpmeet of her husband through all the years of his struggles and success, of his obscurity and of his eminence. We wish for them both an enjoyable day in Honolulu, and that they may carry with them nothing but pleasantest memories."

AT THE AMERICAN LEGATION, JAPAN

The *Japan News* gives the following account of one of Mr. Bryan's receptions in Japan:

The speeches rendered at the dinner party given at the American legation on Friday evening in honor of Mr. W. J. Bryan, were as follows:

MR. GRISCOM'S SPEECH

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: It seems to me that no better introduction could be found for a man than to say that over six million people were ready to vote for him, and over thirty million people wanted him to be president of the United States. If I racked my brains for years I could probably not do better than to turn on Mr. Bryan the very graceful analogy which he used to the students of Waseda university in his speech of yesterday. Mr. Bryan said that when you first view a distant range of mountains you can only distinguish clearly two or three very great and high peaks, and so it is that the people of foreign countries, viewing the United States, can distinguish among its public men but two or three great figures. As one who has lived for some years among foreign peoples, I am perhaps particularly able to judge, and I can truthfully say that of those figures in our public life best known to foreigners, Mr. Bryan is one of the foremost and greatest.

I welcome Mr. Bryan to Japan for several reasons, but first let me say that I have long held that the diplomatic service should be non-partisan, and on this account I am always glad to welcome a democrat. I am happy to be able to say that no matter who the American

is who comes to Japan, whether he be a rich democrat or a poor republican, he receives the same treatment at my hands.

Now, there can be nothing better for our international relations than to have the most intelligent and thoughtful men in our communities travel abroad and it seems to me a splendid sign of the times that such a man as Mr. Bryan should find time in his busy life to travel abroad and study and observe other countries. It is an excellent sign for the future. If Mr. Bryan had any doubts in his mind before he left America as to how we were viewed by the Japanese people, all such doubts must have long since been set at rest. Our good relations with Japan were laid on a firm foundation fifty years ago by Perry and Townsend Harris, and Mr. Bryan will find that these relations are ever the same, established on a firm, pure, gold basis, and I think that even he will admit that that is a good standard to apply to international relations. It is my function to endeavor to the best of my ability to maintain the parity, and, as we all know, it is not always an easy matter to maintain a fixed parity. In this difficult task there could be no greater help than to have a man such as Mr. Bryan come to Japan and speak to all classes of the community, and to meet people of every walk in life. He can explain to them far better than I can what is American life and American thought, and I can assure him that for his assistance I am frankly grateful.

I need not tell you of what Mr. Bryan is in America. His position is too well known. He is a man who appears to be ready to raise his ideals as high as the human mind is capable of conceiving ideals, and as a consequence he has a hold on the great American people which in many respects is unique. He is a man of many capacities, and now I am going to propose his health, and you are at liberty to drink to him in any quality which you may select. You may drink to him as a statesman; you may drink to him as the leader of a great political party; you may even drink to him as a good democrat; but for my part I drink to Bryan the man; I drink to Bryan the scholar; and I drink to Bryan the earnest friend of the American people.

MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH

Mr. Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have been admonished that I would be expected to say something in acknowledging this very generous toast, but I hardly know what to say. I was a cautious man before I came to Japan, but I have learned here an additional caution. I bought the three Nikko monkeys, carved in wood, and I understand that they represent a very important philosophy; i. e., that the wise man sees nothing that he ought not to see; hears nothing that he ought not to hear; and says nothing that he ought not to say. I have not worried about the first two, for I have not expected to hear anything that I ought not to hear, or to see anything that I ought not to see, but I have kept my eye on the third monkey, and have tried to be circumspect in all my ways and cautious in all my utterances, but I cannot forbear to submit a word in reply to the very kind things which have been said.

I appreciate the opportunity that our minister has given us to meet the distinguished people who are assembled around this board. I appreciate also the dignity and ability with which he represents my country. When I go aboard and meet republicans in the foreign service I am satisfied that, whatever may be the character of the republicans left at home, good men have been sent abroad, and I feel like suggesting that when we have any more contests they make a fair exchange and send away the ones who have been left at home and bring back those who are away. As I meet these learned, courteous and kindly republicans, and as I receive such hospitable treatment at their hands, I feel all the old animosity disappearing and I am, tonight, much in the attitude of a young man, of whom I heard, who courted his girl for a year before he had the courage to propose to her. He finally summoned up sufficient courage to tell her that he loved her, and asked her to marry him. Being a very frank girl, she replied, "I have loved you, Jim, for many months and have only been waiting for you to tell me so that I could tell you." Of course, Jim was delighted—so delighted that he went to the door and, looking up at the stars, exclaimed, "O Lord, I haint got anything against anybody." I feel that way tonight, and

this is not only true in a political sense, not only true of my feeling towards republicans, but I think that as I come into contact with the people of other nations and races, I come to feel a closer attachment to them than I could have felt had I not met them. I am more and more impressed with the broadening influence of traveling. As we visit different countries we learn that people everywhere, no matter through what language they speak, or under what form of government they live, are much the same. We find that the things that we hold in common are more important and more numerous than the smaller things which separate us.

I consider it a great privilege to meet the distinguished citizens of Japan. I would be confessing my own ignorance of the world's politics if I did not know by name and by history the illustrious men of this great island, and tonight I have the pleasure of sitting at the board with two of the men of whom I have often heard. One, Marquis Ito, sits at my right. He will go down in history as the builder of a great constitution; his fame will increase with the ages until he shall be known throughout the world as our own great Jefferson is known because of his connection with the Declaration of Independence.

I am glad also that there is in this gathering another man, Count Okuma, distinguished in politics and in education, and who yesterday so kindly entertained me in his home and gave me the opportunity of looking into the faces of the students assembled in the school of which he is the patron saint.

I am glad that at this board we have these two men, the marquis and the count, who represent so fully the aspirations and the breadth of thought in this country. I speak of these men, not that I forget the other distinguished persons present, but because these two represent the parties of which they are the acknowledged leaders. I believe that it is necessary that there shall be conflicting parties in every great and growing nation. Show me a nation where there is no dispute, where there is no discussion, where there is no conflict of thought, and I will show you a nation that has more death than life. The moving waters are the pure waters; the stagnant waters soon become poisonous. It is a good sign to find men contending for the principles in which they believe, and it in-

creases my confidence in a nation when I find men of spirit who think and have the courage to speak their thoughts.

We have found many things of interest in this country, but Mrs. Bryan and I have been especially interested in what they call the Korean lions. I do not know whether the other Americans have been impressed by these, but we are firmly determined to take two Korean lions home with us (if we can secure a pair) and put them as a guard in front of our house. Now, the Korean lions are interesting for several reasons, and one of the most important is that they represent the affirmative and the negative. I noticed today that one of them had his mouth open as though he were saying "yes," and the other had his mouth tightly closed as if he had just said "no." Both the affirmative and the negative are necessary. You find everywhere the radical and the conservative. Both are essential in a progressive state. The conservative is necessary to keep the radical from going too far, and the radical is necessary to make the conservative go at all. One is as necessary to the welfare of the nation as the other. There must be a party in power, and there must be a party out of power, although I think that, for convenience sake they ought to change places occasionally. When a party goes into power it is apt to be more conservative than when out of power, and when a party goes out of power it is likely to become more radical. I might give a number of reasons for it. In the first place, responsibility tends to make a party more deliberate—it sobers it. Then, too, a party that is defeated often learns from the victor how to win, and sometimes the successful party learns from the defeated one.

Time modifies parties and the Korean lions illustrate this also. They have come down from Babylonian times and each nation seems to have added something. So with both the conservative and the radical parties. These parties will change from time to time as they pass through various nations, and as they pass through various generations, for what is an affirmative party today may be a negative party tomorrow. Having accomplished one reform, it may hesitate to undertake another, and finally give way to a more courageous party.

A great American philosopher, Emerson, has said that the dreams of one generation become the accepted facts of the next. All the parties feel the influence of this contact with public opinion. I repeat that I am glad that I am permitted by the kindness of Minister Griscom to meet about this board the two leaders to whom I have referred. Each is a help to the other. Neither would be as strong without the other to stimulate him. We help each other in this way.

I have also learned to hold in high esteem His Majesty the Emperor, and I might give you two reasons for it. First, I have been drawn to him in most tender way, by finding that when he selected a chrysanthemum to represent royalty he gave it sixteen petals, thus recognizing the familiar ratio of sixteen to one. Second, and most important, because he has had the wisdom to give to his people constitutional government and other blessings which in too many countries have been secured only by the employment of force.

I am glad that I have thus had an opportunity to meet and become acquainted with the people of this island, and I appreciate most heartily the hospitality they have shown us. I am not vain enough to assume that it is in any large degree a personal tribute. I recognize and accept it rather as an indication of the general good-will they entertain towards the country of which I am but an humble citizen. The sincerity of this expression of good-will has impressed me. It has beamed forth from the eyes of students and been felt in the hand-clasp. I have beheld it everywhere, and I shall be glad to tell my people when I return home that the people of Japan reciprocate the friendly feeling that is entertained towards Japan by the people in our country. I am going to insist that more Americans come to Japan and I hope that more Japanese will visit our country. This exchange will teach us both to know each other better and I am satisfied that we will find, as we always find, that acquaintance removes to a large degree the differences between men and nations. I will promise those who hear me tonight, that whenever there is a question between America and Japan I shall be a better friend of Japan's than I have been in the past, if that is possible, because I think I understand the country better than I

ever could have understood it without meeting the people of Japan. I can be more proud of your history and share more fully in your anticipations of a still more glorious future.

MR. BRYAN IN JAPAN

The *Japan Times*, referring to Mr. Bryan's speech at Waseda, says:

This morning, W. J. Bryan, the distinguished leader of the democratic party in the United States, addressed a very large gathering of all college students, assembled at Waseda university, by invitation of Count Okuma, whose guest Mr. Bryan is. Though the weather was slightly rainy, there was a very large assemblage in the university grounds, as the proceedings had to be in the open air on account of the large number of people. The grounds were appropriately decorated, and the students showed no impatience or fear of the wet weather, but undoubted enthusiasm. When Count Okuma appeared, with Mr. Bryan, the cheering was prodigious.

Dr. Hatoyama briefly introduced Mr. Bryan to the audience, and said: Mr. Bryan is American—that is in itself an introduction to Japanese; for ever since the days of Commodore Perry the friendship of the United States has made a deep impression on the hearts of the Japanese. (Applause.) This was shown in the reimbursement of the Shimonoseki indemnity and the promptness in acceding to Japan's efforts to shake off the yoke of ex-territoriality and recover her tariff autonomy. In fact, whenever any question of justice was involved in our international relations we could always count on the United States to be on the side of right. (Applause.) In the second place, our guest belongs to the democratic party, whose influence has always been in the interests of equal rights for all. (Applause.) In the third place, our guest is Mr. Bryan, leader of the opposition in America. In fact, today we are here honored by the presence of two leaders of opposition, Mr. Bryan and Count Okuma. (Loud applause.) The last few weeks have witnessed in Japan the welcoming of two dis-

tinguished personages from England and America; I refer to Secretary Taft and Admiral Noel. They are certainly eminent personages, and deserve the enthusiastic welcome they received. But these are gentlemen in the service of their respective governments, and it is slightly possible to imagine a fraction of policy in the courtesies extended to them. At least, it is generally so believed in these official functions. But here we have Mr. Bryan who has no official passport. He is a private gentleman, a typical and representative American, imbued with high ideals, both in public and private life. His influence in the political party which he leads is very great, and his possibilities in the future are still greater. (Applause.) I believe I express the sentiment of all here when I say that we welcome him most heartily and sincerely. (Applause.)

Mr. Bryan said:

Fellow Students: It gives me very great pleasure to meet you, to look into your faces, and to learn from you the cordial sentiments which you entertain towards the land of my birth. I have looked forward for a great many years to this visit to Japan. The days that I have had to wait have dragged, and I am now here to enjoy that which I have heretofore beheld only in anticipation. And I know of no opportunity that I appreciate and utilize with more gratification than the opportunity to speak to the students here assembled. I address you as fellow students, for I also am a student. (Hear! hear!) I began studying when I was young—younger than any of you here. I have studied ever since, and I hope that I will not graduate from study until my life closes. (Hear! hear!) All life is a school to those who improve it as they ought. None of us are too old to learn. None of us know all that can be known, and no one is so humble that he cannot teach others something. The receptive mind is characteristic of the student, and I would rather talk to students than to any other class of people. I talk to them in my own country, and I am glad to talk to them in every country which I have the good fortune to visit. The student is passing through the springtime of life. In the spring we sow the seed—it is the time of year when the sowing gives the greatest promise of a

crop; so that when you leave a thought with a student it grows and develops.

Then I like to speak to students because the student exercises more than an average influence upon the life of his country. The more the student develops himself, the stronger he becomes; the more he can multiply any good thing that is given to him. I like to talk to students, and I like especially to talk to those students who have had as their inspiration and as their example the distinguished statesman of Japan, Count Okuma, whose guest I am today. (Loud Applause.)

It is impossible to calculate the influence of one human life upon the lives of others, because the influences that touch the heart go on and on forever. We speak to those about us, but if we speak through an example that impresses itself, then we speak not only to those whom we know today, but to their children and their children's children to the remotest generations. And so I am glad today to be the guest of this great man whose name has reached our own country and whose face I longed to see. (Applause.)

As you approach the mountain range you find that a few peaks reach up above the rest of the range, and the eye rests upon them. So in approaching any land there are national characters that reach above the rest. Foreigners see these mountain peaks of humanity, so to speak, and learn to know them even though ignorant of the foothills and of the land in general. And so I, even in distant America, learned to know the great men of Japan and learned to count among them Count Okuma. (Applause.) I am glad, therefore, to be here as his guest, and as the guest of this school, and if you will bear with me I will make a few suggestions that occur to me as timely in speaking to students.

In the first place, let me say to you that while things seem strange to a visitor, whether he visits this land or any other land—while these differences first attract attention, yet after all we are much alike. If you look at the eye of a human being you find that it may have a color that is distinctly its own, and you begin to classify eyes. Some will have blue eyes, some will have brown eyes, some will have black eyes, but no matter what color the eye is, it looks out upon the same landscape and sees

the same things. And so we may differ in appearance or in features, we may differ in size, we may differ in dress, but after all we are human beings and we have the same impulses and the same purposes. And this to my mind is an important lesson for us all to learn. We, of course, coming from our own country, recognize that the people we see upon the street are not quite so tall, not quite so heavy, as those we meet upon the street at home; but I never have felt that I could hold one in contempt because he was not so large as others. I remember hearing years ago a phrase like this: "Nature does not put up her jewels in large packages; the priceless gems are usually smaller than the rocks we see about us." I have known persons small of stature who in mind towered above others with larger bodies. I say however much we may differ in appearance, in dress, in custom, when you come to know people you find that they are very much alike, and when you can touch the heart you find that the heart of man differs less than the face or even the mind. And so I am sure that if I speak from my heart I can speak to the hearts of those who listen to me. (Applause.)

In speaking to students there are two or three things that I feel like suggesting. First you will pardon me if I say a word in regard to public speaking, for it has been my lot to do a great deal of public speaking, and I have noticed that in Japan there is a growing tendency to take part in public discussion. I entertain this theory—that every citizen should be able to present his own ideas to every other person in order that the nation may have the advantage of the wisdom of all its people, and students especially need to fit themselves to present their views in a way that will best convey their ideas and most impress others.

Now what is eloquence? What is oratory? There are people who imagine that with the coming of the newspaper the opportunity of the orator disappears. There never will be a time when there will not be a place for eloquence and oratory. Whenever great interests are at stake, whenever the destinies of men hang upon decisions, whenever people feel deeply upon great issues, there will be eloquence, and if I were going to define eloquence, I would define it as the speech of one who

knows what he is talking about and means what he says. There are two things that the public speaker must have; he must have information, because if he does not know anything he cannot give information to others. He must, in the first place, know what he is talking about; he must be informed upon his subject, and then he must be earnest. A great Latin poet said nearly 2,000 years ago:

“If you would draw tears from the eyes of others,
Yourself the sign of grief must show.”

You must feel, if you would have others feel. So, the first thought which I wish to leave with you is that if you are to have effective public speaking you must study the matter in hand, and have something to say; something that really must be said, no matter what it may cost. Where you have (1) information, and (2) earnestness, you will surely have persuasive speech.

The next thing of importance in public speaking is to state clearly what you want to say. Present each thought so that it may be understood. We sometimes say in our country that there are certain “self-evident truths,” truths that are so plain that one cannot help seeing them. I make the statement even more broadly, that not only are there “certain self-evident truths,” but that “all truth is self-evident.” The best service you can render to the truth is to state it so clearly that it can be understood, for a truth so stated needs no argument in its defense.

Next to clearness of statement is brevity. Say the thing in just as few words as possible. I do not know whether you are sufficiently familiar with our language to understand me if I tell you a little story to illustrate what I mean by brevity, for sometimes it is difficult to catch the point of a story even when one could understand a general conversation. But I will see whether I can make it plain to you. It will show you how much can be said in a few words. I will use the story to illustrate my meaning. A man once said to another man, “Do you drink?” The other man was a little offended at the question, and said: “That is my business, sir.” Then the first man said: “Well, have you any other business?” (Laughter and applause.) I do not know whether I have been able to make the point clear to you, but what I

mean is that in a very few words a good deal was said; and the more you can say in a few words, the more effective will be your speech.

But there are some who do not aspire to public speaking, and I desire to say something that will apply to all of you on the subject of education. There are some people who imagine that only a few of the people need to be educated, and it used to be the general opinion that it was sufficient for any country if just a few of its people had well trained minds. I do not believe in that doctrine. If God had intended that only a few of the people should have their minds developed he would have given minds to only a few of them, and the rest of the people would have been given only bodies, without minds. But when God gave minds to all of us, I think He gave the best possible proof that He intended that all of us should have our minds trained. I have met a great many people in the last fifteen years, but I never yet have met any person who had too much education, or mind too fully stored with useful information. (Applause.) I am anxious to see every boy and every girl in the world have the highest education that he or she may receive. I believe that it will be much better for themselves, and also for all those about them. Wherever I have seen education misused, or bringing to the possessors less advantage than should have been expected, I have found that it was because there was not back of the education the moral purpose that there ought to have been. If any person thinks that education is merely given to him in order to enable him to get all possible advantage over other people, then it is not doing him as much good as it ought to do. But if he understands that it is given him in order to make him more useful and helpful, and to help him to do a larger work for mankind, then he cannot have too much education. The more education you give him the better it is for him and for all those who come within the circle of his influence. It is necessary, I say, that there should be, at the back of the education, some useful purpose. I do not know that I can better describe the difference between the two kinds of purpose than by saying that some seem to think that the object of life is to get as much for one's self as possible and to keep it, while others feel that the object of life is to do as much for

others as possible. (Applause.) If you visit a cemetery, or go to the places where monuments are erected in memory of the dead, you will find out what the people buried there have done for the world, what they have given to the world. Some people are great, they may be learned or powerful, but they are always thinking of "something to eat," or something to drink, or something to wear—and, when they die, the people say, "Very well!" (Loud laughter and applause.) Then there are those who are like the bee, doing something for the good of others; and when these die they leave something behind them to make the world glad that they have lived. I do not know that I can leave with you a better thought than this—What do you want people to think about when you are gone? You have in this land a deep reverence for the dead, for your ancestors; you revere those who lived before you, and yet some of them have done more for the world than others, and you distinguish between those who have done large things and the others who have not done so much. And as we get older, and think of the impression that our lives have made on the world, and how men are likely to regard us after death, things that seemed very important to us when young seem less so. Some spend their lives trying to make money, to surround themselves with riches; others seek to gain high positions; but as they get older they find that their place in history will be determined, not by what people have done for them, but by what they have done for the people. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

In conclusion the assemblage gave three cheers for Mr. Bryan on the call of Dr. Hatoyama.

MR. BRYAN AT KAGOSHIMA

At Kagoshima, Japan, October 31, Governor K. Chikami delivered to Mr. Bryan the following address of welcome: "Sir: Now that, on this occasion more than any other in my life, I need the full command of all my faculties, I feel very sorry indeed to confess that I am well-nigh at a loss when I think of my poor qualifications for tendering an address of congratulations and welcome

to one of the greatest orators of the age. But I must screw my courage up to the sticking point and do my little best in order to fulfill, however imperfectly, the honorable and otherwise certainly the most pleasant duty assigned to me this evening.

“Sir, I suppose you know well enough that we, the Japanese people, have just been celebrating, all over the land, the triumphal return of the Nelson of the east, whose brilliant victory on the Sea of Japan has made our empire the mistress of the far eastern waters, and at the same time the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, which, I earnestly hope, may prove to be the impregnable bulwark of the world’s enduring peace and prosperity.

“That things have happily reached this consummation, I need hardly say, is in the main owing to the timely summons of Commodore Perry, who, half a century ago, firmly but kindly roused Japan from the slumber of ages and introduced her to the comity of civilized nations. When our grandsires woke up and cast their wondering glances around they were quite surprised to find that the sun was already in his meridian splendor and that no time was to be lost. We had to bestir ourselves and to essay, in a couple of decades, what it took the nations of Europe centuries to accomplish. Fortunately the startled nation was not in altogether such evil case as the tortoise in the story, and our people at once girded up their loins and, with the indomitable energy of Napoleon and his army scaling the Alps, addressed themselves to the steep and toilsome slopes that lead to the heights of modern civilization.

“Now, sir, in this arduous, complex and Herculean task we looked upon your fatherland as our guiding star, and your friends as our teachers and advisers. And it was exceedingly a happy thing for us that it was your assistance that we courted, for America—the country whose motto was then as it still is, and I firmly believe ever will be, ‘Justice, nothing but justice to all without any distinction of race or nationality.’ I say America always and everywhere stood by us in all sincerity, extending her helping hand in our direst need and perplexity. Had you, the Americans, been sordidly ambitious and bent on territorial aggrandizement—as some countries unfortunately are—what might not have been the

fate of our Island Empire in her youthful days, and what her present position among the nations is more than I can tell.

“From these times onward down to the recent Russo-Japanese war, your compatriots have shown us a real and undisguised sympathy both in word and deed. To cite a few instances out of many, here is the *Sun*—I think it was—which declared at the very beginning of the conflict that ‘The Russo-Japanese war is the war of right against wrong, and justice is on the side of Japan.’ Not in newspaper utterances only, but also in munificent contributions to the Red Cross society and to the Soldiers’ relief fund we can clearly discern the attitude of the American public towards our country. Nay, more, was it not the president of the United States who so humanely stepped in between the recent combatants and conducted them into the conference chamber at Portsmouth, and with a wholly disinterested zeal and by untiring efforts succeeded at last in arresting the deplorable course of savage bloodshed and horrible carnage?

“All these and hundreds of other blessings we owe to the American people and all of us acknowledge ourselves their grateful debtors.

“Having thanked you thus far, sincerely, though in halting language, for what you have generously and ungrudgingly done us in the past, and hoping for your continued interest in our national welfare, allow me to tender you, on behalf of the committee of reception and my friends here assembled, as well as the people of Kagoshima at large, the warmest and heartiest welcome. I welcome you, first of all, as the representative of one of the most friendly and most sympathetic nations in the world; I welcome you again as a strong link in the chain of friendship subsisting between your country and ours; I welcome you once more as one of the foremost statesmen of the age. Furthermore, I welcome you as one who possesses the Divine gift of winged words, bestowed only upon the elect. Lastly, I welcome you, sir, as a man fearless and unflinching in the fight for what he holds to be in the right. May your stay here be long, pleasant and agreeable to you, sir!

“I hereby call upon you, my friends, to fill your glasses and after drinking to the health of Mr. Bryan, to join me

in three ringing, rousing cheers for the prosperity and happiness of our honored guest this evening."

Banzai! Banzai! Banzai!

Following this address, Governor Chikami presented a little gift to Mr. Bryan, saying: "In the name of all here present I beg you, Mr. Bryan, to do us the honor as well as to give us the pleasure of accepting this humble specimen of Satsuma ware as a slight token of our admiration and esteem. Mere trifle as it is in itself, we shall be very happy indeed if, after your safe return to your home and friends, it reminds you now and then of your visit to this nursery of heroes."

MR. BRYAN'S RECEPTION IN JAPAN

Japanese newspapers, copies of which were recently received at THE COMMONER office, give interesting accounts of Mr. Bryan's visit in Japan. It is impossible with THE COMMONER's limited space to reproduce all that these newspapers say concerning Mr. Bryan's visit, but some extracts will doubtless be interesting to COMMONER readers. The *Japan News*, in one issue, tells of a dinner given in honor of Mr. and Mrs. Bryan by the "America's Friends Association." It is related that Viscount Nagoka proposed the health of President Roosevelt, which was heartily received, and that then Mr. Bryan proposed the toast of the Emperor of Japan in these words:

"Our Bible says that he that ruleth his own spirit is greater than he that taketh a city. I propose the health of one who has shown his ability to do both—His Majesty the Emperor."

It is said that Mr. Bryan's toast was received with great enthusiasm. Baron Kaneko extended a welcome to Mr. Bryan, and the *Japan Times* says that Mr. Bryan responded in a speech which called for "continued applause." Responding to Baron Kaneko's address of welcome, Mr. Bryan said:

"I appreciate more than words can express your cordial reception and this opportunity of addressing those who have shown their interest in the United States by attending its colleges. I thank Baron Kaneko for the

kind words spoken by him in regard to myself and on behalf of my countrymen, and I reciprocate most heartily his expressions of friendship for the United States. He speaks of our countries as surrounding the Pacific and trusts that the relations between the two nations may always be pacific. When I began to read history, I thought that the Mediterranean sea separated the Roman empire into a number of parts, but I soon learned that the sea was really a great highway which united the empire. And so the Pacific ocean is a bond of union between our land and yours, and allow me to express the hope that all our differences may be drowned in its depths and that our sympathies may be united by its waters. Baron Kaneko has been kind enough to praise my speaking, but after hearing him speak in a foreign language I can imagine how eloquent he would be if he spoke in his native tongue. I am sure he would easily win the prize over me if I tried to speak in your language.

“I will not attempt to reproduce the Madison Square Garden speech, to which he has referred, but will suggest a few things which seem to me appropriate to the occasion. As the members of this society have paid my country a high compliment by visiting it for the purpose of study, so one of your members paid me the highest compliment I ever received. When only eighteen he conceived the idea of visiting my home to study the science of government. Crossing a wide ocean and traveling nearly two thousand miles inland he became a member of our family. He remained with us for more than five years and his excellent conduct and exemplary habits gave us a very favorable opinion of the Japanese. It was an ideal that led this boy to cross the Pacific and it was an ideal that led each of you to go to America to pursue your studies. The ideal is a most important thing, for it is not only permanent but it controls the life. Give a man bread and he will hunger again; give him clothing and his clothing will wear out, but give him a high ideal and that ideal will be with him through every waking hour, lifting him to a higher plane in life and giving him a broader conception of his relations to his fellowmen. I do not understand your politics well enough to know whether you have parties as we have, but the ideal controls the party as it controls the individual. That party

which has the highest ideal will in time control the destinies of the nation. Nations also have ideals. Some individuals think only of what they get from others, while some think rather of what they can do for others. So with nations; they may have a low ideal and spend their energies in a selfish endeavor to get the best of other nations, or they may have a high ideal and try to benefit the world.

“There is no reason why nations should not be mutually helpful. Each nation is able to do some things better than any other nation. Each nation can learn something from other nations and each nation can impart knowledge. I hope that more of your people will visit our country and that more of our people will visit your country in order that each may in the fullest measure help the other.

“Baron Kaneko has described our nation as the greatest republic on earth. I can reply that Japan has made more progress in the last fifty years than any other nation has ever made in the same length of time. Your emperor chose as the word to designate his reign a word which means enlightenment. The selection of this word was prophetic, for his reign has been one of great enlightenment. When he reaches the end of life and goes to join the ancestral spirits, he will have the proud consciousness that no other ruler has ever witnessed among so many of his people, such remarkable progress in all that makes a nation great.

“While Japan has astonished the world by her valor and success on land and sea she has greater victories before her along the lines of peaceful development. Carlyle, in concluding his book on the French revolution, says that thought is stronger than artillery parks, but that love is even stronger than thought. Let me close with the hope that good-will may exist between us and between all nations and that the rivalry may be, not to see which can injure each other most, but which can contribute most to the welfare of the human race.”

MR. BRYAN IN JAPAN

The *Japanese Times* of Friday, October 20, prints the following:

This morning the Keio-gijiku university had the honor of a visit from the eminent American, whose name is on everybody's lips just now—Mr. W. J. Bryan. He drove up to the main entrance of the university sharp at the appointed hour, namely, a quarter after nine, and was met there by President Kamada and the faculty, who immediately ushered him to the middle of the corridor leading from the "Preparatory" buildings to the university class rooms. The students were drawn up on the spacious lawn tennis ground facing the corridor. It was raining then, but the enthusiasm of the boys rose above the elements, and in the rain they stood, giving hearty cheers as the distinguished visitor fronted them. Another tremendous cheer went up as Mr. Kamada introduced Mr. Bryan to the audience in a few but most appropriate words.

Mr. Bryan had begun to speak. His strong, sonorous voice—emanating from a man who is a perfect model of physical development and high intellectual mien, and beaming with the goodness of heart that he appeared to be—at once cast a spell, as it were, over the assemblage. He commenced by referring to the unfavorable state of the weather, on account of which he appreciated the students' enthusiasm all the more. He then said: "I came here today to do honor to the founder of your school whom I have long since learned to admire." Proceeding, Mr. Bryan dwelt on the fact that the late Mr. Fukuzawa had by his unique conduct won the noble title of the "Great Commoner." The title had a special significance to the speaker, because he was the editor of a journal called *THE COMMONER*, the aim of which was to represent the great mass of the American people and to stand guard over their rights and interests. Perhaps the reason why Mr. Fukuzawa was called the "Great Commoner" was a little different. Mr. Fukuzawa won the title because he refused all titles and preferred to be one of the people. In America many people wish to be in office, regarding it as a source of power and influence. But a man might be so great as to be influential without

an office—individually great and above official greatness. Mr. Fukuzawa was a great man; he needed no office to make him great; without an office he was great enough to be influential among his fellowmen and to make his power lastingly felt. That was why he (Mr. Bryan) admired Mr. Fukuzawa so much and came to do honor to the memory of the "Great Commoner." In so doing he wanted to illustrate what he was going to say by making a reference to cloisonne, the art of producing which had reached the highest degree of perfection in Japan. Cloisonne had attracted his attention; he had visited one of its factories, and he was going to take home a cloisonne vase as a souvenir of his visit. But to proceed. He had had occasion to make a speech on "civilization." Civilization was a word that everybody used; but hardly anybody seemed to know what it meant. He had looked into books to see what others had to say about civilization; but in none of them had he found a satisfactory definition of the word. The speaker, therefore, proposed to give a definition of his own, and it was this: "Civilization is the harmonious development of the human race physically, mentally and morally." To raise the civilization of a country, the body, the mind and the heart must contribute each its own force in harmonious co-operation.

Here Mr. Bryan sought a simile in a barrel of apples. There might be good and bad apples in the barrel; the good ones enhanced and the bad ones lowered the value of the barrel, which, therefore, to be of good value should contain uniformly good fruit. So with civilization. But in civilization the heart formed the most important factor. He did not mean here the physical organ called the heart, but man's moral nature, the spiritual man in man. It went without saying that to accomplish anything a man must be endowed with a strong constitution, and the physical development of the body was a matter of great importance. But the body alone, however well developed, was not enough to make man a civilized being. Animals had bodies; man must have something more, namely, mind. Mind stood infinitely higher than body, and schools were the place where young people had their minds developed. Hence the importance of education. But to be a truly enlightened being a man needed more than mind and body. A man might be great in both and

yet be a very bad man. All knew that a steam engine was a product of high intellect and possessed great powers; but without an engineer to direct its course it could only be a destructive force. A man developed only physically and mentally was in a similar way liable to be a mere destructive being. Consequently he needed the moral force to guide him in his conduct, to make him into a being with a good purpose. Now as to the illustration promised. The speaker saw the artist make his cloisonne vase. First of all there was a plain metallic vase—the body. The artist drew fine figures of wire on the vase, and they represented the plan, the purpose of his work. Then came the filling of enamels—the moral qualities. But the vase still looked rough; but after polishing (education) there emerged a grand work of art unrivaled for its beauty and elegance. So with civilization individual and national; in all high civilization there must be the harmonious development of body, mind and heart.

IMPRESSION MADE BY MR. BRYAN

(The following editorial appeared in *Shinjin*, a Tokyo newspaper, and was translated into English by Mr. J. Ingaki, official interpreter to Governor Ohomori, of Kyoto.)

“We have recently been busy receiving distinguished foreign guests who have visited our country.

“Mr. Taft, United States secretary of war, Miss Alice Roosevelt and members of United States senate and congress visited first. Then Dr. Bowne, professor of Boston university, was interested in our educational and religious lines. Mr. Harriman, American millionaire and proprietor of a steamship company was one of our distinguished guests. The next, Admiral Noel, commander-in-chief of the British China squadron, commanding some battleships anchored off Tokyo bay. These distinguished guests were received properly by us. At the same time they no doubt left several good influences upon our social and spiritual life.

“But no one equals Mr. Bryan, who left more instructive lessons during his one week’s stay in the capital.

He is a great man whom we have revered for a long time as the leader of the democratic party of the United States, as a great orator and as a candidate for the presidency of the country. Having an interview with him, and having observed his conduct and listened to his speeches, our reverence toward him increased more and more.

“1. The first lesson is about his oration.

“2. The second lesson is that he is a man of principle.

“3. The third lesson is that he is a devoted Christian.

“4. The fourth lesson is that he is not a too serious man, but he is a man who understands humorous talk and he is an open hearted man.

“1. About his oration: He taught to the five thousand students of Waseda the secret of oration, and mentioned three elements of its success, that is, knowledge, sincerity and simplicity.

“He is the very example of these three elements. He has not repeated the same facts or materials. He is a man of great memory. When he once stands on the platform, rich materials easily come to his mouth, just as he would search for things in a bag. He is a man of sincerity and full of spirit when he speaks. We lack of oration full of spirit.

“Mr. Bryan visited our country and showed its very example to us. We must be thankful to him, and try to produce such an ideal orator in the future from our posterity.

“2. He is a man of principle. He insisted upon the importance of an ennobling ideal of political parties of each country, and expressed his desire for promotion of justice, not only among individuals, but also among nations.

“In the presence of the Governor, the Mayor, and members of the Tokyo city, he gave lessons that the officers of the city must be responsible, temperate and faithful to the practice of justice.

“He didn't take any drink but water when he met with Admiral Togo, even when he proposed toast to His Majesty. How evident that he is a man of principle.

“3. That he is a Christian who does not take it shame to be a Christian, or to preach the gospel.

“His faith in Christ is the foundation of everything. Opinion of business and education comes from this

spring. He failed in the candidacy for presidency, but this is not failure of his faith and character, but only the result of difference of his noble and profound political opinion. Some minister said that he has no moral defect in public or private life.

“His quiet conduct, his daily life at Lincoln, his home place, and his severe social activity are good examples. These are lessons he learned from Christ.

“4. About his humorous character. He showed his humor at the Girls’ university and at the Y. M. C. A. in Tokyo. Also at the table speech at the United States ministers’ dinner party when he mentioned Korean lions standing in front of the temples and compared them to Marquis Ito and Count Okuma.

“During Mr. Bryan’s stay in Tokyo, we had celebration of naval review and naval officers return after victory.

“Citizens both in Tokyo and Yokohoma were quite crazy in its celebration. Both these are only remembrances of past glory.

“Unless we strive after production of such a great personality as Mr. Bryan is a celebration of the naval review and the victory will be no meaning. Mr. Bryan’s visit is not an accident, but a providence to our country.

“May heavenly blessing be upon the great man and his family during their long voyage and travel.

“May his instruction given to our countrymen bear fruit and produce such a great personality as he is among our people.”

MR. BRYAN IN THE PHILIPPINES

The *Manila Times* of January 1 prints the following report of the celebration on Rizal day:

Rizal, the patriot; Rizal, the martyr; Rizal the man and Filipino; everywhere was manifested the most devout spirit, the most intense feeling, the greatest enthusiasm. The early morning hours of Saturday saw Filipinos out in full holiday regalia. By 7 o’clock the Escolta and Plaza Binondo, as well as central points of other districts, especially Tondo, were fairly alive with indigenous humanity—and its wife.

The parade was the feature of the day's program. It was essentially an industrial demonstration, the tobacco interests being the feature of the procession.

In the exercises which were held at the reviewing stand on Luneta, a pleasing feature was apparent. Representatives of nearly every political faction engaged in the local political field vied with each other to make the affair a success, political axes being for the moment laid aside in the unanimous effort to pay homage to the martyred patriot and scholar in whose name the day was celebrated and for whom all held the same respect.

Numerous gatherings were had in private residences after the ceremonies and in the evening "bailes" and "banquetes" were given. These lasted, in some cases, till the early hours of Sunday morning.

Long before the hour of 7 the Plaza Calderon de la Barca was crowded with a motley throng of natives and it was as much as Manila's "finest" could do to keep the street-car tracks and roadway clear for passing vehicles and street cars. From all directions were coming divisions which were to take their place in the rapidly forming parade. A large number of floats were early on the scene and were greatly admired by the native element. One special float, that of the La Yabana cigar factory, received considerable applause and was surrounded for a long time by an admiring crowd.

The arrival of the boys of the Liceo de Manila in company formation armed with dummy rifles and headed by two troops mounted as lancers was a signal for considerable applause. The boys presented quite a soldierly appearance and carried themselves during the evolutions necessary for them to accomplish before they were able to take up their position, in a manner that called forth the praise of a large number of Americans.

The grand marshal having seen that everything was in order for a timely start, gave the order to march at ten minutes after 8 o'clock. Four mounted policemen headed the procession and were followed by the grand marshal and his aides. The deputy marshal and his aides remained to see that the procession was properly despatched.

The route taken was down Rosario, through Calle Galvey and over the bridge of Spain.

The parade presented an imposing appearance as it passed down Calle Bagumbayan from the bridge of Spain to the Luneta. At many points along the route the crowd cheered heartily as the floats passed and the students of Liceo de Manila came in for a large amount of applause as they executed a number of military movements.

The procession down Calle Bagumbayan was headed by a lone bearer of a banner with the inscription, "Ay Rizal." He was several rods in front of the regular line of parade and evidently was having a parade by himself. Then came the mounted detachment of police in charge of Corporal Harper, which cleared the street and regulated the thousands of vehicles that thronged the thoroughfare. Following Corporal Harper came a mounted detachment of natives in command of Senor Sytiar, all wearing red sashes and representing the society of Maypag-Asa. The next in line was the banner of Balagates and several companies of boys in uniform accompanied with music.

The exhibit of Cabayan followed. It was headed with a float upon which was a coffin decorated in white and drawn by a bevy of native girls, followed by the Tondo school, the boys of the school being in white uniforms with blue trimmings.

The display of "La Rosa" cigar and cigarette factory was next in line. The first float of "La Rosa" consisted of a monument of Dr. Jose Rizal drawn by four white ponies, with four native girls seated at the base of the monument arrayed in gorgeous colors. The monument was followed by a band playing a funeral dirge and the employes of the "La Rosa" factory.

Mr. Bryan spoke as follows:

"Ladies and Gentlemen: I esteem it a rare privilege to witness and take part in this occasion. A despot once expressed a wish that all mankind had but one neck, that he might sever that neck by a single blow. Happily his cruel wish was not realized. But I think I can say all Filipino people have but one heart and I can hear that heart beating today.

"Monuments and memorial days testify truly to the merits of the living as well as to the virtues of the dead. It is not given to all of us to be heroes; it is not given to all of us to do work in this way; but it is possible for

all of us to show appreciation for the work that has been done—it is possible for us to pay homage to greatness, and while there is but one hero in our thoughts and in our hearts there are tens of thousands of people today who do him homage and say: ‘As he was, we would wish to be.’

“You meet today upon a spot hallowed by a martyr’s blood and you have listened to lessons drawn from his life. I cannot hope to aspire to be classed with those who have spoken, for they are knit to the hero by ties which do not stretch across the ocean; and yet as a mountain peak is seen many miles away, this stupendous man has reached such a height that we have seen and known of him.

“If you will permit me to draw one lesson from the life of Rizal, I will say that he presents an example of a great mind consecrated to his country’s welfare. He, though dead, is a living rebuke to the scholar who selfishly enjoys the privileges of an ample education and does not impart the benefits of it to his fellows.

“His example is worth an immeasurable sum to the people of these islands, to the child who reads of him, to the young and to the old. They should all be inspired by what he did, by his noble thoughts and noble deeds. He has proved by his example that he who writes upon the hearts of men leaves his inscription on tables more durable than stone. He teaches not only the people of the Philippine Islands, but the people of all the world that achievements of the heart are worth much more than the achievements of the mind.

“It is not possible to have monuments reared over the remains of every mortal being; this is reserved for the few. Of all the millions of the human race but few resting places are marked by a memorial monument, but it is possible for every human being to build for himself a monument in the hearts of the people which will stand when all the monuments of stone and granite have crumbled to decay.”

At the reception given to Mr. Bryan at Malolos, Senor De Luce, mayor-elect, spoke as follows:

“Honorable Mr. Bryan, Distinguished Ladies, Gentlemen: I shall begin by saluting the true champion of democratic principles, the true defender of the rights of humanity, of the people and of individuals, him who in the Kansas platform included the independence of our people, before whose altar the entire Filipino people has offered in sacrifice its life, fortune, amenities of life, etc.

“We greatly and profoundly regret that your presence in the capital of what was once our short-lived Filipino republic is to be of so short a duration. We would have desired to have the honor to retain you in our midst a few days longer, so as to be able to show you without ambiguity and detours what really is the true feeling of the people of Bulakan, so that upon your return to your homeland you could destroy by irrefutable proof certain erroneous ideas that are being propagated over there about us.

“Honorable Sir: So deep rooted is in our people the desire of prompt independence that the mere news of the arrival of the head of that great party that supports our legitimate aspirations was sufficient to have stream to the capital people from the nearest as well as most remote towns to render homage and give thanks to him whom they believe to be their only savior.

“Before this so spontaneous demonstration by men and women of different degrees of culture and education, and before the sympathy and admiration of the whole Filipino element of Manila towards you, I believe that you cannot doubt for one single moment that the desire for prompt independence is deeply engraved in the hearts of our people.

“Judging from the way of living of our people, its necessities, its habits, the organization of its families, of its towns and provinces; judging also from its religion, its manner of administering government, its sciences, arts, etc., you will never be able to harbor the least doubt that our people is already civilized and has a right to a separate personality.

“The richness of our woods, our waterways, our fields, our growing industries and our commerce, are sufficient resources for the maintenance of a separate nation, especially if we take into consideration the sobriety and modesty of our people that even today is self-supporting; and much better can this be accomplished with the protection of your country and its guarantee of a perpetual neutrality, such as is enjoyed by the Swiss republic, the kingdom of Belgium, and many others.

“By such a policy America will not only once more prove its claim to the title of ‘Champion of the liberties of the people’ as she has just demonstrated by giving independence to Cuba and Panama, but she will also benefit herself by doing away with the necessity to maintain an army twice its natural size and also a navy twice its natural size, and through them increase the burdens of taxpayers, already large enough. By such a policy she also undoubtedly would minimize the danger of a conflict between America and some foreign power, and by that selfsame policy she would avoid the corruption of those great principles inherited from her ancestors, the true democrats, because a colonial system is bound to corrupt such high principles.

“We trust that with your well-known influence and power, even should we not be granted immediate independence, you will see that we receive the benefits of an entirely democratic government in which the executive and legislative power will be separated and in which the judiciary will be entirely independent of outside pressure. We further trust that we shall be favored with true representation by the extension of suffrage and the restriction of the veto powers of those high up in power. Let us get more autonomous municipalities, and let the people have more say in the provincial government, and let the provinces be represented in the commission by men elected by them and the people, and thereby bring about that Filipino commissioners, who are our legislators, be the real representatives of the people, and that the establishment of the Filipino assembly become a fact and remain not an empty promise. Only by such actions do we understand the fulfillment of democratic principles by the great American people, and only by such actions and means can there be established and cemented forever

eternal friendship and harmony between the American and the Filipino people.

“But we shall not molest you any longer, illustrious Democrat. Much more, yea, infinitely more, could we tell you, were it not that we know that your time is short. I raise my glass to you, and all of your followers, who have not forgotten the doctrines of your ancestors. I drink to your prosperity and to America, our sister and liberty-giving nation. Gentlemen, Hurrah for Mr. Bryan!”

In its issue of December 27 *El Renacimiento*, published at Manila, printed the following editorial:

“Bryan. This is a name among names. Others may boast of it but in their cases it does not mean so much. The daily press today fills column after column regarding him and his name is in the mouths of everyone. The events of yesterday claim special notice, consisting, as they do, of more than mere generalities.

“Why do these simple people salute us? Do they treat the Americans here this way. These are questions which were asked of his companions during the trip through Paranaque, Las Pinas and Bacoor yesterday.

“‘The salutations are for you,’ replied a prominent Filipino, ‘because they know that it is you who is approaching. These people do not know you, but they have learned that you are here and your name is revered by them.’

“In fact few names of Americans can be mentioned among Filipinos which will excite more feeling. Bryan did not need to come here in order to be popular.

“The principal impression produced by his presence, even upon his adversaries in politics is his consummate amiability and discretion. Bryan has made no statements or passed any judgment regarding the Philippine administration. He has not given any excuse for his being characterized as an agitator or a scoffer at the enterprise which the United States, as a nation, has undertaken in these islands.

“But does this signify that Bryan will abstain from collecting data for future use? We believe not. One can easily hope for a highly optimistic opinion from him, but a party man takes his ideas and prejudices with him wherever he goes and he sees things through the light of his convictions.

“There are those who see in this oriental trip significant connection with another trip made by him through the western country. Under the cloak of a newspaper man and traveler the politician is preparing his weapons. The man of the world can be a statesman even after his overthrow. The man who collects his data in different countries in the guise of a democrat and writer would not make a bad chief of staff. The Philippine problem, of international interest in the Pacific and the shores of Asia, has attracted the notice of American politicians.

“It is undoubtable that the questions in these islands are becoming of more and more interest to people of the United States. Bryan will probably find his chief political adversaries among the members of the Taft party. It will be a good thing if, when the discussion becomes warm and they are called on to tell what they learned in the Philippines, he too will be able to speak from personal knowledge and face them with facts.

“We are getting on. These visits of statesmen from the United States, in the fight in which ideas, politics and opinions will figure so much, these islands cannot but be benefited.

“Although Bryan may not be a presidential ‘possibility,’ he will always remain prominent in politics and in newspaper work and will always exercise a great influence on public opinion. As a democrat he will count on the members of his party carrying out his ideas.

“Therefore it is impossible to overestimate the importance of his visit to the Philippines. He is gathering the most pleasing impressions. His reception has not been marked with official ostentation. He receives kindly the attentions of government officials, commands the respect of Americans and the homage of the Filipinos, an homage which is at once spontaneous, sincere and cordial. Bryan with his penetration will see this. How much difference between the ritual and the purely volun-

tary reception. How many such have been given to Americans in the Philippines?"

The *Manila Times*, edited by George C. Sellner, printed the following editorial:

"In some ways the speech made yesterday by Mr. Bryan in response to the address advocating immediate independence is an epoch-making event. The democratic leader has come to be looked upon as the foremost spokesman in behalf of the doctrines which are held by those whom we have come to designate, without intending any unfair reflection, 'agitators,' and the utmost significance has been attached by them to all his utterances touching Philippines affairs. To have him, therefore, after a warm welcome and with fervent declamation in behalf of immediate independence still ringing in his ears, turn on his hosts and in our frank, blunt, Anglo-Saxon way, tell them not what they wanted to hear, but what he believed they ought to hear, counseling them to support the plans which the government has laid for their advancement and progress toward self-government, and by implication, advising them to forego their agitation in behalf of independence at this time, to have him do this shakes the very foundations of the hopes which have been cherished so fondly by these advocates of independence at this time. The speech also shows that Mr. Bryan's real attitude on the question of the disposition of the Philippines is not what many of these agitators for immediate independence have understood it to be.

"Apart from these, perhaps the leading feature of the speech, is the manner in which there is emphasized the fact that those Americans who do not believe in granting the islands independence at this time are as much the friends of the Filipino people as those who advocate immediate independence. By a perversion of judgment common to mankind these agitators have come to regard as friends among the American people only those who support the policy of at once turning the archipelago over to their inhabitants to govern. It is timely and refreshing, therefore, to have him whom they term their

'savior' to tell them that those among the American people who do not believe the islanders are yet fit to govern themselves are as much the friends of the Filipinos as are those who contend that they are. The republicans, as well as the democrats, have the welfare of the people of the archipelago at heart, and are trying to do what appears best for their welfare.

"Believing, as we do, conscientiously, benevolently and sincerely, that the worst that could happen to the people of the Philippine islands at this time would be to leave them to their own devices, we naturally welcome the attitude adopted by Mr. Bryan. We are only sorry that he has not time to devote to a thorough examination of the archipelago and its people, visiting the almost savage Igorot, and the entirely savage Moro, and the many other tribes of the islands. We are afraid that he may leave the Philippines as so many more of our visitors have done, with only a superficial and misleading impression of their people and their needs. Traveling only where civilized agencies have made travel convenient, he will not be able to form a true conception of the many heterogenous elements, which are comprised in the term, Filipino people, or realize just how incompetent to speak for 'The Filipino people' are those orators who appeared before him yesterday. His speech, however, warrants the hope that he will take a broad and sane view of the conditions here, and base his opinions on those conditions. As to Mr. Bryan himself, if anything our pride in him as a man has been increased in that he has shown that he is more than a politician, that he is a statesman, and that he is more than a democrat, that he is an American."

One Manila paper printed the following:

The Elks gave a rousing reception last night to William Jennings Bryan at the club house on the Luneta and all Manila turned out to do homage to their distinguished guest. The club rooms were artistically arranged with flags and potted plants and the spacious halls were the scene of many groups of well known faces.

Punch and lemonade were served during the evening and the music was furnished by the constabulary band.

The guests were received by Colonel Dorrington and Mrs. Dorrington, Governor Ide and Mr. and Mrs. Bryan, and were ushered by Messrs. Reiser, Patstone, Stewart and Fisher.

There was considerable stir when Emilio Aguinaldo entered the hall and was ushered up to the receiving party. He was introduced to Mr. Bryan by Governor Ide. Aguinaldo said in Spanish, "I am glad to meet you and I have been very anxious to see you. I have heard a great deal of you." This was interpreted to Mr. Bryan, who said, "We have heard your name in our country also." Then Mr. Bryan said, taking hold of Aguinaldo's arm and turning to Mrs. Bryan, "This is Aguinaldo."

The Bryan family will enjoy a family dinner today, at the residence of their old Lincoln, Neb., friends, Mr. and Mrs. M. L. Stewart. They will attend religious services at either the Methodist or Presbyterian church.

On Christmas, Executive Secretary Fergusson will honor the Bryan family with a big Christmas dinner. The fattest gobbler in town was selected by Fergie himself.

Mr. Bryan cannot give definite information concerning his sojourn here until he familiarizes himself with the steamship schedule. However, it was settled yesterday that he and his family would stay at least two weeks. They will travel some in the provinces, but will not be able to make the Southern trip.

At a meeting of prominent native citizens held in the office of the president of the municipal board and presided over by that official, the following program for entertaining Mr. Bryan was decided upon:

A public banquet at one of the hotels of Manila.

An evening entertainment at the Liceo de Manila, at 4 o'clock p. m., on January 6, with the following program:

1. Parade of the students.
2. Address of welcome to the Honorable William Jennings Bryan.
3. Band.
4. Speech by Mr. Bryan.
5. Theatrical performance by the students of the college.

An excursion to the Pagsanjan falls.

The following committees were appointed: For the arrangement of the banquet: Senores Ramon Genato, Dr. Jose Alemany and Martin Ocampo. For the excursion: Hon. T. H. Pardo de Tavera, Juan Cailles, Del Pan, V. Fernandez, R. Yangco, A. Cruz Herrera, Rivera, Fabella, Francia, Benitez and V. Llamas.

The *Manila Times* of January 1 gave an account of the popular banquet given to Mr. Bryan in the Luzon restaurant. From this report the following extracts are taken:

At the popular banquet held in honor of William Jennings Bryan last Friday night in the Luzon restaurant the distinguished guest showed the same caution as at Malolos in dealing with the questions of policy affecting these islands, never at any time doing more than skirting issues which if not dead are generally quiescent.

About 150 guests sat down at the tables, though when the speaking began there were probably close on 300 persons present, most of the new arrivals being young Filipinos of the class which made itself prominent in the "Independence day" held recently before the visiting congressmen in the Marble hall.

The program, which was somewhat artistically designed, had on its first page the Stars and Stripes, inside the picture of Mr. Bryan and the menus and names of the committee of organization, and on the last page the Katipunan emblem of the rising sun and the three stars. During the evening the Rizal orchestra discoursed music at intervals.

Generally the speaking was too long, Judge Yusay, who occupied a place on the program, consuming an hour in a speech which finally tired its hearers. Mr. Bryan, the last orator, did not close his remarks till half-past one.

In his own speech he took occasion to say that he did not feel at liberty to speak freely, as he would in the United States. Two or three times when his remarks were leading to a climax whose logical sequel appeared to be some reference to independence, his audience waited almost breathlessly; but he carefully evaded the seemingly logical denouement and ended in some relevant but

not thrilling expression. One could sense rather than hear the sigh, in some cases of relief, in others of disappointment, which followed.

His address dwelt chiefly on two thoughts, the first being that there is a tie which binds all mankind together, that tie being knit up with the human heart, and the second being what constitutes civilization and how it may be attained.

The following report is taken from the *Manila Times* of December 28:

“Independence the Soonest Possible.”

“Malolos Obliged.”

“Mr. Bryan, the Hope of Our Nationality.”

“W. J. Bryan, Defender of Our Liberty.”

Such were the legends mounted upon the arches under which William Jennings Bryan passed from the railroad station to Malolos on the occasion of his provincial excursion yesterday. The trip was made by the famous democrat, in company with his wife and children, as guests of Manager Higgins. The private car of Manager Higgins and an extra coach took the party first to Gapan, where it arrived about 9:30 a. m., after having stopped at several of the stations en route where Bryan made short addresses to the delegations which were in attendance at the stations with bands of music and banners flying to greet him.

At Malolos, the seat of the former revolutionary government and the center of operations of the prime movers in the “independencia” campaign, luncheon was had at the home of Mrs. Tanchanco, an opulent Filipino matron. After the luncheon was over Teodoro Sandico rose to introduce Sr. Daluz, who addressed the following words to the assembled guests:

“I salute the real champion of a democratic people, the true defender of the rights of the people; he who at Kansas City included in his platform the independence of the Philippine islands. I am sorry that his presence in Malolos, once the capital of a Filipino republic, is so short. So deep-rooted is the desire for independence in the Filipino people that the news of the arrival of this champion has brought to Malolos many from all about,

only to greet their savior. Such spontaneous manifestations by all grades of people will, I believe, convince you that we desire our independence at once. It will show you that we have a right to nationality, that we have everything that is necessary to support a government of our own. If the government will give up this independence it will show it is the champion of liberty as it did in its treatment of Cuba. Such a step here will eliminate the need of a great American army twice its natural size and it would avoid the corruption of the principles inherited from the ancestors of Americans. If America will not give us full independence, grant us a democratic government! Separate the executive and legislative branches! Give us real independence of the judiciary! We drink a health to those who have not forgotten the true principles of Americans."

After the toast to the great orator had been drunk, Bryan rose to his feet and addressed some two or three hundred natives, aside from those who were gathered at luncheon. The following is his address:

"Allow me to thank you for the welcome you have extended to my family and to me. I appreciate also the kindly manner in which you have referred to the way in which I have tried to express my friendship for the Filipino people. I do not propose to discuss here political questions. I have not felt that in these islands I should enter on any disputed questions.

"Some things I can say with propriety. While you appreciate the manner in which I have attempted to show my friendship for the Filipinos, do not make the mistake of believing that those who differ from me are not interested in this people. In my country there are two great political parties, republicans and democrats. They enter into contests which are strenuous, but in fundamental principles both are the same. Thomas Jefferson founded the democratic party. Abraham Lincoln was the first great republican. Lincoln has left records to show the admiration that he felt for the principles and utterances of Thomas Jefferson.

"In two contests I was defeated by the republicans but I believe as much in the patriotism of those who voted against me as I do in the patriotism of those who fought for me. Those who agreed with me announced a policy

for the Philippines. Those who opposed me did not. But do not make the mistake of believing that those others are enemies to the islands. I believe the majority of all American people without regard to politics or party are sincere well wishers of the Filipinos. Yes, all.

“However you may differ about policies, all your people speak well of what our country stands for in regard to education. The fact that our people are encouraging education among you ought to be accepted as proof that they intend to act justly toward you. If they intend to do injustice they would not educate you, for the more educated you are the more quickly will you detect and denounce injustice. Let me remind you that these little children who are attending school speak more eloquently in your behalf than I am able to do. The more educated people you have among you the easier will be the task for those who speak for you in the United States. The more respect your people show for the law the easier will be the task for those who speak for you. The higher the ideals shown in your language and your lives the easier the task of those who speak for you. I want you to have as much confidence in the republicans in power as I have, though I have been twice defeated by them. And when I say this I am not trying to pay them for anything. I do not owe them anything. When I say trust them, I say it because I believe the American people want to do right, and given the time will find out what is right on every question.

“Differences of opinion must be expected. In fact, that people differ in opinion is to their credit rather than to their discredit. Those who agree in everything do not as a rule think on anything. Differences of opinion must not only be expected but must be respected. Do not expect our people to administer authority here without mistakes. They make mistakes at home, and if we democrats come into power, good as we are, we will make mistakes. The Spanish made mistakes here, and so would the Filipinos. I suggest that if you want to help us in the United States who are interested in you, you can do it by supporting with all the enthusiasm you have the efforts made by America here. Let us hope that whoever is in authority here and there, they will have the

wisdom to so promote the welfare of all as to unite both peoples in an eternal affection.”

Conception Felix, the president of the Women's association of the Philippines, followed Mr. Bryan and spoke of the duty of the islands in securing for them the best advantages for their welfare and concluded with the statement that the women of the Philippine islands demanded their independence.

After leaving Malolos the trip to Pasig was made and the return to Manila was so timed as to allow the party to arrive at Santa Mesa in good season. A special car of the street railway company met it there.

The publication issued by the Y. M. C. A. in the Philippine islands prints the following:

“The Hon. William Jennings Bryan has been one of the guests of the day and his presence in the Y. M. C. A. brought a great blessing to the work of Christianity. He sent us, before leaving the city, one of his photographs which we reproduce in our present number. The board of directors of the Tokyo Y. M. C. A. has sent to him the following letter of thanks:

“November 9, 1905.—Hon. W. J. Bryan, Manila, Philippine islands.—Dear Sir: The board of directors of the Tokyo Young Men's Christian Association beg to tender their resolution in the last meeting of the board, which was held on the 6th inst., to express their heartfelt thanks for your kindness in giving an address in the association; for the help and assistance you have given us in your short stay in this city was so remarkable that the interest in this Christian work was greatly stimulated and we may add this was not only in the city of Tokyo, but throughout the country.”

At the reception given at Bacolod, Negros, January 5, Senor Joaquin Jortich spoke as follows:

“Hon. William Jennings Bryan, and distinguished party—Gentlemen:

“The people of Bacolod and the province in general, through me, have today the honor of greeting their distinguished visitors, giving to them all a most cordial and sincere welcome, and very especially to the illustrious leader of the democratic party who has deigned to grant us the high distinction of his visit.

“Mr. Bryan has doubtless noticed since he set foot on Filipino soil that the people of the islands received him as if he were an old and beloved friend.

“There is nothing strange in this; one of the most striking qualities of the Filipino is gratitude, even though his enemies and detractors assert the contrary. The Filipino people know that Mr. Bryan has been and is a sincere champion of the Filipino ideals and interests in America, and this little suffices to make all here, without distinction, receive him today with open arms and with hearts swelling with joy.

“His visit today to this province gives us the satisfaction of knowing him personally as well as the opportunity of expressing our true sentiments toward the North American people, to whom we hope to make our humble voice through the channel of our illustrious visitor.

“The Filipino people cannot fail to thank Providence which has appointed to them the good fortune of being under the protection of the noble and powerful Stars and Stripes.

“No one familiar with the history of the constitution of North America can fail to admire the spirit of wisdom and morality which permeates its most liberal institutions.

“It is true that the Philippines’ bill is not in every way based upon the principles which that constitution breathes, and it is also true that in the government administration there exist certain prejudices which find no place in so wise a constitution; but those defects are errors which we hope will be rectified in time and through the education of the people.

“To deny that the Filipino people aspire to independence in the future would be to deny the light of the sun in broad day. But in spite of this aspiration, we understand that peoples, like men, in order to be independent, must necessarily pass in strictly chronological order, through different stages, which they cannot traverse by

leaps and bounds. Nor do we fail to realize that the liberty, great or small, which may be granted to a people, must be in direct relation to the state of their culture.

“Our ambition is just and within the bounds of reason and logic. We wish independence through evolution because we understand that a people, differing from another in race and its ethnographical and ethnological conditions, can never be governed with justice and equity except by itself; and this, because the pride of superiority will always dominate the governing race to the detriment of the governed, and the latter will never be happy. Some of the congressmen and senators who were here a short time ago have said in Washington that the Filipino people are growing away from the American people. That statement is by no means as clear as it should be.

“The Filipino people, by virtue of being a tropical race, are very sensitive and with the same impetuosity with which they love and admire a benefactor, they hate and despise a tyrant.

“The American people have brought us in the Philippines many things of great value; they have bestowed upon us many benefits and have granted us many liberties which formerly we did not enjoy; but it is also true that among the good things they have brought some evils; among the benefits there have sprung up like brambles certain unjust abuses, and among the many liberties conceded us petty tyrants have arisen to restrict them. Therefore, the Filipino people have grown away from the bad Americans, but in no way from the American people to whom we owe but gratitude and love.

“We love those who love us and despise those who despise us. However defective our past civilization may have been, it has left in our hearts the feeling of dignity which befits a people of culture.

“Unfortunately, in the Philippines, not all those who are here as Americans possess the noble sentiments of the American people, whom we admire and love, for we would be contemptible did we, through the fault of some bad representatives, come to hate an entire nation which has been and is lending us its aid.

“Our illustrious visitor has proof positive of my assertion. The Filipino people, without knowing him personally, receive him with open arms and as to an old and

beloved friend open to him their hearts, telling him their troubles.

“This is the Filipino people, these are their real feelings toward the people of North America.

“We trust that these prejudices may disappear in time, as these two races, destined to live together, continue on the road of mutual sympathy and a better understanding.

“With regard to our present situation, with an administrative standpoint, although we are, relatively better off than formerly, nevertheless there are in the present government many defects which merit censure.

“Against such defects we shall continue to struggle so long as the Philippines shall not possess a legislative body which shall know better than that of today the needs and conditions of this people.

“At present we have no legislative body but the civil commission, composed of three Filipino members, without portfolios, and four American members with them. The latter members, the majority of whom do not know the country in its inside phases, clearly can never dictate laws which are adapted to the circumstances and conditions of the people.

“The Philippine archipelago is very diverse in its ethnographical and ethnological conditions, and, therefore, it is very difficult to frame a law which is adapted to its general necessities unless one has an accurate and profound knowledge of the situation and conditions of each and every one of the thirty-some provinces which form the archipelago.

“Another of the greatest defects which we observe in the present government is the inequality and lack of justice in the appointments of government positions, as between Filipinos and Americans, with the exception of the judiciary which is the department most evenly distributed.

“In the civil commission and in the provincial boards the voice of the Filipino is not in the majority, neither therefore is the voice of the people. It is true that the municipalities appear to operate with the fullest liberty, but this liberty is restricted, because the provincial boards exercise direct control over all their acts, so that municipal autonomy is, as a matter of fact, nominal.

“The most noble and acceptable institution which the American government has established here is that of public instruction. Even the officials in that department are also the best liked and those upon the most friendly terms with the Filipino people, although defects are not entirely absent, as is the case with every human creation. Against this department we can say nothing up to the present. God grant that it may continue so for many years, without being affected by the discord of prejudices which the enemies of the country seek to sow.

“With respect to the economic phase, we could be no worse off than we are now, and this can be easily explained. Since the year 1896, in which the revolution against Spain commenced, the Philippines have gone from bad to worse in all their economic conditions, particularly in matter of agriculture, which is the sole source of their wealth. Of 56,000,000 acres of land which we have fit for cultivation, only 6,000,000 acres are cultivated and 50,000,000 are not cultivated. War, drouth, cholera and rinderpest among our work animals have prostrated us to such an extent that all which the farmer might say of the situation pales before the reality. To these inferior troubles must be added others on the outside, the lack of market for our sugar; Japan, protecting herself from Formosa, raises her custom tariff upon sugar; China, with the boycott, closes her market to us because of our relations with America, and rich America, which should protect us, also closes her doors to us with a Dingley tariff.

“To sum up, the Philippines have no money, they have no production, they have no market. Could there be a harder situation?

“The plantations paralyzed and the laborers without work, thus rises the germ of ladronism. The scarcity of money is such that in order to find a dollar today one needs a searchlight, and to make matters worse the articles of prime necessity rise in price, making existence almost impossible for the poor workman.

“In the time of the Spanish government there were in circulation some two hundred million of Mexican pesos, today we have hardly thirty million, according to the last report of the secretary of finance, a sum which, when divided among eight million inhabitants, gives 3.75 pesos per capita.

“If to this we add the stoppage of all business through the paralysis of commerce and the industries, it will be seen that with 3.75 pesos for each inhabitant, pauperism, hunger and misery are necessary consequences.

“Here we have the actual state of the Philippines, whose competition the powerful sugar trusts in America still fear. America needs 3,000,000 tons of sugar for her home consumption; her production amounts to only one million tons, so that she must import two million tons from abroad. The Philippines produce only three millions piculs of sugar, or about 187,500 tons. Is it possible to dream of competition?

“Our money crisis can only be met by the establishment of agricultural mortgage banks, and if we wish to escape disaster in that enterprise it is necessary that its administration be completely separated from the government, with the exception of the usual powers of inspection, this because it is well known that prosperity in these affairs is based upon mercantile interest, which does not exist in government officials, whose interests are political rather than mercantile. As proof of this statement let us look at what happened with the \$3,000,000 which the national government donated to the insular government to improve the greivous situation of the country. With all our soul we are grateful for so generous a gift, but we greatly regret that the government has not known how to administer it better. The \$3,000,000 have been exhausted, but the situation of the country has not improved in the slightest degree. That was, indeed, a disaster.

“Today questions involving many millions are being discussed and it would be very lamentable if the protection and good wishes of the national government should come to naught through a mistaken or defective administration. Our agricultural crisis is due rather to the terrible mortality of the work animals, which is today extending to all classes of cattle. This is a misfortune from which we have been suffering since the year 1901. Five years of massacre, no stock in the world will stand it.

“To remedy this state of affairs we need machinery which will take the place of the work animals, and we believe that the free entry of every class of machinery

for a definite time would be one of the most efficacious means of fomenting and encouraging the many lines of industry which we have to exploit, and, therefore, of raising the country from the state of prostration in which it is found.

“With what has been said, our distinguished guest will be able to form an idea of the situation of this country under its triple aspect, political, administrative and economic, and echo across the seas our by no means enviable condition. I have spoken.”

PERPETUAL FRANCHISES IN THE PHILIPPINES

Of all the mistakes of the American government in dealing with the Filipinos, no mistake is likely to have as far reaching an influence for evil as the granting of perpetual railroad franchises. Every railroad is to a certain extent a monopoly, for a second railroad cannot be built with promise of profit until there is traffic enough to support two roads. A railroad, therefore, can collect almost twice as much as it ought to before a second railroad would dare to build a parallel line. Usually, when competing lines are built between central points they are built far enough apart to leave each one in undisputed control of local traffic. To fasten a perpetual franchise upon a community is to burden all future generations.

No generation has a moral right to mortgage posterity unless a permanent improvement is created equal in value to the incumbrance. Who will calculate the value of a perpetual franchise? The future is so uncertain that the purchaser of a franchise would not pay any more for a perpetual franchise than he would for one running fifty or a hundred years. If asked to give more because the franchise ran forever he would reply that it was not only purely speculative, but that while the present generation of stockholders would have to pay the purchase money, remote generations would be the beneficiaries, if any benefits ever actually accrued. When one looks back over the last hundred years and notes the changes that have taken place in the methods of transportation he under-

stands how unlikely one would be to pay more for a two hundred year franchise than he would for a franchise running a hundred years, or even fifty.

But while a purchaser would not gamble much on the future value of a perpetual franchise the people who live along the railroad may be subjected to a never-ending injustice. If one generation could rightfully mortgage future generations it would be impossible for those living at the present time to secure a compensation at all commensurate with the burden imposed on those yet to be born.

If it would be inexcusable for people to barter away the rights and welfare of their own children, what shall we say of those who, acting as guardians, assume to dispose of the property of their wards in such a way that, without securing any material advantage to the wards, the rights of future generations are surrendered. Every Filipino paper opposes perpetual franchises, every Filipino who is free to express his own opinion opposes them, and no American can defend them.

It would be far better for the Filipinos if the guaranteed rate of interest was higher, if necessary, and the franchise limited to twenty-five years. It would be better still, if the American government would advance the money for the building of such roads as may be needed and then, giving the Filipinos the benefit of the low rate of interest at which our government can sell bonds, provide a sinking fund that would enable the Filipino government to own the railroads as soon as our government was reimbursed.

In France, railroads were guaranteed dividends and also a sinking fund sufficient to pay for the railroads within fifty years, at the end of which time they became the property of the government. Such an arrangement in the Philippine Islands would be much more advantageous to the Filipinos than the plan adopted, which grants a perpetual franchise and for thirty years guarantees an interest rate more than twice as large as our government has to pay.

Aside from the economic injustice done the Filipinos by the perpetual franchises they involve a political menace which the Filipinos are quick to recognize. Our financiers see a vital connection between gunboats and

investments, even when they cannot see any connection between the constitution and the flag, and a perpetual franchise means that our nation will be perpetually appealed to, to guarantee dividends on investments made on a never-ending concession.

The Filipino students, in a memorial recently prepared, call attention to the dangers concealed in the perpetual franchise, and ask what hope there is of obtaining self-government when their material interests have passed "under the eternal control of American capital."

Even in our own country the doctrine of "innocent purchaser" has been carried so far that the rights of the patron who makes the railroad profitable and whose geographical position compels him to use the railroad whether he wants to or not, are subordinated to the interests of stockholders who are under no compulsion to buy, and might, on inquiry, ascertain the proportion of water as compared with money actually invested in the road; how then can we expect the Filipinos, who through coming ages must patronize these roads to be more successful in protecting themselves from the exactions of holders of perpetual franchises? If our government takes the side of the stockholders when both stockholder and patron are Americans, there will be more danger of our government taking the side of the stockholder when the latter is an American and the patron is a Filipino.

The perpetual franchise is a mistake that ought to be corrected at once. If our government attempts to substitute a limited franchise for a perpetual one it will learn how much the selling price of such an intangible asset is above the purchase price, but the sooner the change is made the less will be the cost.

So long as the American officials sell, or even advocate, perpetual franchises in the Philippine Islands, Filipinos cannot be blamed for doubting the intentions of our government. The trend in the United States is away from long time franchises. Why, the Filipino asks, should perpetual franchises be fastened upon helpless wards of the government?

INDIVIDUALISM VS. SOCIALISM

(Written by W. J. Bryan and published in the April number of the *Century Magazine*. Copyrighted and reproduced by permission of the *Century*.)

Before entering upon a study of the old world and its ways, I accept the invitation of the *Century* to submit a brief comment upon socialism as compared with individualism. The words individualism and socialism define tendencies rather than concrete systems, for as extreme individualism is not to be found under any form of government, so there is no example of socialism in full operation. All government being more or less socialistic, the contention so far as this subject is concerned is between those who regard individualism as ideal, to be approached as nearly as circumstances will permit, and those who regard a socialistic state as ideal, to be established as far and as fast as public opinion will allow.

The individualist believes that competition is not only a helpful but a necessary force in society, to be guarded and protected; the socialist regards competition as a hurtful force, to be entirely exterminated. It is not necessary to consider those who consciously take either side for reasons purely selfish; it is sufficient to know that on both sides there are those who with great earnestness and sincerity present their theories, convinced of their correctness and sure of the necessity for their application to human society.

As socialism is the newer doctrine the socialist is often greeted with epithet and denunciation rather than with argument, but as usual it does not deter him. Martyrdom never kills a cause, as all history, political as well as religious, demonstrates.

No one can read socialistic literature without recognizing the "moral passion" that pervades it. The Ruskin Club, of Oakland, Cal., quotes with approval an editorial comment which asserts that the socialistic creed inspires a religious zeal and makes its followers enthusiasts in its propagation. It also quotes Prof. Nitto, of the University of Naples, as asserting that "the morality that socialism teaches is by far superior to that of its adversaries," and quotes Thomas Kirkup as declaring, in the

Encyclopædia Britannica, that "the ethics of socialism are identical with those of Christianity."

It will be seen, therefore, that the socialists not only claim superiority in ethics, but attempt to appropriate Christ's teachings as a foundation for their creed. As the maintenance of either position would insure them ultimate victory, it is clear that the first battle between the individualist and the socialist must be in the field of ethics. No one who has faith (and who can contend with vigor without such a faith?) in the triumph of the right can doubt that that which is ethically best will finally prevail in every department of human activity.

Assuming that the highest aim of society is the harmonious development of the human race, physically, mentally and morally, the first question to decide is whether individualism or socialism furnishes the best means of securing that harmonious development. For the purpose of this discussion individualism will be defined as the private ownership of the means of production and distribution where competition is possible, leaving to public ownership those means of production and distribution in which competition is practically impossible, and socialism will be defined as the collective ownership, through the state, of all the means of production and distribution.

One advocate of socialism defines it as "common ownership of natural resources and public utilities and the common operation of all industries for the public good." It will be seen that the definitions of socialism commonly in use include some things which cannot fairly be described as socialistic, and some of the definitions (like the last one, for instance) beg the question by assuming that the public operation of all industries will necessarily be for the general good. As the socialists agree in hostility to competition as a controlling force, and as individualists agree that competition is necessary for the well-being of society, the fairest and most accurate line between the two schools can be drawn at the point where competition begins to be possible, both schools favoring public ownership where competition is impossible, but differing as to the wisdom of public ownership where competition can have free play.

Much of the strength developed by socialism is due to the fact that socialists advocate certain reforms which

individualists also advocate. Take, for illustration, the public ownership of waterworks. It is safe to say that a large majority of the people living in cities of any considerable size favor their public ownership, individualists because it is practically impossible to have more than one water system in a city, and socialists on the general ground that the government should own all the means of production and distribution. The sentiment in favor of municipal lighting plants is not yet so strong, and the sentiment in favor of public telephones and public street-car lines is still less pronounced; but the same general principles apply to them, and individualists, without accepting the creed of socialists, can advocate the extension of municipal ownership to these utilities.

Then, too, some of the strength of socialism is due to its condemnation of abuses which, while existing under individualism, are not at all necessary to individualism—abuses which the individualists are as anxious as the socialists to remedy. It is not only consistent with individualism, but is a necessary implication of it, that the competing parties should be placed upon substantially equal footing, for competition is not worthy of that name if one party is able to arbitrarily fix the terms of the agreement, leaving the other with no choice but to submit to the terms prescribed. Individualists, for instance, can consistently advocate usury laws which fix the rate of interest to be charged, these laws being justified on the ground that the borrower and the lender do not stand upon an equal footing. When the money lender is left free to take advantage of the necessities of the borrower, the so-called freedom of contract is really freedom to extort. Upon the same ground society can justify legislation against child labor and legislation limiting the hours of adult labor. One can believe in competition and still favor such limitations and restrictions as will make the competition real and effective. To advocate individualism it is no more necessary to excuse the abuses to which competition may lead than it is to defend the burning of a city because fire is essential to human comfort, or to praise a tempest because air is necessary to human life.

In comparing individualism with socialism it is only fair to consider individualism when made as good as

human wisdom can make it and then measure it with socialism at its best. It is a common fault of the advocate to present his system, idealized, in contrast with his opponent's system at its worst, and it must be confessed that neither individualist nor socialist has been entirely free from this fault. In dealing with any subject we must consider man as he is, or as he may reasonably be expected to become under the operation of the system proposed, and it is much safer to consider him as he is than to expect a radical change in his nature. Taking man as we find him, he needs, as individualists believe, the spur of competition. Even the socialists admit the advantage of rivalry within certain limits, but they would substitute altruistic for selfish motives. Just here the individualist and the socialist find themselves in antagonism. The former believes that altruism is a spiritual quality which defies governmental definition, while the socialist believes that altruism will take the place of selfishness under enforced collectivism.

Ruskin's statement that "government and co-operation are in all things and eternally the laws of life; anarchy and competition eternally and in all things, the laws of death," is often quoted by socialists, but, like generalizations are apt to be, it is more comprehensive than clear. There is a marked distinction between voluntary co-operation, upon terms mutually satisfactory, and compulsory co-operation upon terms agreeable to a majority. Many of the attempts to establish voluntary co-operation have failed because of disagreement as to the distribution of the common property or income, and those which have succeeded best have usually rested upon a religious rather than upon an economic basis.

In any attempt to apply the teachings of Christ to an economic state it must be remembered that His religion begins with a regeneration of the human heart and with an ideal of life which makes service the measure of greatness. Tolstoy, who repudiates socialism as a substantial reform, contends that the bringing of the individual into harmony with God is the all important thing and that this accomplished all injustice will disappear.

It is much easier to conceive of a voluntary association between persons desiring to work together according to the Christian ideal, than to conceive of the successful

operation of a system enforced by law, wherein altruism is the controlling principle. The attempt to unite church and state has never been helpful to either government or religion, and it is not at all certain that human nature can yet be trusted to use the instrumentalities of government to enforce religious ideas. The persecutions which have made civilization blush have been attempts to compel conformity to religious beliefs sincerely held and zealously promulgated.

The government, whether it leans toward individualism or toward socialism, must be administered by human beings and its administration will reflect the weaknesses and imperfections of those who control it. Bancroft declares that the expression of the universal conscience in history is the nearest approach to the voice of God and he is right in paying this tribute to the wisdom of the masses, and yet we cannot overlook the fact that this universal conscience must find governmental expression through frail human beings who yield to the temptation to serve their own interests at the expense of their fellows. Will socialism purge the individual of selfishness or bring a nearer approach to justice?

Justice requires that each individual shall receive from society a reward proportionate to his contribution to society; can the state, acting through officials, make this apportionment better than it can be made by competition? At present, official favors are not distributed strictly according to merit either in republics or in monarchies; is it certain that socialism would insure a fairer division of rewards? If the government operates all the factories, all the farms and all the stores, there must be superintendents as well as workmen, there must be different kinds of employment, some more pleasant, some less pleasant; is it likely that any set of men can distribute the work or fix the compensation to the satisfaction of all, or even to the satisfaction of a majority of the people? When the government employs comparatively few of the people it must make the terms and conditions inviting enough to draw the persons needed from private employment, and if those employed in the public service become dissatisfied they can return to outside occupations; but what will be the result if there is no private employment? What outlet will there be for discontent if the government owns

and operates all the means of production and distribution?

Under individualism a man's reward is determined in the open market and where competition is free he can hope to sell his services for what they are worth; will his chance for reward be as good when he must do the work prescribed for him on the terms fixed by those who are in control of the government?

As there is no example of such a socialistic state as is now advocated, all reasoning upon the subject must be confined to the theory, and theory needs to be corrected by experience. As in mathematics, no one can calculate the direction of the resultant without a knowledge of all the forces that act upon the moving body, so in estimating the effect of a proposed system one must take into consideration all the influences that operate upon the human mind and heart, and who is wise enough to predict with certainty the result of any system before it has been thoroughly tried? Individualism has been tested by centuries of experience. Under it there have been progress and development. That it has not been free from evil is not a sufficient condemnation. The same rain that furnishes the necessary moisture for the growing crop sometimes floods the land and destroys the harvest; the same sun that coaxes the tiny shoot from mother Earth, sometimes scorches the blade and blasts the maturing stalk. The good things given us by our Heavenly Father often, if not always, have an admixture of evil, to the lessening of which the intelligence of man must be constantly directed. Just now there are signs of an ethical awakening which is likely to result in reforming some of the evils which have sprung from individualism, but which can be corrected without any impairment of the principle.

The individualist, while contending that the largest and broadest development of the individual, and hence of the entire population, is best secured by full and free competition, made fair by law, believes in a spiritual force which acts beyond the sphere of the state. After the government has secured to the individual, through competition, a reward proportionate to his effort, religion admonishes him of his stewardship and of his obligation to use his greater strength, his larger ability, and his richer reward in the spirit of brotherhood. Under indi-

vidualism we have seen a constant increase in altruism. The fact that the individual can select the objects of his benevolence and devote his means to the causes that appeal to him has given an added stimulus to his endeavors; would this stimulus be as great under socialism?

Probably the nearest approach that we have to the socialistic state today is to be found in the civil service. If the civil service develops more unselfishness and more altruistic devotion to the general welfare than private employment does, the fact is yet to be discovered. This is not offered as a criticism of civil service in so far as civil service may require examinations to ascertain fitness for office, but it is simply a reference to a well known fact, viz., that a life position in the government service, which separates one from the lot of the average producer of wealth, has given no extraordinary stimulus to higher development.

It is not necessary to excuse or to defend a competition carried to a point where it creates a submerged fifth or even a submerged tenth to recognize the beneficial effect of struggle and discipline upon the men and women who have earned the highest places in industry, society and government.

There should be no unfriendliness between the honest individualist and the honest socialist; both seek that which they believe to be the best for society. The socialist, by pointing out the abuses of individualism, will assist in their correction. At present, private monopoly is putting upon individualism an undeserved odium and it behooves the individualist to address himself energetically to this problem in order that the advantages of competition may be restored to industry. And the duty of immediate action is made more imperative by the fact that the socialist is inclined to support the monopoly, in the belief that it will be easier to induce the government to take over an industry after it has passed into the hands of a few men. The trust magnates and the socialists unite in declaring monopoly to be an economic development, the former hoping to retain the fruits of monopoly in private hands, the latter expecting the ultimate appropriation of the benefits of monopoly by the government. The individualist, on the contrary, contends that the consolidation of industries ceases to be an eco-

conomic advantage when competition is eliminated, and he believes, further, that no economic advantage which could come from the monopolization of all the industries in the hands of the government could compensate for the stifling of individual initiative and independence. And the individualists who thus believe stand for a morality and for a system of ethics which they are willing to measure against the ethics and morality of socialism.

HOW THE BANKS FILLED HANNA'S WAR CHEST IN 1896

THEY WERE ASSESSED ONE-FOURTH OF ONE PER CENT. ON COMBINED CAPITAL AND SURPLUS AND TWO "HURRY UP" CALLS MADE UPON THEM DURING THAT MEMORABLE CAMPAIGN

Speaking of "muck-rakes," James W. Breen operated one very effectively when, in an article published in the *New York Herald*, Sunday, April 15, he told how the banks filled Mr. Hanna's war chest during the campaign of 1896. Mr. Breen tells the story of how bank directors voted to the republican party funds intrusted to their care. One-fourth of one per cent. on combined capital and surplus was levied against the banks of the country, and two calls were made.

Mr. Breen makes it clear that these assessments and contributions were known to bank examiners under the control of the comptroller of the currency, and were suppressed. He adds: "It is doubtful if any bank examiner was simple enough to imagine that payments of this kind were lawful."

Mr. Breen points out, also, that Senator Knox of Pennsylvania, who is one of the sub-committee of the committee on privileges and elections, charged with the preparation of a bill to prevent improper campaign contributions, was in 1896 a director of one of the Pittsburg banks which contributed; that Senator Knox must have known of these contributions.

Mr. Breen says that the following circular was in 1896 sent to Pittsburg bankers:

Pittsburg, Sept. 2, 1896.—To the Board of Directors of the City Deposit Bank.—Dear Sirs: The undersigned have been appointed a committee to solicit from the banks funds in aid of the campaign for the republican national committee. The banks of New York and some other places have been contributing on the basis of one-quarter of one per cent. of their combined capital and surplus, and the national committee requests us to ask the Pittsburg banks to do the same.

We only started yesterday afternoon, and so far have found all the banks we have approached willing to contribute on this basis. So far we have received the following subscriptions:

Farmers' Deposit National bank.....	\$5,000
People's National bank.....	5,000
National Bank of Commerce.....	2,000
T. Mellon & Sons.....	2,750
Bank of Pittsburg.....	2,500
National Bank of Western Penn.....	1,200
Union Trust Company.....	750

We are informed that the Second National bank will give \$5,000, and that in the other banks we have visited the matter is to be brought before the boards and formally recommended, so that we anticipate favorable action by all. The campaign managers are looking over a much larger area of country than is usual in a national campaign and it is taking a great deal of money. The question is a vital one to all financial institutions, and therefore is declared a proper and legitimate matter for contributions on the part of the banks.

The subscriptions here are payable to James S. McKean, chairman of the auxiliary finance committee, and by that committee will be turned over to the national treasurer, Cornelius N. Bliss, who will receipt to the contributors. On the basis of what the other banks are doing the City Deposit bank is asked to subscribe one-quarter of one per cent. of its capital and surplus, which would be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$450. Trusting this matter will have your favorable consideration, we remain respectfully,

T. H. GIVEN,
F. P. DAY,
A. W. MELLON,
Committee.

Mr. Breen says that he obtained a copy of this circular on September 3, 1896. He made a copy of it and showed it to Albert J. Barr, president of the Pittsburg Post company, and that several typewritten copies of the circular were made in the Pittsburg Post Office. He asked the *Post*, which was presumably supporting the democratic ticket, to make the circular public, but Albert J. Barr said that if it was published it would "rock the boat." Mr. Breen replied: "Why shouldn't it be rocked?" and Mr. Barr said that he would have to take the matter under advisement and consult with others. Mr. Breen says: "Meanwhile Col. Guffey, who was the democratic national committeeman from Pennsylvania, had been informed of the affair and, although not slow to realize its bearing upon the McKinley campaign, he advanced various "business" reasons why it would be inadvisable for a democratic newspaper in Pittsburg to print this evidence."

Mr. Breen further says that when he subsequently called upon Mr. Barr of the *Post* that gentleman thanked Mr. Breen for his kind offer but informed him that he had "very reluctantly concluded not to take the risk of publishing this letter."

Following are some extracts from Mr. Breen's article:

"It is no secret in political circles that the national bank assessment of September 2, referred to in the letter quoted above, was only the first installment of the various levies made upon the national banks of the country during that heated campaign. A month or more later Hanna descended on Wall street, the alarm was again sounded, and a tremendous fund was raised for the specific purpose of insuring the success of McKinley electors in the doubtful states, especially New York and Indiana. As the circular letter itself plainly indicates, the September collection was general throughout all the large commercial cities of the north, and the toll exacted by the call issued later in the campaign is reported to have been equally large. Confining the discussion, however, to the tangible evidence actually in hand, it is seen that eight Pittsburg banks paid an average of \$3,118 each to the national republican campaign committee in response to one call in a single campaign. There are now 128 banks

doing business through the Pittsburg Clearing House. In 1893 there were seventy. Maintaining this average of \$3,118 for each of the seventy banks doing business in Pittsburg in 1896, it is seen that from that city alone the committee would have realized the tidy sum of \$218,260 as a result of its first call for aid. A contribution of one-fourth of one per cent. of their capital and surplus by the banks of the United States would produce an enormous sum. In September, 1896, the national banks had a capital of \$658,126,915. The surplus would bring the total up to at least \$1,000,000,000. One-fourth of one per cent. of the amount would be \$2,500,000. It is not to be assumed that all the national banks contributed, but it is reasonably certain that most of those in the larger cities did so—representing probably four-fifths of the combined capital and surplus. The state banks and trust companies undoubtedly helped the work along. I have not at hand statistics as to the capital and surplus of these institutions, but it seems safe to assert that the banks furnished more than \$2,000,000 to Mr. Hanna's war chest on the first call. It will not be forgotten that late in October Mr. Hanna called on the financial powers for a second contribution—'to make the doubtful states secure.' If the call brought half as much, or even one-fourth, as the first one, the enormous proportions of the McKinley campaign fund may be estimated when it is remembered that practically all the large industrial and railroad corporations were pouring gold into the treasury of the republican campaign committee. The estimate, so far as Pittsburg is concerned, would have to be reduced by eliminating the contribution of one bank. Among the directors of the bank in question was a well known citizen of Pittsburg, who, when he heard of the proposed contribution, or assessment, promptly objected. The directors decided to go ahead, notwithstanding his opposition. He engaged a lawyer and had papers prepared to procure an injunction. The directors then capitulated and no contribution was made by that bank. It will be noted in the circular of the banks given above that it is stated that the committee will turn the funds over to 'the national treasurer, the Honorable Cornelius N. Bliss, who will receipt to the contributors.' In other words, each institution paying money into the fund was

given an individual receipt from Mr. Bliss, who consequently has, or at least had, knowledge of the identity of each separate contributor and the amount turned over by such contributor to the general fund. Consequently, if any senate or other committee wishes information as to campaign contributions, the means of obtaining such information are at hand."

MR. BRYAN'S RECEPTION IN INDIA

Indian newspapers received recently show that in India, as elsewhere on his travels, Mr. Bryan received cordial reception. The *Indian Mirror*, published at Calcutta, in its issue of March 9, prints a long editorial paying high compliment to Mr. Bryan, and congratulates the people of India upon the fact that Mr. Bryan is making observations in their country, the publication of which cannot but be of advantage to the observed.

The *Advocate* of India, published at Bombay, in its issue of March 24, pays a high tribute to Mr. Bryan and reminds the people of Bombay that they should not miss the opportunity of making his acquaintance, saying: "The points of view from which Mr. Bryan may be admired are various and many."

In its issue of March 27, the *Times* of Bombay prints the following editorial:

MR. BRYAN'S VISIT

"The arrival in Bombay yesterday of Mr. William Jennings Bryan, the leader of the great democratic party of the United States, is an event of singular interest. Mr. Bryan needs no introduction to the citizens of Bombay. His fame is already world-wide. He has twice been nominated as candidate for the presidency of the United States, and though he was not successful, he enjoys the complete confidence of millions of his fellow-countrymen, and he is young enough to try again. The issues of American politics are no direct concern of Bombay; it is enough for this city to know that Mr. Bryan is one of the greatest living Americans to make it glad to have him in its midst. It welcomes him because his visit

typifies and represents that intense interest in India and its people which is so characteristic of modern America. That interest is all the more appreciated because it proceeds from no other motive than a deep and sympathetic regard for the natives of India, and from a desire to know them better and to study the system of administration under which they live. It is a fact that during the last year or two the number of American travelers visiting India has probably exceeded those of any nationality other than British, and this fact is only one indication of that eager inclination to learn more of India which is at once discovered by any visitor to the United States from this country. Mr. Bryan is understood to look with some misgivings upon the policy of expansion in the Pacific on which his mighty nation has now entered; but whatever may be the principles to which he adheres we trust that in the vast machinery which represents British rule in the India of today he will find some features which may invite his approval.

“Mr. Bryan is not only a great American, he is also, by common consent, the greatest living orator in a nation of orators. He has conferred upon Bombay a welcome privilege in consenting to deliver his famous address, ‘The Prince of Peace,’ in the town hall this afternoon at 6 o’clock. The address has for its theme reflections suggested by a visit to the tomb of Napoleon. Admission is free, and the only trouble we fear is that even the Town Hall will not suffice to hold those who are eager to avail themselves of Mr. Bryan’s graceful acquiescence in the widely-expressed wish that he should deliver a public address in Bombay. As a speaker, his powers are unique. Whatever views his hearers may begin by holding, he so grips them by his magnetic personality and the intensity of his convictions that they invariably end by acknowledging the power of his magic gift of silvern speech. If he could gather the whole population of the United States into one vast hall he would be elected president by acclamation. None could say him nay—whatever they might think the next morning. The man who can exercise this wonderful gift is a man worth hearing, and in welcoming Mr. Bryan among them the citizens of Bombay are grateful for the kindly feeling which has led him to consent to address them.”

In its issue of March 28, the *Times* of India prints an account of Mr. Bryan's reception in Bombay. This account follows:

“Bombay Town Hall, in the course of its history extending now for a period of three-quarters of a century, has been the scene of many historic and eventful gatherings, but it is doubtful whether any have been of a more interesting or unique character than the one which took place last evening, when the spacious hall was densely packed with citizens of Bombay, eager to see and hear the great American democratic leader, Mr. William Jennings Bryan. The audience was cosmopolitan in the extreme. Americans, of course, turned up in large numbers, and while Englishmen were well to the fore, there were also representatives from other European countries. By far the large majority, however, was composed of natives of India. The gathering was a striking testimony to the world-wide usage of the English language, for those present were English speaking people, and had assembled together to hear one of the greatest masters of oratory deliver an address in that language. The personality of the man, no doubt, attracted many, but the chief and predominating reason for the attendance was the desire to listen to America's foremost orator. At the outset it is safe to say that those who had the good fortune to be present received an intellectual treat.

“Long before the time for the meeting to commence—6 o'clock—the Town Hall was packed. It is estimated that with those standing by the windows and doors, there were quite three thousand persons present, and of these only a small proportion were seated, the sides and back of the hall being filled with people perfectly willing to put up with the discomfort of standing. The hall was tastefully decorated with flags, prominent by the organ being the Stars and Stripes, the Union Jack, and the Japanese national emblem. At five minutes to six the Hon. Mr. Fulton, Sir Lawrence Jenkins and Dr. Mackichan arrived and were warmly welcomed, and a minute later Sir P. M. Mehta's entrance was the signal for a great ovation. Only a minute was wanted for the hour when the American consul, Mr. W. T. Fee, escorted the distinguished visitor onto the platform, the audience accord-

ing him a splendid reception. Mr. Bryan was seated between Dr. Mackichan and Sir Lawrence Jenkins. In a few happily expressed sentences Dr. Mackichan, who presided, introduced Mr. W. J. Bryan, who then delivered his address on 'The Prince of Peace.' Mr. Bryan spoke for exactly one hour, and throughout the whole of his oration he had the undivided attention of his audience. Those who are best calculated to know affirm that the company last night was the largest ever gathered within the Town Hall, and it consisted of divers races and creeds. It consequently speaks much for the magnetic influence of the man when it is remembered that for one hour Mr. Bryan held this varied gathering under the spell of his eloquence, while he discoursed on a subject in which at least two-thirds of those present could have but little, if any, sympathy. All listened with the closest interest, and there was certainly much in which all could agree. The happy epigrams and choice phrases in which Mr. Bryan gave voice to those principles of morality which are for the advancement of the brotherhood of man were warmly applauded by all sections of the audience. Mr. Bryan possesses a clear and silvery voice and every word was to be distinctly heard in the uttermost corners of the hall. At first he is slow and quiet, but as he warms into his subject and becomes engaged in argument he grows more vehement in manner and ends in a perfect torrent of words, well chosen and beautifully expressed. His style never loses its deeply impressive character, and one feels that the man is giving vent to feelings right from the heart. For once the audience really sees a man in earnest, and the words carry conviction. A religious address is, however, very different to a political one, when men's passions are easily aroused, and denunciation and invective of an opposite policy command rounds of applause. Mr. Bryan had a difficult task to fulfill. Following his custom when outside America he decided to leave politics severely alone, and he confined himself to an essentially religious topic. Many of those present were of a totally different way of thinking to the great statesman, and that he succeeded in keeping all more than interested to the end cannot but be classed as a remarkable oratorical feat. It was a brilliant speech, and freely acknowl-

edged by all so to be. At the conclusion the Hon. Mr. Fulton suitably voiced the thanks of those present to Mr. Bryan and the proceedings terminated. Mr. Bryan will carry away from these shores many pleasant memories of his present tour through India, but one can confidently assert that the remembrance of the wonderful gathering in the Bombay Town Hall will long be treasured as one of the happiest events of a memorable tour by America's great democrat."

In its issue of March 28, the *Times* of India, giving an account of Mr. Bryan's reception in Bombay, prints the following report:

"Dr. Mackichan, in opening the proceedings, said the distinguished gentleman who was about to address them needed no introduction to a Bombay audience or to any audience. (Hear, hear.) This was the first journey which he had made around the world and the first visit he had paid to their city, but his reputation and fame had made their world-wide journey before him, and he came among them as one whom many in all nations regarded with admiration and esteem. (Applause.) Whatever might be their political sympathies they all admired the heroic contest in which he was engaged some years ago and those qualities which evoked so much enthusiasm in the American Nation, and they had that night shown by the unprecedented numbers in which they had assembled how gladly they welcomed amongst them this distinguished American citizen and how deeply honored they felt by his visit. (Applause.) But it was no political platform on which they met that night. It was a broader platform of those things which appealed to the heart of all humanity, and the Hon. Mr. Bryan was to speak to them not of politics, or political contests, but of the great problems which concerned all of them assembled there. He thought they might take it that one of the lessons of the lecture would be a lesson of the lecturer's own life, that no political reputation could be enduring or beneficial that was not based upon a deep

sense of moral responsibility and that did not spring from the highest spirit of self-sacrifice. It was those qualities in Mr. Bryan which formed the foundation of his enormous influence, and he thought it no small honor to the city that it had had the opportunity of listening to such a great man. (Hear, hear.) He might say that, mingled with a desire to honor Mr. Bryan, it was also their desire to show their respect to the great nation which he represented. (Applause.) India was not unmindful of the many services which through many generations America had rendered to this country. In times of prosperity and in times of adversity India had owed much to the country from which Mr. Bryan had come and they welcomed him as a distinguished man and as a distinguished representative of a great country. (Applause.) But he would not stand longer between them and their expectations, and would call upon the Hon. Mr. Bryan to address them. (Applause.)”

Here follows a report of Mr. Bryan’s address on “The Brotherhood of Man.” The *Times*’ report concludes as follows:

“The Hon. Mr. Fulton said the vote that he had to propose was one which he felt sure they would receive with acclamation, and that was a most hearty vote of thanks to Mr. Bryan for the great lecture that he had delivered to them that evening. (Applause.) At the commencement of his address Mr. Bryan spoke with modest deprecation of the expectations which had been formed, but now they found that those expectations had been fully realized. (Hear, hear.) They felt that they were founded upon a true instinct, and as he spoke of the good effect of a kindly act, he (the speaker) could not help thinking that it was he that night who was putting into practice his own ideas—(hear, hear)—because if a man in his position who had been able to sway vast audiences in a great nation of the world were to come there to address them, who were all strangers to him, in the manner that he had done, it was an act of kindness for which they could not be too grateful. (Applause.) He thought that hereafter when they saw his name in the papers they would think of this kindly act that he had done that evening—(applause)—and if here-

after he was called to the highest position in the great republic they would all remember with pride and pleasure that they had the opportunity of meeting him that evening. (Applause.) He would not detain them any longer but would move a hearty vote of thanks to Mr. Bryan."

"The vote was carried with acclamation.

"The chairman said he would now in a brief word convey to the Hon. Mr. Bryan the vote which by such hearty acclamation had been passed that night. He felt sure that they would all remember this occasion, and they would remember especially this fact in the history of the great statesman, who was with them that night, that his life had been based upon those principles which he had expounded with such eloquence and which had drawn out to him that enthusiasm which had gathered around him in the political life which he had spent in his own land. (Applause.) In conclusion he wished to say that this was a time of special privilege for Bombay, because during the next week they would have the honor of listening to two Japanese orators, who were visiting Bombay and who were coming to India to speak to the Indian people of the great uplifting of the national life of their country.

"The proceedings then terminated."

In its issue of March 28, the *Advocate* of India prints an extended report of the Bombay reception, saying that the great audience "was worthy of the man," also, "it was, perhaps, the most graceful act of courtesy that Bombay could pay to its distinguished visitor that he was received with unstinted enthusiasm by an assembly, the greater part of which belonged to a separate race and followed other faiths. By 6 o'clock every available inch of space was occupied, the entire hall being filled from the organ loft to the balcony in the rear of the building. Mr. Bryan's appearance on the platform was a signal for a wonderful demonstration of enthusiasm."

The *Advocate* of India concludes, as follows: "There can be only one conclusion regarding the meeting. Mr. Bryan discharged his great and difficult task with complete success. Considering the nature and the diversity

of his audience, he handled his theme with consummate skill and tact, and he sat down, leaving the fame of his name as an orator undiminished. It was hardly an address to which we listened. It was still less a sermon. It was not a piece of declamation or rhetoric. It was something of them all. With the true instinct of the orator, Mr. Bryan can adapt himself to the mental condition of his audience. He did that last night with remarkable success. There was nothing doctrinaire or dogmatic about him, and hardly anything didactic, and yet he spoke with the might which thrills with deeply cherished convictions and beliefs."

MR. BRYAN'S LONDON INTERVIEW

A cablegram under date of London, July 5, and carried by the Associated Press, says that Mr. Bryan gave to newspaper correspondents the following statement:

"The first suggestion of a reception for me at New York came prior to the action of any of the state conventions and before there was any discussion of the next campaign. It came from the Commercial Travelers' Anti-Trust League, of which Mr. Hoge is president. I assured him I should be pleased to meet the members of the league, suggesting that the reception be characterized by simplicity.

"Now that the actions of some of the state conventions have raised a question as to the political significance of the reception, I am glad to say that it must not be regarded in the light of an indorsement for the presidential nomination. While I appreciate the compliment paid by the various state conventions, I do not regard their expressions as binding upon them or upon the party of their state. I shall not prosecute them for breach of promise if they transfer their affections to another; I shall not even publish their letters. To allow the reception to be regarded as an indorsement would in the first place be unjust to others who may be candidates.

"I have seen the names of several mentioned as possible candidates, among them Congressman Hearst, Senator Bailey and Governor Folk, who have all rendered

conspicuous service to the party and the country, and their claims should be considered. The party is entitled to its most available man, and the question of availability cannot be determined so far in advance. Circumstances and issues may strengthen the claims of some of the gentlemen mentioned, and the list should be an open one until the time comes to choose.

“I may add that it would not be just to me to be put in the attitude of announcing my candidacy or admitting the certainty of my being a candidate. I am advancing in years and cannot spare two years out of my life just at this time.

“I shall be glad to return to America, although every day of my trip has been enjoyable. I shall be glad to meet my friends in America, and after I have met them they will be just as free as before to do what they think best on issues and candidates.”

FOURTH OF JULY ADDRESS AT AMERICAN SOCIETY BANQUET, LONDON

Referring to the dinner given by the American Society at London, July 4th, on which occasion Mr. Bryan spoke, the Associated Press said:

“Ambassador Whitelaw Reid and Mr. Bryan engaged in some sharp, but good humored, banter over political differences, the crowd evincing its enjoyment of the sport with cheers and shouts of laughter. Mr. Reid, in responding to Sir W. B. Richmond’s graceful proposal to his health, said with reference to Mr. Bryan: ‘At home, as a citizen, I have openly and squarely opposed him at every stage of his conspicuous career. I am reasonably sure that when I return home I shall continue to do the same. I believe he tonight is as well satisfied as I am, though by different reasoning, that the country we both love and try to serve has not been ruined by its gold.

“ ‘Abroad, as the official representative of the American people, without distinction to party, I am glad to welcome him here as a typical American, whose whole life has been lived in the daylight and one whom such

a great host of my countrymen have long trusted and honored.'

“Mr. Bryan, rising, amid laughter and cheers, said:

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency, and Gentlemen—Remembering, as I do with great pleasure, the evening which I spent with this society on Thanksgiving Day two years and a half ago, I was glad indeed that I was able to accept the invitation extended on the part of this society by our distinguished ambassador, the Hon. Whitelaw Reid. It gives me great satisfaction to be able to look into the faces of so many of my countrymen and of those who speak our language. The only sad feature of the day is that it follows so closely upon the terrible accident that has kept some Americans from this banquet hall, and I am sure we all appreciate the very kindly expressions of sympathy which have been read this evening. Death is at no time a welcome guest, but it can never be so unwelcome as when it comes not only suddenly, as it did in this case, but when those taken are far from the friends who are near and dear to them.

I appreciate the kind words spoken by our ambassador, and I can almost wish that he had said enough of a political nature to justify me in making a political speech. It has been now nearly ten months since I had the chance to make one, and you can understand what self-restraint it requires to pass by this opportunity. Not even his mention of gold will draw me into politics, although I might say that if our country has done so well walking on one leg, what progress she would have made if she had but had two. The American ambassador has referred to the fact that in our country he has felt it necessary to oppose some things that I have said. I can testify that he has not only done so, but that he has done it well; and remembering how much better he acts abroad than at home, I can assure you that no American rejoices more than I that he is 3,000 miles away from his field of influence. In a trip of some months I have met a number of republican office-holders. I have found them good men, and I sometimes wish that we had enough offices to take all the republicans out of the United States. But I cannot be tempted to deviate

from the course which I laid out for myself, and I am going to ask your indulgence while I present some thoughts that I feel may possibly be worthy of consideration here.

Our English friends, under whose flag we meet tonight, recalling that this is the anniversary of our nation's birth, would doubtless pardon us if our rejoicing contained something of self-congratulation, for it is at such a time as this that we are wont to review those national achievements which have given to the United States its prominence among the nations. But I hope I shall not be thought lacking in patriotic spirit if, instead of drawing a picture of the past, bright with heroic deeds and unparalleled in progress, I summon you rather to a serious consideration of the responsibility resting upon those nations which aspire to premiership. This line of thought is suggested by a sense of propriety as well as by recent experiences—by a sense of propriety because such a subject will interest the Briton as well as the American, and by recent experiences because they have impressed me not less with our national duty than with the superiority of western over eastern civilization.

Asking your attention to such a theme, it is not unfitting to adopt a phrase coined by a poet to whom America as well as England can lay some claim, and take for my text "The White Man's Burden:"

"Take up the White Man's burden—
In patience to abide,
To veil the threat of terror
And check the show of pride.
By open speech and simple,
An hundred times made plain,
To seek another's profit,
And work another's gain."

Thus sings Kipling, and, with the exception of the third line (of the meaning of which I am not quite sure), the stanza embodies the thought which is uppermost in my mind tonight. No one can travel among the dark-skinned races of the Orient without feeling that the white man occupies an especially favored position among the children of men, and the recognition of this fact is accompanied by the conviction that there is a

duty inseparably connected with the advantages enjoyed. There is a white man's burden—a burden which the white man should not shirk even if he could, a burden which he could not shirk even if he would. That no one liveth unto himself or dieth unto himself has a national as well as an individual application; our destinies are so interwoven that each exerts an influence directly or indirectly upon all others.

Sometimes this influence is unconsciously exerted, as when, for instance, the good or bad precedent set by one nation in dealing with its own affairs is followed by some other nation. Sometimes the influence is incidentally exerted, as when, for example, a nation in the extension of its commerce introduces its language among, and enlarges the horizon of, the people with whom it trades. This incidental benefit conferred by the opening of new markets must be apparent to anyone who has watched the stimulating influence of the new ideas which have been introduced into Asia and Africa through the medium of the English language. This is not only the mother tongue of very many of the world's leaders in religion, statesmanship, science and literature, but it has received, through translation, the best that has been written and spoken in other countries. He who learns this language, therefore, is like one who lives upon a great highway where he comes into daily contact with the world. Without disparaging other modern languages, it may be said with truth that whether one travels abroad or studies at home there is no other language so useful at the present time as that which we employ at this banquet board, and the nation which is instrumental in spreading this language confers an inestimable boon, even though the conferring of it be not included in its general purpose. England has rendered this service to the people of India, and the United States is rendering the same service to the people of the Philippines, while both England and the United States have been helpful to Japan and China in this way.

But the advanced nations cannot content themselves with the conferring of incidental benefits; if they would justify their leadership they must put forth conscious and constant effort for the promotion of the welfare of the nations which lag behind. Incidental bene-

fits may follow, even though the real purpose of a nation be a wholly selfish one, for as the sale of Joseph into Egypt resulted in blessings to his family and to the land of the Pharaohs, so captives taken in war have sometimes spread civilization, and blacks carried away into slavery have been improved by contact with the whites. But nations cannot afford to do evil in the hope that Providence will transmute the evil into good and bring blessings out of sin. Nations, if they would be great in the better sense of the term, must intend benefit as well as confer it; they must plan advantage, and not leave the results to chance.

I take it for granted that our duty to the so-called inferior races is not discharged by merely feeding them in times of famine, or by contributing to their temporary support when some other calamity overtakes them. A much greater assistance is rendered them when they are led to a more elevated plane of thought and activity by ideals which stimulate them to self-development. The improvement of the people themselves should be the paramount object in all intercourse with the Orient.

Among the blessings which the Christian nations are at this time able—and because able, in duty bound—to carry to the rest of the world, I may mention five: education, knowledge of the science of government, arbitration as a substitute for war, appreciation of the dignity of labor, and a high conception of life.

Education comes first, and in nothing have the United States and England been more clearly helpful than in the advocacy of universal education. If the designs of God are disclosed by His handiwork, then the creation of the human mind is indubitable proof that the Almighty never intended that learning should be monopolized by a few, and he arrays himself against the plans of Jehovah who would deny intellectual training to any part of the human race. It is a false civilization, not a true one, that countenances the permanent separation of society into two distinct classes, the one encouraged to improve the mind and the other condemned to hopeless ignorance. Equally false is that conception of international politics which would make the prosperity of one nation depend upon the exploitation of another. While no one is farsighted enough to estimate with

accuracy the remote, or even the immediate, consequences of human action, yet as we can rely upon the principle that as each individual profits rather than loses by the progress and prosperity of his neighbors, so we cannot doubt that it is to the advantage of each nation that every other nation shall make the largest possible use of its own resources and the capabilities of its people.

No one questions that Japan's influence has been a beneficent one since she has emerged from illiteracy and endowed her people with public schools open to all her boys and girls. The transition from a position of obscurity into a world power was scarcely more rapid than her change from a menace into an ally. China is entering upon a similar experience, and I am confident that her era of reform will make her, not a yellow peril, but a powerful co-laborer in the international vineyard. In India, in the Philippines, in Egypt, and even in Turkey, statistics show a gradual extension of education, and I trust I shall be pardoned if I say that neither the armies nor the navies, nor yet the commerce of our nations, have given us so just a claim to the gratitude of the people of Asia as have our school-teachers, sent, many of them, by private rather than by public funds.

The English language has become the vehicle for the conveyance of governmental truth even more than for the spread of general information, for, beginning with Magna Charta, and continuing through the era of the American revolution and the Declaration of Independence, down to the present, no other language has been so much employed for the propagation of that theory of government which traces authority to the consent of the governed. Our own nation presents the most illustrious example known to history of a great population working out its destiny through laws of its own making, and under officials of its own choosing, although, I may add, we scarcely go beyond England in recognizing the omnipotence of a parliament fresh from the people. It is difficult to overestimate the potency of this conception of government upon the progress of a nation, and, in turning the thought of the world away from despotism to the possibilities of self-government, the pioneers of freedom made Western civilization possible. An idea

will sometimes revolutionize an individual, a community, a state, a nation, or even a world, and the idea that man possesses inalienable rights which the state did not give, and which the state, though it can deny, cannot take away, has made millions of human beings stand erect and claim their God-given inheritance. While the area of constitutional liberty is ever widening, while the tyranny and insolence of arbitrary power are every year decreasing, the leaders of the world's thought—not only the English-speaking nations, but the other Christian nations as well—have yet much to do in teaching reverence for the will of the majority and respect for the public servants upon whom the people bestow authority.

The Christian nations must lead the movement for the promotion of peace, not only because they are enlisted under the banner of the Prince of Peace, but also because they have attained such a degree of intelligence that they can no longer take a pride in a purely physical victory. The belief that moral questions can be settled by the shedding of human blood is a relic of barbarism; to doubt the dynamic power of righteousness is infidelity to truth itself. The nation which is unwilling to trust its cause to the universal conscience, or which shrinks from the presentation of its claims before a tribunal where reason holds sway, betrays a lack of faith in the soundness of its position. Our country has reason to congratulate itself upon the success of President Roosevelt in hastening peace between Russia and Japan; through him our nation won a moral victory more glorious than a victory in war. His Majesty King Edward VII has also shown himself a promoter of arbitration, and a large number of the members of the English Parliament are enlisted in the same work. It means much that the two great English-speaking nations are thus arrayed on the side of peace. I venture to suggest that the world's peace would be greatly promoted by an agreement among the leading nations that no declaration of war should be made until after the submission of the question in controversy to an impartial court for investigation, each nation reserving the right to accept or reject the decision. The preliminary investigation would almost in every instance insure an amicable settle-

ment, and the reserved rights would be sufficient protection against any possible injustice.

Let me go a step farther and appeal for a clearer recognition of the dignity of labor. The odium which rests upon the work of the hand has exerted a baneful influence the world around. The theory that idleness is more honorable than toil—that it is more respectable to consume what others have produced than to be a producer of wealth—has not only robbed society of an enormous sum, but it has created an almost impassable gulf between the leisure classes and those who support them. Tolstoy is right in asserting that most of the perplexing problems of society grow out of the lack of sympathy between man and man. Because some imagine themselves above work, while others see before them nothing but a life of drudgery, there is constant warring and much of bitterness. When men and women become ashamed of doing nothing, and try to give to society full compensation for all they receive from society, there will be harmony between the classes.

While Europe and America have advanced far beyond the Orient in placing a proper estimate upon those who work, even our nations have not yet fully learned the lesson that employment at some useful avocation is essential to physical health, intellectual development, and moral growth. The agricultural colleges and industrial schools which have sprung up in so many localities are evidence that a higher ideal is spreading among the people. If America and England are to meet the requirements of their high positions they must be prepared to present in the lives of their citizens examples, increasing in number, of men and women who find delight in contributing to the welfare of their fellows, and this ought not to be difficult, for every department of human activity has a fascination of its own.

And now we come to the most important need of the Orient—a conception of life which recognizes individual responsibility to God, teaches the brotherhood of man, and measures greatness by the service rendered. The first establishes a rational relation between the creature and his Creator; the second lays the foundation for justice between man and his fellows, and the third furnishes an ambition large enough to fill each life with

noble effort. No service which we can render to the less favored nations can compare in value to this service, for if we can bring their people to accept such an ideal they will rival the Occident in their contribution to civilization. If this ideal—which must be accepted as the true one if our religion is true—had been more perfectly illustrated in the lives of Christians and in the conduct of Christian nations, there would now be less of the “White Man’s Burden.”

If it is legitimate to “seek another’s profit” and “to work another’s gain,” how can this service best be rendered? This has been the disputed point. Individuals and nations have differed less about the purpose to be accomplished than about the methods to be employed. Persecutions have been carried on avowedly for the benefit of the persecuted; wars have been waged for the alleged improvement of those attacked; and, still more frequently, philanthropy has been adulterated with selfish interest. If the superior nations have a mission, it is not to wound, but to heal—not to cast down, but to lift up, and the means must be example—a far more powerful and enduring means than violence. Example may be likened to the sun, whose genial rays constantly coax the buried seed into life, and clothe the earth, first with verdure, and afterward with ripened grain; while violence is the occasional tempest, which can ruin, but cannot give life.

Can we doubt the efficacy of example in the light of history? There has been a great increase in education during the last century, and the school-houses have not been opened by the bayonet; they owe their existence largely to the moral influence which neighboring nations exert upon each other. And the spread of popular government during the same period, how rapid! Constitution after constitution has been adopted, and limitation after limitation has been placed upon arbitrary power, until Russia, yielding to public opinion, establishes a legislative body, and China sends commissioners abroad with a view to inviting the people to share the responsibilities of government.

While in America and in Europe there is much to be corrected, and abundant room for improvement, there has never been so much altruism in the world as there

is today—never so many who acknowledge the indissoluble tie that binds each to every other member of the race. The example of the Christian nations, though but feebly reflecting the light of the Master, is gradually reforming the world.

Society has passed through a period of aggrandizement, nations taking what they had the strength to take, and holding what they had the power to hold. But we are already entering upon a second era—an era in which nations discuss not merely what they can do, but what they should do, considering justice of greater importance than physical prowess. In tribunals like that instituted at the Hague, the chosen representatives of the nations weigh questions of right and wrong, give to the small nation an equal hearing with the great, and decree according to conscience. This marks an immeasurable advance, but there is another step yet to be taken. Justice, after all, is a cold, pulseless, negative virtue: the world needs something warmer and more generous. Harmlessness is better than harmfulness, but positive helpfulness is vastly superior to harmlessness, and we still have before us the larger and higher destiny of service.

There are even now signs of the approach of this third era, not so much in the action of Governments as in the growing tendency among many men and women in many lands to contribute their means, and in some cases their lives, to the intellectual and moral awakening of those who sit in darkness. Nowhere are these signs more abundant than in our own beloved land. I have felt more proud of my countrymen than ever before since I have visited the circuit of schools, hospitals, and churches which American philanthropy has built around the world. Before the sun sets upon one of these centers of a new civilization it rises upon another.

On the walls of the temple at Karnak an ancient artist carved the likeness of an Egyptian king; the monarch is represented as holding a group of captives by the hair, the other hand raising a club as if to strike a blow. What king would be willing to confess himself so cruel today? In some of the capitals of Europe there are monuments built of, or ornamented with, cannon taken in war; this form of boasting, once popular, is still

tolerated, though it must in time give way to some emblem of victory less suggestive of slaughter. As we are gathered tonight in England's capital, permit me to conclude with a sentiment suggested by a piece of statuary which stands in Windsor Castle. It represents the late lamented Queen Victoria leaning upon her royal consort; he has one arm about her, and with the other hand is pointing upward. The sculptor has told in marble an eloquent story of strength coupled with tenderness, of love rewarded with trust, of sorrow brightened by hope, and he has told the story so plainly that it was scarcely necessary to chisel the words: "Allured to brighter worlds, and led the way." It was a beautiful conception—more beautiful than that which gave to the world the Greek Slave, the Dying Gladiator, or the Goddess Athene, and it embodies an idea which, with the expanding feeling of comradeship, can be applied to the association of nations, as well as to the relations that exist between husband and wife. Let us indulge the hope that our nation may so measure up its great opportunities, and so bear its share of the White Man's Burden, as to earn the right to symbolize its progress by a similar figure. If it has been allured by Providence to higher ground, may it lead the way, winning the confidence of those who follow it, and exhibiting the spirit of Him who said, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."

I take pleasure, therefore, on this occasion among our countrymen and our countrymen's friends in proposing: "The Day we Celebrate"—The 4th of July.

MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH BEFORE THE IRISH CLUB

A Dublin newspaper printed the following account of Mr. Bryan's reception by the Irish Club at London:

Mr. William Jennings Bryan, the democratic candidate for the American presidency, was present at a reception given in his honor by the Irish Club at its magnificent new premises, Charing Cross road, last evening. The function was one which excited great interest, and long before the hour appointed quite a large crowd had col-

lected in the street for the purpose of catching a glimpse of the distinguished American as he entered the club. There were numerous photographers with their cameras ready to snapshot Mr. Bryan the moment he alighted from his cab. Mr. Bryan accepted the invitation to attend the reception a week or two ago, notwithstanding the fact that his time had been fully allocated to the round of engagements which monopolized every available hour, and which deprived him almost of a moment's leisure.

The club was beautifully decorated, and American and Irish flags floated in the breeze from the windows and from the roof of the building. Several hundred guests assembled, and when Mr. and Mrs. Bryan, accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. John Redmond and Mr. T. P. O'Connor, entered the reception hall, shortly after 6 o'clock, they were received with an outburst of enthusiasm which affected the distinguished visitors. The scene was an exceedingly brilliant and animated one.

Mr. T. Rouse, president of the Irish Club, presided at the reception. Amongst those present were: Mr. W. J. Bryan and Mrs. Bryan, Mr. John E. Redmond, M. P., and Mrs. Redmond, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M. P., Mr. John O'Connor, M. P., Mr. J. Annan Bryce, M. P., and Mrs. Bryce, Messrs. T. Condon, M. P., J. P. Hayden, M. P., C. Dolan, M. P., W. McKillop, M. P., D. Coogan, M. P., J. O'Dowd, M. P., R. Hazleton, M. P., P. J. O'Shaughnessy, M. P., Mr. Joyce, Mr. J. Cullinan, M. P., W. Duffy, M. P., J. McKean, M. P., O. Nolan, M. P., W. O'Malley, T. Harrington, M. P., W. Lundon, M. P., W. Devereux (mayor of Southwark), Mr. McAleer (mayor of Workington), Captain Hon. FitzRoyal Hemphill, Rev. E. Malley, Rev. P. Roe, Rev. J. Boyle, Rev. W. Byrne, Waterford; Rev. Mr. Lynch, Mr. F. H. O'Donnell, Thomas Curran, senior; Councillor M. C. Walsh, Ald. Anglim, Councillor MacManus, Councillor Leach, E. Cunningham, M. Keating, R. A. Walker and Mrs. Walker, S. Geddes, F. Salles and Mrs. Salles, H. McGrath, John Keating and Mrs. Keating, Miss Flynn, J. Cunningham, W. P. Ryan, J. P., Jr. Matthew, Mr. W. Ludwig, John Ryan and Mrs. Ryan, Miss E. Rouse, Miss F. Rouse, Dr. Harold C. O'Malley, Mrs. O'Malley, the Misses O'Malley, Miss Ryan, etc.

Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M. P., who was received with applause, said: Mr. Bryan, on behalf of the Irishmen of

London and of Great Britain generally I offer you hearty welcome, a cead mile failte to the Irish Club. Your name is one which even centuries ago was prominent and historical in the annals of Ireland. May we not also believe without any lack of modesty that some at least of your many gifts—your eloquence, your political insight, your imagination, your ready sympathy, your geniality, your amiability—are in part derived from your Celtic ancestors (applause). But, Mr. Bryan, you would be a welcome guest among us whatever the origin of your family in the mere fact that you are a distinguished citizen of the United States (applause). A little touch of American nature makes the whole world kin. To every land and every race your country has been a land of promise, of hope, of larger liberties, greater equality of opportunity, beneficial change of environment (applause). To the Irish in particular your country has been an asylum and a refuge. Nearly forty years ago England's greatest tribune used these words: "You will recollect that when the ancient Hebrew prophet prayed in his captivity he prayed with his window open towards Jerusalem. You know that the followers of Mahomet when they pray turn their faces toward Mecca. When the Irish peasant asks for food and freedom and blessings his eye follows the setting sun. The aspirations of his heart reach beyond the wide Atlantic, and in spirit he grasps hands with the great republic of the west." To us it is often the cause of bitter wail, and sometimes almost of despair, that so many millions of our race have been driven by evil laws from our own beautiful and fertile land, but it is some consolation to us that so many of these millions have found happy and prosperous homes in the hospitable and glorious bosom of the great republic of the west (applause).

We are proud that they have done their duty for their new country in battle by land and sea, that in the pursuits of commerce they have taken their due share, and we are proud and grateful also that while no race of the many in your land are more ardently patriotic, and I might say more vehemently American, yet they have not forgotten that sad little island from which their race springs (applause). In your visits to our country you must have been struck by the palpable signs all around

you—the close and myriad ties that bind our people to the United States. There is scarcely one in the thousands of cottages by which your train has sped in which America has not a daily and hourly thought in one gray-haired father or mother, brooding over some beloved son or daughter who has left them to find work in America. This man has a brother there; this woman a sister; in short while millions of our people remain in the flesh within the shores of Ireland, the dearer part of their hearts and their souls lives in the lands of the Stars and Stripes, with the living, or the dead—who has found a last resting place in American earth (applause).

There is not a ship that crosses the Atlantic which does not bear thousands of messages of love from the scattered children of the Gael to each other. The Christmas letter that brings help and often the very necessities of life to the poor people left at home from relatives that have prospered in your land is still one of the great events of Irish life, still one of the epochs of the Irish year (applause). With the ties so close and so numerous, even the breadth of the Atlantic can never make an Irishman think of America as far away. It is so near to the hearts of our people that it seems just next door. The surf that beats against the shores of our little island has apparently traveled from some spot on your great coastline (applause). We look on you, sir, as one of our truest and most powerful friends. We wish you just as well as we know you wish us (cheers). It is not for us to make any pronouncement, or even to express any personal sympathies on questions of internal politics in America. We have friends in all parties (applause). We have admiration for men in all parties, and not the least for the courage of the resolute and honest man who is now your chief magistrate (applause)—a sentiment we know will be welcomed by you, whose strong advocacy of your own political views has always been tempered by your genial and kindly estimate of the personal merits of your political opponents (applause). What great destiny may be reserved for you in the future is not for us to forecast. That rests in the hands of your own great and gifted people. To us it is your personality that makes the appeal (applause). It is not the first time we have met you here

in London. You have grown upon us the more we have known you. Millions of your own countrymen look to you with enthusiastic affection and admiration as a political leader. We bear you the same feelings as a man (applause). We admire, we respect—may I not even say love?—you for yourself (applause). We wish you God-speed, a safe return to your own land, and many long years of health and life for the service of your people and your country. We wish the same blessings to the true and sweet companion who is here with you, and who is so splendid a specimen of America's noblest product, the American woman (applause). Mr. and Mrs. Bryan, I utter to you together the pleasant and sad greeting, "Welcome and farewell. Cead mile failte agus bean-nacht libh" (loud applause).

Mr. Bryan, who was received with loud and continued applause, said: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen—It is very kind of you to give us this cordial welcome and this friendly farewell. I appreciate the compliment which is paid to us by the invitation to attend this club, the compliment paid to us in the speech of Mr. O'Connor, and the honors done us by the presence of Mr. Redmond, the leader of the Irish party in Parliament (applause). My only complaint is that in being more than complimentary Mr. O'Connor has been less than kind, for he has said so much in that generous commendation that it makes it a little embarrassing for me to speak at all. I think I made a great mistake when I was a candidate for office. If I could have stayed at home and kept still and let Mr. O'Connor tell the people what a good man I was, I think I would have been elected by an overwhelming majority. His introduction of me is much more embarrassing than one I received some years ago. It is now twenty-two years since I visited an Irish settlement near the town in which I lived; the chairman of the meeting, whose name was Timothy Flynn, came and told me that he was to preside and asked me to tell him how I wished to be introduced and he would introduce me (laughter). I was then a young lawyer, just beginning practice, and I thought it might be well for the people to know that (laughter), and to know that in case they had need of a lawyer's services I was prepared to render them at a reasonable charge (renewed laughter). So I

told him to say that Mr. W. J. Bryan, an attorney, of Jacksonville, would now address them. It was a modest introduction, I think, but he had my professional card in it. He went over it several times, and just before calling the meeting to order he asked me to repeat it, and I gave it to him again. He called the meeting to order, and instead of introducing me as I had requested, said: "The meeting is called to order, Mr. O'Bryan will now speak" (laughter). I look back to it as the best introduction I ever had, for it raised no false hopes; it threw me on the mercy of my audience, and left me to hoe my own row (hear, hear).

Yes, I have some Irish blood in my veins (applause). Just how much I do not know. I hope it will not be necessary to investigate, for I think I claim more than I could prove (laughter). I have the testimony of my father that we were of Irish extraction, although we do not know when our ancestors landed in America, or from what part of Ireland they came. I know that I am part Irish; my name helps me out in that. I am part English. My father's mother's name helps me out in that. I am part Scotch. My mother's mother's name helps me out in that (laughter). But I am all American (applause). I think my wife not only has some of the blood of each of these countries, but as she goes beyond me in nearly every other respect, so in this, she traces her ancestry to one more race than I do, and mixes a little German with Irish, English, and Scotch (applause). So that you can understand, we have a double reason for appreciating the cordiality of your welcome (applause).

Mention has been made of the fact that some of your countrymen have gone to America. That is true (laughter)—a great many. In fact so many, that when I was in Ireland the other day I could not help noticing the number of American names you have on your buildings (laughter and applause). I saw nearly everywhere names with which I am familiar, on the buildings in Cork, Dublin and Belfast. I may say to you that the Irish who have gone to America have been a great help to our country. I can say without flattery that no people have come amongst us who have shown themselves more capable of efficient participation in every department of

American life (applause). You may go into any section of the country, you may go among the people of any occupation, of any profession, of any calling, and you will find the Irish there (applause). There is no department of work in America in which they have not played a conspicuous part. They have been prominent in the ministry, they have been prominent in statesmanship, they have been prominent at the bar, and in every industrial occupation they have borne their part. It is not strange, therefore, that there should be a sympathy between the people of Ireland and the people of the United States (applause). It is not strange, either, that everything that affects your welfare interests them, that every aspiration you have for the development and elevation and progress of your people finds a warm response in the hearts of the American people (applause), and that is true, as has been so eloquently said, without regard to party, and without regard to creed (applause). Just as in Ireland, O'Connell, the Catholic, and Parnell, the Protestant, found common ground in advocating the rights and interests of Irishmen, so in my country Protestants and Catholics look with friendly eyes upon the Emerald Isle, and wish you great prosperity and the advancement of your people (applause). It is true, also, in politics, for while I think I can say that the majority of the Irish of America belong to the party to which I belong, I must be frank enough to tell you that sympathy with the Irish cause is not monopolized by the democratic party. The republicans as well as the democrats, look with interest and deep concern upon all that appertains to your welfare, and your development, and your ambitions (loud applause). I think I owe it to my political opponents to say that we democrats cannot claim any greater love for you, or greater interest in you, than the republicans can, for I believe this feeling is well-nigh universal (applause).

If I was speaking merely from the political standpoint I might express regret that your people, when they went to America, divide themselves among the various parties; but when, if I find good people in the party opposed to me, instead of discouraging me, it encourages me, because it gives us something to fight for in getting them out of the other party into our own (laughter). If we had all the

good people in our party, and all the bad people in the other party, it might be bad for our country.

Mr. O'Connor has mentioned our country and its position in the world. I am glad that the people of Ireland feel as they do towards America, and I may say to you that in an absence of now a little more than ten months, it has done my heart good to find a friendly feeling towards the United States in all the countries I have visited. Nowhere did I find people expressing anything but interest in the United States, and I want to say this to you—that it has strengthened me in the conviction that the ambition of my nation should be not to make people fear it, but to make people love it (applause). If there be any who take pride in the fact that people outside of their land bow in fear before their flag, I take pride in the fact that we have a flag which makes them turn their eyes towards Heaven and thank God that there is such a flag (applause).

I have been in attendance on the session of the Inter-parliamentary Union; I have been interested in its work, and I have taken great satisfaction in the evident progress of the peace sentiment throughout the world. I am not an old man, though much older than when I labored under the disadvantage of being a boy orator (laughter). I am still a young man, so young that I hope that in the course of nature I may live to see the time when nations, instead of training people to kill each other, will recognize that justice, and justice only, can furnish an enduring foundation for a nation, and will be willing that every question in dispute shall be presented for investigation and deliberation, with the idea of settling all questions by reason and not force (loud applause). I have such faith in this sense of justice that I believe in the course of time every question will be settled right. If I did not have faith in that sense of justice I could not advocate any reform, for it is only to the sense of justice that God placed in the human heart that we can appeal (applause). It is because I believe that that sense of justice is to be found everywhere that I have hope that Ireland's appeal for justice will be a successful appeal, and in the triumph of justice you will be brought nearer and nearer together, not only with those who live in other parts of these islands, but with the people who live in other parts of the

world. I believe what a great French writer said, and what Tolstoy repeated, that the world is entering upon an era in which love and good-will will take the place of avarice and greed and violence (applause). When that time comes and we begin to examine and see to whom the credit belongs, I believe you will find that credit must be divided; that some credit must be given to the people of America, who have been pleading for justice; that some credit must be given to the great leaders of Ireland, who have been pleading for justice; and that some credit—yes, some credit must be given to the great English and great Scotch statesmen who have been pleading for justice (applause).

I am not here to make you a speech. I am simply here to acknowledge the courtesy that you have shown to Mrs. Bryan and myself, and I thank my friend, Mr. O'Connor, for having included Mrs. Bryan in his words of welcome (applause), for she has been my companion in all my labors, and has not only multiplied all my joys, but has robbed all my disappointments and sorrows of their sting (loud applause). It is fit that the kind words spoken of her should be spoken by an Irishman, for I know of no country where woman is held in higher esteem, or shares more fully in all that concerns the family, than in Ireland (loud applause).

Mr. John Redmond, M. P., who was received with prolonged applause, said: Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise with some reluctance to address you, because after the two speeches to which we have listened any words are superfluous, and yet I am not sorry to have an opportunity, in two or three simple words, to bear acknowledgment here, in Mr. Bryan's hearing, to the debt of gratitude that my colleagues of the Irish party, and I myself, owe to men of all parties of America for material aid in our struggles and for sympathy, and the greater the sufferings which we were enduring at home the greater the sympathy that we have inevitably received in America (applause). I myself have had the honor of visiting America within the last few years. Since I have had the honor of being chairman of the Irish parliamentary party in the House of Commons I have gone as Ireland's ambassador to America four or five times, and I have found fervent sympathy and assistance from all classes of the American

people (applause). It is true, as Mr. Bryan has told you, that the majority of our countrymen in America belong to the great political party of which he is the honored chief, but it is true also that sympathy with our country is not confined to that party (applause). I have to say for myself that when I have gone to America as the representative of Ireland, I have been received with equal generosity and sympathy by the chiefs of the democratic party and those of the republican party, and from no man have I received greater sympathy and kindness than from that great man who, at the head of a different party from Mr. Bryan, presides over the destinies of America today (loud applause). The strength of the Irish cause in America lies in the fact that that cause is not linked to any political party, but that it appeals to the broad sympathy of humanity and justice which guides all political parties in the United States (applause). As in the past, so it will be in the future, I have never in America met a single individual American who was the enemy of Irish aspirations (hear, hear). I have never in America come across any man of public opinion, any newspaper of any political creed that was the enemy of Irish aspirations, and I am perfectly convinced that when the moment comes when our aspirations shall triumph, and when Irish prosperity and Irish liberty will exist on Irish soil in its full measure as completely as they have been enjoyed by individual Irishmen wherever they have gone throughout the world, that there will be no quarter of the civilized globe where that result will be received with greater acclamation and universal rejoicing than in that great land (applause). Aye, that great land which has been to us something more than a friend and a sympathizer, that great land which in the words of one of her own poets:

“Whose free latch-string was never yet drawn in
Against the meanest child of Adam’s kin”

(cheers); that great land which has been our refuge and our hope, that great land to which we have looked in our sorrows and our triumphs; that great land which we honor today by honoring Mr. Bryan (applause). America is in the minds and hearts of Irishmen at home all the time. There is not a day the sun sets in the western

ocean that our people don't bless the name of America (applause). We look upon her as our friend in the west; we look upon her as our great source of strength in our contest for justice today (applause); and all of us Irishmen in this room are proud to have the opportunity of doing honor to this great American citizen who is amongst us (applause). Speaking in the name of all my colleagues, the freely-elected representatives of five-sixths of the Irish people at home, I tender to Mr. Bryan, and through him to the American people, the expression of our deep gratitude and of our love and veneration (loud applause).

Mr. and Mrs. Bryan left shortly afterwards for the Continent.

A GREAT GATHERING IN LONDON

The fourteenth conference of the Inter-parliamentary Union was opened at London July 23. Extracts from an Associated Press dispatch follow:

“Adherents of international peace from all the parliaments of Europe, as well as several of those of the western hemisphere, were present, but hardly had the conference opened when, amidst a scene of considerable excitement, Prof. Maxim Kovalevsky, a member of the lower house of the Russian parliament, announced that he and his colleagues, representing, until yesterday, the youngest parliament in the world, would be obliged to withdraw in consequence of the dissolution of the body they were officially appointed to represent.

“There were about 500 delegates present, the American representation being headed by Congressman Richard Bartholdt, while William J. Bryan occupied a seat on the platform.

“Lord Weardale (Sir Philip Stanhope) opened the congress, his preliminary sentences of welcome being specially addressed to the Russian delegates, whereupon the delegates rose in a body and, turning toward the delegation of the late parliament, cheered them to the echo. Lord Weardale also incidentally mentioned President Roosevelt as having been associated with them in the work of peace.

“Premier Campbell-Bannerman, in reply, reminded his hearers that King Edward had always been a great advocate of peace. The British government, he said, was in entire sympathy with the object of the conference, whose work had already aroused among the nations a strong feeling in favor of peace. The world had far too long been nothing less than a huge military camp. The premier especially greeted the members of the Russian parliament present, and also paid a tribute to Emperor Nicholas, who had done so much towards the enhancement of ideas of peace. It could, he thought, be safely asserted that the Russian parliament, although dissolved, was sure to again come into existence.

“Then the premier, in a sudden access of enthusiasm, shouted: ‘*La дума est morte! Vive la дума!*’ (The Russian parliament is dead! Long live the Russian parliament!)

“The delegates rose to their feet and a storm of cheering continued for a couple of minutes.

“In conclusion the premier said he hoped that at the next peace conference at The Hague a general act would be drawn up providing for the submission of all questions of dispute without restriction to The Hague tribunal for the universal good of humanity.

“Count Apponyi, the Hungarian minister of worships, followed, characterizing the premier’s speech as a ‘direct message from King Edward, the latter announcing on his own initiative his complete adhesion to the work of the conference.’

“The count went on to say that the British premier’s appeal for the relief of Europe from the burdens of their military budgets could not be fruitless. The parliaments must follow suit.

“On Count Apponyi’s suggestion a telegram was sent to King Edward as follows:

“‘The inter-parliamentary conference received the king’s adhesion with profound gratitude. May he long be spared to promote the welfare of his people and the cause of international peace.’

“Then came the most dramatic moment of the opening of the session. Professor Kovalevsky rose, but some minutes elapsed before he could gain a hearing, so prolonged was the cheering. Finally, in a voice somewhat

broken with emotion, he announced the necessity for the withdrawal of the members of the Russian parliament. He said:

“We came here in behalf of the Russian nation to partake in the great work of the conference. The Russian people desire peace. The mission of the Russian parliament was to snatch a great people from a regime of violence and substitute for it a sense of reality, liberty and justice. We hoped to take an active part in your work, but our mission comes to a sudden end, as our parliament having been dissolved, we are no longer official representatives. Our sympathy remains. We return home with the determination to continue the great struggle for freedom, liberty and justice.’

“The announcement of the withdrawal of the Russian delegates was met with a storm of protests and shouts of ‘No! No!’ and attempts on every side to induce the Russians to remain, but the latter insisted that they no longer had any official status and must leave England for Russia this evening and return to the ‘battlefield.’

“The Russian delegates then left the hall and the conference then settled down to business. But the incidents attending the dissolution of the Russian parliament were for some time discussed far more eagerly than the business of the conference.

“Lord Weardale, who had in the meantime been elected president, had some difficulty in getting the excited delegates quieted, but ultimately attention became absorbed in the discussion of the reports of the commissions on the American proposals for an international congress and a model arbitration treaty to be submitted to the next conference at The Hague.

“Mr. Bartholdt expressed particular gratification at the solution suggested by the committee appointed at Brussels of this most perplexing problem. The scheme to convert the next Hague conference into a permanent body, which would meet at stated periods, and to create a council for the codification and development of international law, he considered so thoroughly practicable and timely that no well disposed government could object to it.

“In conclusion, Mr. Bartholdt said:

“ ‘What we want is a world organization and a system of law in order to replace arbitrary power in international relations.’

“The former Austrian minister of commerce, von Plener, presented the report of the Brussels’ commission, giving the proposed model treaty of arbitration. He said that while it was impossible to recommend the American proposal in its entirety some of the features were good, notably the means by which it proposes to decrease the cost of arbitration. Herr von Plener moved the adoption of the model treaty as amended by the commission, together with a recommendation urging on the powers that when arbitration is impossible to have recourse, singly or jointly, to the mediation of a third power before declaring war.

“At this juncture William J. Bryan rose, his appearance being heartily cheered.

“ ‘I cannot see,’ he said, ‘that the people have any justification in killing each other before investigating the question involved. There is no question of the sufficient importance of this. I want to move an amendment to Herr von Plener’s recommendation, to be appended to the commission’s report. It goes further than this without going too far. This is my resolution :

“ ‘ ‘If a disagreement should occur between contracting parties, which in the terms of the proposed arbitration treaty need not be submitted to arbitration, they shall, before declaring war or engaging in any hostilities whatever, submit the question to The Hague court, or some other impartial international tribunal, for investigation and report, each party reserving the right to act independently afterwards.’

“ ‘This resolution I put in order that there shall be no more shedding of human blood.’

“Mr. Bryan’s amendment and Herr von Plener’s recommendation were supported by the German delegates.

“Congressman T. E. Burton, of Ohio, vice-president of the American delegation, moved the inclusion in the treaty, that questions relating to consular and diplomatic privileges and the collection of debts shall be submitted to arbitration. This was agreed to and the report of the committee appointed at Brussels to prepare a model

arbitration treaty for presentation to the powers and the second peace conference at The Hague, was adopted.

The meeting also adopted the following proposals:

“*First*—That it would be advantageous to give to The Hague conference a more permanent influence in the organized functions of diplomacy and that the powers should agree in establishing periodical meetings of the conference.

“*Second*—That in naming their representatives to the second Hague conference the powers may usefully give them instructions to ascertain the best means of constituting a consultative commission charged with the duty of preparing the codification and development of international law.

“Objection was raised to a proposal to attempt unification of national laws as utopian and it was eliminated. Prince Hilkoﬀ, a member of the Russian delegation from the Upper House of Parliament, this evening announced his intention to remain and participate in the work of the conference. It appears that Count Benkendorﬀ, the Russian ambassador here, urged the former minister of railways to adopt this course. The prince has been appointed a member of the international council.”

MR. BRYAN'S AMENDMENT

The *Kansas City Journal* (Rep.) complains because Mr. Bryan received some attention at the London peace gathering. The *Journal* says that Mr. Bryan became “the hero of the hour” although he had “never given any time or labor to the great cause and had in all probability never given the proposition a serious thought.”

It is needless to say that Mr. Bryan has given considerable time and labor to the cause of peace, and those who do not know that he has given considerable thought to the particular proposition which was, at his suggestion, adopted by the London gathering, may learn something to their advantage by reference to an article printed hereinafter and entitled, “Long Strides Toward Permanent Peace.”

LONG STRIDES TOWARD PERMANENT PEACE

On the first day of the fourteenth conference of the Inter-parliamentary Union held at London, July 23, the report of the Brussels' commission, giving a proposed model arbitration treaty, was made. This model treaty is to be submitted to the next conference at The Hague. Some of the details of the proceedings of the London meeting will be found on another page of this volume.

Mr. Bryan offered to the model arbitration treaty the following amendment:

“If a disagreement should occur between contracting parties which in the terms of the proposed arbitration treaty need not be submitted to arbitration, they shall, before declaring war or engaging in any hostilities whatever, submit the question to The Hague court or some other impartial international tribunal for investigation and report, each party reserving the right to act independently afterwards.”

On the following day, Mr. Bryan's amendment was unanimously adopted after being changed in phraseology so as to read:

“If a disagreement should arise which is not included in those to be submitted to arbitration the contracting parties shall not resort to any act of hostility before they separately or jointly invite, as the case may necessitate, the formation of the international commission of inquiry or mediation of one or more friendly powers, this requisition to take place, if necessary, in accordance with Article VIII. of The Hague convention providing for a peaceful settlement of international conflicts.”

The Inter-parliamentary Union met in 1904 at the world's fair in St. Louis. At this St. Louis meeting the union called upon the president of the United States to take the initiative in calling a new inter-governmental conference to take up the work left unfinished at The Hague conference in 1899. Under the instructions of the president, the American secretary of state sent, in October, 1904, notes to representatives of other governments in line with the suggestion made at the St. Louis conference. Favorable responses were received from all the powers. The Russian government, while expressing its sympathy with the plan, suggested that the conference

be postponed until after the conclusion of the war with Japan. As soon as peace was declared between Russia and Japan, Russia recommended to the president of the United States that the conference at The Hague, as proposed at the St. Louis convention, be called. It is to this conference that the model arbitration treaty will be submitted.

Mr. Bryan has long urged the adoption of the plan which, by the action of the London gathering, seems certain to be incorporated in an international arbitration agreement.

Writing in *THE COMMONER* of February 17, 1905, protesting against the continuation of the war between Russia and Japan, Mr. Bryan said:

“There has been killing enough on both sides to satisfy that absurd sense of honor which requires bloodshed. There never was a time when the Christian nations were under a more imperative duty to throw their influence on the side of peace, and the United States can well afford to take the lead because our relations with both Russia and Japan are such as to relieve us of any suspicion of selfish interest; and when peace is restored our nation should take the initiative in promoting a system of arbitration so comprehensive that *all differences will be submitted to the arbitration court*, reserving to each nation the right to refuse to accept the finding if it believes that it affects its honor or integrity. Such a system would make war a remote possibility.”

While treaties were pending before the senate during the winter of 1905, and writing in *THE COMMONER* of February 24, 1905, Mr. Bryan said:

“It is possible, however, to provide for the impartial investigation of any international dispute, leaving the final submission to arbitration to be a matter of treaty. The president might be authorized to enter into an agreement *to submit any and every international dispute to The Hague court for investigation*. When the court reports upon the facts and presents the real issue between the parties, then the parties can decide intelligently whether it involves a proper question for arbitration or affects the integrity and honor of either nation. Such an investigation would, in most cases, remove misunderstanding and bring about a reconciliation, and public

opinion would exert a powerful influence in harmonizing any differences which might be found to exist. Such a plan would do more to promote peace than the plan embodied in the treaties submitted by the president. If such a plan had been in operation the Russian-Japanese war might have been prevented. It is quite certain that a preliminary investigation by an impartial board would have prevented most of the international wars of the last half century, and would be still more effective in the future."

In THE COMMONER of September 15, 1905, Mr. Bryan addressed an open letter to President Roosevelt. This letter was entitled, "A Plan for Permanent Peace," and was as follows: "To President Roosevelt: Circumstances placed you in a position where, as chief executive of the nation, you were able to bring Russia and Japan together to effect an honorable peace.

"You performed your duty in a manner creditable to yourself and to your country. You have been hailed as a peacemaker and you realize how the peaceful victory thus achieved by you outshines your military exploits. Why not use the present opportunity to put on foot a movement for the establishment of permanent peace? Last winter you asked for authority to enter into agreements which would be in effect arbitration treaties and the senate (wisely, I believe) refused to surrender the treaty making power. But now if you had been intrusted with the authority asked you would have hesitated to submit a question involving the nation's honor, and it is not always possible to know in advance what questions may be involved. Why not ask congress for authority to *submit all international questions* (when an agreement cannot be reached by parties interested) *to an impartial board for investigation and report.* Investigation will, in nearly every case, remove the cause of complaint and reconcile the parties. Questions which a nation might be unwilling to submit to arbitration in advance could be settled by investigation by an impartial international board.

"It was a glorious thing to end the war between the Russ and the Jap, but it would have been more glorious to have prevented the war and saved the frightful loss of life. The moral prestige which our nation now enjoys

would in all probability enable it to lead a successful peace movement. The congratulations which you have received from the heads of European governments strengthen the chances of success. If the leading nations of the world would enter into an agreement to join in the creation of such a board and pledge themselves to submit all disputes to the board for investigation before declaring war, the danger of war would be reduced to a minimum. Few men have had it in their power to do so much for humanity—will you improve the opportunity?"

In his speech before the American Society at London, July 4, 1906, Mr. Bryan said: "The Christian nations must lead the movement for the promotion of peace, not only because they are enlisted under the banner of the Prince of Peace, but also because they have attained such a degree of intelligence that they can no longer take pride in a purely physical victory. The belief that moral questions can be settled by the shedding of human blood is a relic of barbarism; to doubt the dynamic power of righteousness is infidelity to truth itself. The nation which is unwilling to trust its cause to the universal conscience or which shrinks from the presentation of its claims before a tribunal where reason holds sway, betrays a lack of faith in the soundness of its position. I venture to suggest that the world's peace would be greatly promoted by an agreement among the leading nations that no declaration of war should be made until the submission of the question in controversy to an impartial court for investigation, each nation reserving the right to accept or reject the decision. The preliminary investigation would in almost every instance insure an amicable settlement and the reserved rights would be a sufficient protection against any possible injustice."

The work for peace at London must give great encouragement to those who hope to live to see war become a thing of the past. In the light of the results of the London conference we may say, in the language used by Mr. Bryan some time ago: "We have reason to believe that the light of a better day is dawning, and that we are about to enter upon an era in which concession will assert its supremacy over brute force, and the crown of victory be awarded, not to the nation that has the largest army or the strongest navy, but to the nation that sets

the best example and contributes the most to the welfare of the world. When Elijah was fleeing from the wrath of wicked Jezebel and believed all the prophets to have been slain, the Lord commanded him to stand upon the mountain, and as he stood there, a mighty wind swept by him and rent the rocks asunder, but God was not in the wind; and after the wind came an earthquake, but God was not in the earthquake; and after the earthquake, a fire, but God was not in the fire; and after the fire, a still, small voice, and it was the voice of God. And so, today, throughout the world, an increasing number, standing upon the heights, are coming to believe that God is not in the ironclads that sweep the ocean with their guns, that God is not in the armies that shake the earth with their tread, or in the fire of musketry, but in the still, small voice of justice that issues from tribunals like that instituted at The Hague."

MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH BEFORE THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. Bryan's speech before the Inter-parliamentary Union at London, July 26, 1906, was as follows:

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Inter-parliamentary Union: I regret that I cannot speak to you in the language which is usually employed in this body, but I know only one language, the language of my own country, and you will pardon me if I use that. I desire in the first place to express my appreciation of the courtesy shown me by Lord Weardale, our president, and by Baron von Plener, the chairman of the committee which framed the model treaty. The latter has framed this substitute embodying both of the ideas (investigation and mediation) which were presented yesterday. I recognize the superior wisdom and the greater experience of this learned committee which has united the two propositions, and I thank this body also for the opportunity to say just a word in defense of my part of the resolution. I cannot say that it is a new idea, for since it was presented yesterday I have learned that the same idea in substance was presented last year at Brussels by Mr.

Bartholdt, of my own country, who has been so conspicuous in his efforts to promote peace, and I am very glad that I can follow in his footsteps in the urging of this amendment. I may add also that it is in line with the suggestion made by the honorable prime minister of Great Britain, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, in that memorable and epoch-making speech of yesterday, in that speech which contained several sentences any one of which would have justified the assembling of this Inter-parliamentary Union—any one of which would have compensated us all for coming here. In that splendid speech he expressed the hope that the scope of arbitration treaties might be enlarged. He said:

“Gentlemen, I fervently trust that before long the principle of arbitration may win such confidence as to justify its extension to a wider field of international differences. We have already seen how questions arousing passion and excitement have attained a solution, not necessarily by means of arbitration in the strict sense of the word, but by referring them to such a tribunal as that which reported on the North Sea incident; and I would ask you whether it may not be worth while carefully to consider, before the next congress meets at The Hague, the various forms in which differences might be submitted, with a view to opening the door as wide as possible to every means which might in any degree contribute to moderate or compose such differences.”

This amendment is in harmony with this suggestion. The resolution is in the form of a postscript to the treaty, but like the postscripts to some letters it contains a very vital subject—in fact, I am not sure but the postscript in this case is as important as the letter itself, for it deals with those questions which have defied arbitration. Certain questions affecting the honor or integrity of a nation are generally thought to be outside of the jurisdiction of a court of arbitration, and these are the questions which have given trouble. Passion is not often aroused by questions that do not affect a nation's integrity or honor, but for fear these questions may arise arbitration is not always employed where it might be. The first advantage, then, of this resolution is that it secures an investigation of the facts, and if you can but separate the facts from the question of honor, the chances are 100 to 1 that you

can settle both the fact and the question of honor without war. There is, therefore, a great advantage in an investigation that brings out the facts, for disputed facts between nations, as between friends, are the cause of most disagreements.

The second advantage of this investigation is that it gives time for calm consideration. That has already been well presented by the gentleman who has preceded me, Baron von Plener. I need not say to you that man excited is a very different animal from man calm, and that questions ought to be settled, not by passion, but by deliberation. If this resolution would do nothing else but give time for reflection and deliberation, there would be sufficient reason for its adoption. If we can but stay the hand of war until conscience can assert itself, war will be made more remote. When men are mad they swagger around and tell what they can do; when they are calm they consider what they ought to do.

The third advantage of this investigation is that it gives opportunity to mobilize public opinion for the compelling of a peaceful settlement and that is an advantage not to be overlooked. Public opinion is coming to be more and more a power in the world. One of the greatest statesmen of my country—Thomas Jefferson, and if it would not offend I would say I believe him to be the greatest statesman the world has produced—said that if he had to choose between a government without newspapers and newspapers without a government, he would rather risk the newspapers without a government. You may call it an extravagant statement, and yet it presents an idea, and that idea is that public opinion is a controlling force. I am glad that the time is coming when public opinion is to be more and more powerful; glad that the time is coming when the moral sentiment of one nation will influence the action of other nations; glad that the time is coming when the world will realize that a war between two nations affects others than the nations involved; glad that the time is coming when the world will insist that nations settle their differences by some peaceful means. If time is given for the marshaling of the force of public opinion peace will be promoted. This resolution is presented, therefore, for the reasons that it gives an opportunity to investigate the facts, and

to separate them from the question of honor, that it gives time for the calming of passion, and that it gives time for the formation of a controlling public sentiment.

I will not disguise the fact that I consider this resolution a long step in the direction of peace, nor will I disguise the fact that I am here because I want this Inter-parliamentary Union to take just as long a step as possible in the direction of universal peace. We meet in a famous hall, and looking down upon us from these walls are pictures that illustrate not only the glory that is to be won in war, but the horrors that follow war. There is a picture of one of the great figures in English history (pointing to the fresco by Maclise of the death of Nelson). Lord Nelson is represented as dying, and around him are the mangled forms of others. I understand that war brings out certain virtues. I am aware that it gives opportunity for the display of great patriotism; I am aware that the example of men who give their lives for their country is inspiring; but I venture to say there is as much inspiration in a noble life as there is in a heroic death, and I trust that one of the results of this Inter-parliamentary Union will be to emphasize the doctrine that a life devoted to the public, and ever flowing, like a spring, with good, exerts an influence upon the human race and upon the destiny of the world as great as any death in war. And if you will permit me to mention one whose career I watched with interest and whose name I revere, I will say that, in my humble judgment, the sixty-four years of spotless public service of William Ewart Gladstone will, in years to come, be regarded as as rich an ornament to the history of this nation as the life of any man who poured out his blood upon a battlefield.

All movements in the interest of peace have back of them the idea of brotherhood. If peace is to come in this world, it will come because people more and more clearly recognize the indissoluble tie that binds each human being to every other. If we are to build permanent peace it must be on the foundation of the brotherhood of men. A poet has described how in the civil war that divided our country into two hostile camps a generation ago—in one battle a soldier in one line thrust his bayonet through a soldier in the opposing line, and how, when he stooped

to draw it out, he recognized in the face of the fallen one, the face of his brother. And then the poet describes the feeling of horror that overwhelmed the survivor when he realized that he had taken the life of one who was the child of the same parents and the companion of his boyhood. It was a pathetic story, but is it too much to hope that as years go by we will begin to understand that the whole human race is but a larger family?

It is not too much to hope that as years go by human sympathy will expand until this feeling of unity will not be confined to the members of a family or to the members of a clan or of a community or state, but shall be world-wide. It is not too much to hope that we, in this assembly, possibly by this resolution, may hasten the day when we shall feel so appalled at the thought of the taking of any human life that we shall strive to raise all questions to a level where the settlement will be by reason and not by force.

At the conclusion of Mr. Bryan's speech, the amended resolution was unanimously adopted. It read as follows:

"If a disagreement should arise between the contracting parties which is not one to be submitted to arbitration, they shall not resort to any act of hostility before they, separately or jointly, invite, as the case may necessitate, the formation of an international commission of inquiry or the mediation of one or more friendly powers. This requisition will take place, if necessary, according to Article VIII. of The Hague convention for the peaceful settlement of international conflicts."

From an editorial which will be found on another page and entitled, "Long Strides Toward Permanent Peace," it will be seen that Mr. Bryan proposed *the investigation of all disputes* in February, 1905, several months before Mr. Bartholdt introduced his resolution in Brussels.

EUROPEAN NEWSPAPERS AND THE PEACE AMENDMENT

Extracts from European newspaper comments on Mr. Bryan's address before the Inter-parliamentary Union at London follow:

The *Westminster Gazette*, in its issue of July 25, says: "We need not say that we have the utmost sympathy with

the sentiments expressed by Mr. Bryan in his speech to the inter-parliamentary conference yesterday. A great step would, indeed, be taken towards securing the peace of the world if it could be laid down as a general principle that nations in controversy with each other should not have recourse to hostilities before having jointly or separately demanded an international commission of inquiry or the mediation of a friendly power. That, as Mr. Bryan said, would at least give a delay in which passions might cool and the public opinion favorable to peace be mobilized. Nor is it altogether a hopeless ideal, as our own experience in the North sea incident has shown. But the practical difficulty is that, while the peace parties are concentrating on this proposal for delay, the military experts are more and more agreeing together on the immense advantages of snatching the initiative in case of war. Attacks before a declaration of war are now the theme of military and naval essayists, and, unless we can interpose some definite veto of international law, the tendency will be to rush rather than delay hostilities, and the power which hangs back at the critical moment, in order to invoke arbitration, may be exposed to a heavy penalty for its virtue. By all means let the peace parties continue to preach patience and conciliation, but let them also as practical men take note of this contrary drift of military and naval opinion, and see whether it cannot be checked by international law."

The *Evening Standard* and *St. James Gazette* of July 25, says: "Mr. Bryan's speech made a great impression on the inter-parliamentary conference. It was not only eloquent, but it shadowed forth a high ideal, and speeches with that dual attribute are sure to touch the imaginations of men. In stating the case for arbitration among nations from the loftiest point of view—stating it, moreover, in silvern speech—Mr. Bryan aroused in his hearers a momentary enthusiasm for the brotherhood of man and the cause of universal peace. Seeing that that was the effect of his words, we regret his audience was limited, for the cause is one which can well be served by inspiring eloquence, and until the inspiration of peace touches the heart of mankind the progress of arbitration will be hampered."

The *Standard* of July 25 says: " 'If we are to build permanent peace it must be on the brotherhood of man!' These words were addressed yesterday to the peace congress meeting at the Royal Gallery, House of Lords, by one of America's political gladiators, Mr. W. J. Bryan, who has already fought one strenuous contest for the chief magistracy of the North American republic, and who, if rumor speaks truly, will wage another in a couple of years' time. It was known that the famous orator would address the congress shortly after its meeting, and as a result the hall was well filled at the outset with an audience on the tiptoe of expectation. A good speech was expected, and those who listened were not disappointed. Mr. Bryan's fine voice rang like a silver clarion through the spacious gallery—music to the ear, even of those who did not understand the language in which he was speaking—whilst his imposing presence captivated the eyes. The audience was spellbound when Mr. Bryan mounted the tribune, nor was the effect dissipated as his words went out. There was something in the melodious voice which brought home to old British parliamentarians a recollection of the mellifluous accents of John Bright."

The *Daily Mail* of July 25 says: "Although French is the official language of the Inter-parliamentary Union, Mr. W. J. Bryan used his native tongue yesterday in the eloquent and characteristic speech in which he advocated an appeal before resort to war to impartial arbitration on any issue, whether it fell within the competence of an arbitration treaty or not."

The London correspondent for the Paris edition of the *New York Herald* says: "A great speech on the benefits of arbitration was delivered yesterday at the Westminster conference of the representatives of the world's parliaments by Mr. William Jennings Bryan. 'The silver-tongued orator,' says the *Standard*, 'was in his best form, his eloquence completely taking the assembly by storm. At the close of his speech the delegates cheered for fully a minute, and some of them were so deeply moved they rushed forward and shook Mr. Bryan by the hand. The speech was made in reply to the announcement of Baron von Plener, of Austria, that an amendment which Mr. Bryan had put forward was to be com-

bined with the original resolution. The council's proposal provided only for the mediation in a dispute of friendly powers, but Mr. Bryan wished to lay it down, that contracting parties should agree to a reference to a commission of inquiry. The resolution as altered and adopted read: 'If a disagreement should arise between the contracting parties, which is not one to be submitted to arbitration, they shall not resort to any act of hostility before they separately or jointly invite, as the case may necessitate, the formation of an international commission of inquiry or the mediation of one or more friendly powers. This requisition will take place, if necessary, according to Article VIII. of The Hague convention for the peaceful settlement of international affairs.' When Mr. Bryan rose to speak he had a great reception."

The Paris edition of the *New York Herald* makes the following editorial reference: "Mr. Bryan's reputation as a public speaker, already well known in the United States, was enhanced internationally yesterday by an eloquent address in London, delivered before the conference of the Inter-parliamentary Union. His subject, broadly speaking, was arbitration versus armament, and his handling of it caused great enthusiasm among his hearers. A report of Mr. Bryan's speech appears on the first page."

The *London Daily Express* for July 25 says: "The leading feature of yesterday's sitting of the inter-parliamentary conference at Westminster was a speech by the silver-tongued orator of America, Mr. W. J. Bryan. The stately Victoria Hall was crowded early with delegates from all countries. Even a representative from Japan came to give greeting to his brother legislators. The delegates entered in groups, chattering and gesticulating. The attendants were kept busy. All the visitors are not accustomed to English habits. 'Votre chapeau,' said one attendant to a portly gentleman who was looking absently around him. The stranger did not grasp the meaning till the attendant shot a hand out towards the hat perched jauntily on the offending deputy's head. Then it was promptly removed. They walked around, studied the great picture on the wall that faced the canopy, and talked on regardless of the chairman's opening speech.

Suddenly an awed silence fell upon the assembly. A portly, impressive man was on his feet. It was the man who may sometime be America's president. It was a peace speech—terse, rapid, epigrammatical. He pleaded for arbitration in questions generally considered out of the sphere of arbitration. The special advantages of arbitration were, he said, that facts could be separated from questions of honor; that it gave time for calm consideration; that it permitted the 'mobilization of public opinion in favor of peace.' "

The *London Times* of July 25 prints a long editorial from which this extract is taken: "Mr. Bryan's eloquent speech to the conference yesterday should do much to rekindle interest in these issues. The well-known American orator covered a wide range—a wider range, indeed, than may seem to most people to be within practical bounds today; but the force and fire of such an appeal are not lost because they transcend the actual. It was well that the conference should set about their labors with such inspiring words ringing in their ears, and it was appropriate enough, at this moment, that those words should have fallen from an American speaker."

From the news report of the *London Times*, the following is taken: "Great interest was taken in the subject as it was known that Mr. Bryan, whose fame as an orator is world-wide, would speak in support of his amendment. Before the conference met an arrangement was come to whereby the resolution and the amendment were combined. Mr. Bryan, whose appearance at the tribune was greeted with loud cheers, spoke in support of the resolution in its altered form. He was heard with the greatest attention, and was frequently applauded as he made his points in favor of the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. His speech was the outstanding feature of the day's deliberations, but the rest of the proceedings was followed with marked attention and interest by the delegates."

From the *London Times*' news report of the luncheon given in Westminster Hall, at which luncheon Mr. Bryan spoke, the following is taken:

"The lord chancellor, in proposing 'The Inter-parliamentary Union,' said that he esteemed it a conspicuous

honor that he had been privileged to take the chair on that occasion, when so many had come from the uttermost parts of the earth in order to attend that conference. There were assembled there men of many languages, many creeds and many nations interested in subjects that stirred human nature to its depths; but he thought that already, short as the time had been, they had discovered that they did possess common ideals and common purposes. The chief among these was a craving for peace (cheers) and he thought that there could be no more proper place for the expression of that wish than England, where everyone, from the sovereign on the throne to the poorest person in His Majesty's dominions, had but one feeling and one aspiration. He believed that it was not sufficient to wish for peace; it was necessary to aim at methods by which it could be obtained. The first of those methods was by arbitration. (Cheers.) He would express his sympathy with the purposes expressed by Mr. Bryan in regard to arbitration. If time and deliberation could only be secured, the dangers of war would almost disappear, and he was looking forward to the time when those who had in obscurity struggled for the cause would stand in the opinion of mankind alongside the greatest heroes who had secured victories in time of war. (Cheers.) The other method was diminution of armaments, as to which he would only say that an ounce of example was worth a ton of precept, and he trusted that some nation might soon show an example in that respect. (Cheers.) He concluded by expressing his cordial and hearty welcome to those who had done them the honor of coming there that day and by proposing the toast, coupled with the distinguished names of Count Apponyi, a famous Hungarian statesman, the Hon. W. J. Bryan, one of the greatest orators and public men in the United States of America, and Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, than whom no one had rendered more service to the cause of international good-will. (Loud cheers.)"

Mr. President, My Lords, Ladies and Gentlemen:—Permit me, first, to thank the committee on arrangements for the honor it has done my country in giving it a place on the programme, and, next, I must express my appreciation of the compliment paid me personally in putting my name so near the name of the lord high chancellor,

Count Apponyi, and Baron d'Estournelles de Constant. The choice of the lord high chancellor as the presiding officer of this occasion was an appropriate one, for while he is one of the chieftains of a Scottish clan which has captured nearly all the offices worth having in Great Britain, he has won his place fairly and honorably in a forum where victory comes not by sword or prowess in arms, but by the possession of great virtues of the head and heart. I acknowledge my indebtedness to him also for his commendations of the resolution adopted at this morning's session of the Inter-parliamentary Union, providing for the submission of all international disputes to a court of inquiry. It is gratifying to appear at the same board with so distinguished a representative of Hungary as Count Albert Apponyi, who not only speaks for a country which, in length of its constitutional history, stands second to England, but is able to address an audience in almost any language, and speaks so earnestly that those who listen can follow his thought even when they cannot understand his words.

Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, who follows me, also lends honor to this occasion, for he has just won a victory in the passage of his resolution in favor of the limitation of armaments, a resolution to which he has devoted a great deal of time and effort. He is farsighted enough to know that unless some limitation can by agreement be placed upon the building of ships, the nations are likely to break themselves down in an effort to outdo each other in preparation for war. I do not know how I can better emphasize both the folly and the natural result of this rivalry than by an illustration.

Three citizens dwell happily on the shores of a lake. A, in an evil hour, yields to the entreaties of a shipbuilder and orders a war vessel in anticipation of possible attack from either B or C. His vessel is no sooner anchored in front of his land than B takes alarm and orders two ships, much to the satisfaction of the shipbuilder. C then requires three ships, and by the time his are completed, A is ready to admit that he must increase his fleet, and so each ship built by one is made the excuse for the building of other ships by the other. As in this case, there is no limit to the rivalry except in the impoverishment of all, so in nations there is no limit to the rivalry

of shipbuilding except the ability of the people to bear the burdens placed upon them. It is wise, therefore, that the nations agree to limit their war expenses; but I hope that even before this limitation can be agreed upon some nation will have the courage to step forth and set an example by decreasing its armaments without waiting for the action of the others, trusting to the people who, relieved of burdens in time of peace, will be better prepared in any possible exigency, and who will have more reasons to fight for their country when their country shows more regard for their welfare.

While we who are assembled here as members of the Inter-parliamentary Union speak different languages, we are drawn together by the fact that our hearts are in agreement upon a great subject. I fear the plutocracy of wealth; I respect the aristocracy of learning, but I thank God for the democracy of the heart. Just in proportion as our deliberations involve great moral questions we are able to understand each other and to co-operate, even though we live under different forms of government and must address each other through interpreters.

I desire, in the brief time that I have at my disposal, to present but three thoughts for your consideration. First, the worth of moral courage; second, the value of a human life, and, third, the opportunities afforded by this age for great work.

The Inter-parliamentary Union will not perform its full duty unless it lends its influence to the creation of a public opinion which will place as high an estimate upon moral courage as has been placed upon physical courage. Man shares physical courage with the animals, but in the possession of moral courage he stands alone in God's universe. The man who, encouraged by fife and drum and the cheers of his comrades, rushes to certain death upon the battlefield, however worthy of our admiration, is no more courageous than the man who stands unflinchingly for the right in the presence of ridicule and abuse. We have the Bible authority for the statement that "he who ruleth his own spirit is greater than he that taketh a city."

What is the value of a human life? Who will measure the world's loss by the death of those who have fallen in

war? A few days ago I visited the birthplace of the bard of Avon, and as I viewed the scenes upon which he looked in childhood, I asked myself, "what the world would have lost had Shakespeare been a soldier boy and in the enthusiasm of his youth lost his life on the field?" I also visited the early homes of Burns; who can estimate the loss if his voice had been silenced by a cannon ball and the world been deprived of his immortal verse! And so we might ask of Moore and Tennyson; so we might ask of hundreds of poets, divines, philosophers, scientists, statesmen and philanthropists. Against such advantages as may be attributed to war we must place these losses, and who will say that the gain overcomes the dreadful cost? Out upon the doctrine that the world would degenerate unless we had a blood-letting in each generation! I could not worship a God who would make my development depend upon the taking of another's life, or who would make slaughter a condition precedent to the advancement of the race.

Just a word more: Some speak in melancholy tones of the present and regard as Golden Ages the ages that have gone; but if I had my choice of all the generations in which to live, I would choose the present, for at no time in the recorded history of the human race has there been greater opportunity for usefulness. Steam has made communication easy between the remotest corners of the earth, and electricity has made it possible for us to know at once everywhere what has been done anywhere. It is easier today for one to be a benefactor to the whole world than it was a century ago to be helpful to the people of his own valley. At such a time as this the Inter-parliamentary Union has every stimulus for great effort, and I regard it a privilege to be permitted to associate with those who, on this occasion, are gathered from many nations to advance the cause of peace and good-will.

THE HOME COMING OF MR. BRYAN

"NEBRASKA HOME FOLKS"

On Friday, August 24, a special train bearing upwards of one hundred Nebraskans left Omaha for New York

to welcome Mr. Bryan upon his return from his foreign tour. From the start the excursionists were known as "Nebraska Home Folks," and they were everywhere greeted cordially and enthusiastically. The party was headed by Mayor Frank W. Brown, of Lincoln, and Mayor James C. Dahlman, of Omaha; Mayors Max Uhlig, of Holdrege; F. D. Hunker, of West Point; Henry Gering, of Plattsmouth; William Burke, of Friend, and R. E. Watzke, Humboldt, and it was given out vociferously that the Nebraskans were going to be the first to greet their fellow Nebraskan upon his arrival within sight of American shores. This determination was carried out to the letter. Mayor Dahlman, who acquired the sobriquet of "the cowboy mayor" by reason of long residence in the cattle country during the early history of Nebraska, said that Mr. Bryan would first have to come aboard the tug occupied by the Nebraskans "if I have to rope him and pull him aboard." Because of their energy and western push, the Nebraskans drew alongside the Princess Irene in a chartered tug ahead of all other vessels, save the yacht "Illini" occupied by Mayor Brown and party, and in accordance with his declaration, Mayor Dahlman swung his lasso and the loop settled down over the shoulders of Mr. Bryan. It was not necessary, however, to drag Mr. Bryan aboard the tug. He climbed down the ladder to the Nebraskans' tug and was enthusiastically greeted by the "home folks."

"The sight of you is good for sore eyes," exclaimed Mr. Bryan as he shook the hands of his near neighbors and acknowledged their friendly greetings.

From the tug Mr. Bryan went aboard the private yacht, "Illini," owned by Edward F. Goltra, of St. Louis, where he was received by other friends. After several hours on the "Illini" Mr. Bryan was taken to Lewis F. Nixon's home on Staten Island, where he was entertained at luncheon, then returning to the "Illini" he remained until Thursday afternoon, when he landed and was immediately deep in the monster reception prepared for him.

Late Wednesday forenoon, August 29, the "Princess Irene," carrying the Bryan party, was sighted off Fire Island and the notice was immediately followed by a race down the harbor to be the first alongside the big steamship. It required two tugs to carry the Nebraska party

and the race between them for the honor of being first alongside the "Princess Irene" was an exciting one. As the tugs neared the steamship the "home folks" caught sight of Mr. and Mrs. Bryan leaning over the rail, and instantly the cheering began. Hats and handkerchiefs were waved, and Mr. and Mrs. Bryan, their faces wreathed in smiles, responded from the steamer. Huge boxes of flowers were immediately sent over the steamer's side for Mrs. Bryan, and as soon as the planks could be lowered both Mr. and Mrs. Bryan went aboard the first tug. It was raining, but this fact did not lessen the pleasure felt by the "home folks" nor those whom they had traveled 1,600 miles to welcome. As soon as those aboard the first tug had greeted the guests they were handed aboard the second tug and the welcoming scenes were repeated. In response to loud demands for a speech Mr. Bryan said:

"The United States is the best country in the world. Nebraska is the best state in the country, and Lincoln is the best city in Nebraska, and Fairview is better than Lincoln. I was coming to Lincoln to see you, but I find that you have come to New York to see me. I don't know how to tell you how glad I am to see you, and to be home again."

In response to inquiries as to how he felt, Mr. Bryan replied:

"If anyone can express himself in words better than I, I'll give him a month's wages to express how good I feel."

"We are here on a special train," said a member of the party, "and want you to go back home with us. We'll wait until you are ready. Will you come with us?"

When Mr. Bryan said he would be delighted to do so the cheering broke out again. Mr. and Mrs. Bryan then returned aboard the "Princess Irene" to await the usual quarantine inspection.

THE ARRIVAL IN NEW YORK CITY

The following are extracts from the Associated Press report of Mr. Bryan's arrival in New York City:

Greeted by nearly every prominent democrat in the country and accompanied by them, Mr. Bryan was driven from the yacht landing at the Battery to the Victoria hotel. He was constantly cheered by those on the crowded sidewalks. Once at the hotel he was fairly mobbed by thousands of his admirers, was called upon for an impromptu speech and then shook hands for more than an hour with an apparently never ending line of citizens.

He dined with his family and friends and was then driven in an automobile to Madison Square Garden, where his welcome home was made complete in a series of remarkable demonstrations. The Garden meeting was presided over by Mayor Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland. There were brief addresses by Governor Joseph W. Folk, of Missouri, Augustus Thomas, the playwright; Harry W. Walker of the Commercial Travelers' Anti-Trust League, under whose auspices the reception was given, and Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Bryan's entry into New York this afternoon was a series of ovations, beginning with his landing at the Battery at 4 o'clock and reaching a climax when he arrived at the Victoria hotel, Twenty-seventh and Broadway, an hour and fifteen minutes later. Here the home-coming Nebraskan was cheered by the thousands of persons who had gathered outside the hotel entrances and the hundreds who had forced their way into the corridors. Finally an entrance was effected by the police and Mr. Bryan reached the lobby stairs. He was halted and called upon for a speech, and as the crowd surged about him, cheering lustily all the while, Mr. Bryan lifted his hand and secured silence.

"Ladies and gentlemen," he began, "I believe that later this evening I am to make a speech and you must not expect one now. When a man is in difficulty he has a right to call upon his friends for assistance. I am in difficulty now. I am trying to get home, but I have been traveling so much of late that for the life of me I can hardly tell where home is."

"In Washington," called an enthusiastic auditor.

"The White House," shouted another. "And we're going to put you there," yelled a third.

Then everyone cheered. Mr. Bryan smiled indulgently.

"I thought home was in Nebraska," he continued. "Only until 1908." shouted the crowd.

"Some said it was in Missouri," added Mr. Bryan, amid laughter. "I've about come to the conclusion that if I find friends like this everywhere I don't care where home is."

Mr. Bryan shook hands with a few personal friends. This was the signal for a general rush and the Nebraskan was almost swept out of the Twenty-seventh street entrance of the hotel before the police could stem the tide. Finally order was established and the impromptu reception proceeded.

Several thousand persons passed in line and Mr. Bryan shook hands with all. Distinguished men of the democratic party, visiting governors, United States senators and representatives, national committeemen and legislators, mingled with the New Yorkers.

MADISON SQUARE GARDEN MEETING

Following are extracts from the Associated Press report of the Madison Square Garden meeting:

The doors of Madison Square Garden were opened at 5:30 o'clock and by that time hundreds of ticket holders were clamoring for admittance. Police lines had been formed for three blocks from all entrances. In this way the early comers were all handled. The immense auditorium, with its tiers of balconies and galleries, rising to the great glass roof began to fill up so quickly that the ushers and policemen had difficulty in adhering to the seating arrangements. It was a gay-spirited, big-natured audience which had a cheer for everyone. There were calls and counter-calls from the various state delegations. "The Nebraska Bryans' home folks" arrived in a body and were given seats just back of the speakers' stand, at the Twenty-seventh street side of the Garden.

Before the meeting was called to order a band played merrily. When the first strains of "Dixie" were sounded the thousands of Bryan welcomers were on their feet

in an instant and the cheers completely drowned the band.

As each notable democrat entered the hall and was recognized his name was called and the cheering was renewed. Twelve thousand persons, many of them women, were seated by 7 o'clock and an hour later not a vacant seat was to be seen. Hundreds of policemen and fifty firemen were on duty in the giant structure.

At 8 o'clock when Mr. Bryan had not yet arrived Harry W. Walker, on behalf of the Commercial Travelers' Anti-Trust League, called the assemblage to order. He said:

SPEECH OF HARRY W. WALKER

Ladies and Gentlemen, Fellow-Citizens from all over this broad land: On behalf of the Commercial Travelers' Anti-Trust League, I have the great honor of asking this home-coming welcome to be in order. The league welcomes back Mr. Bryan, fresh from his triumphs in the old world, as the most distinguished and best beloved private citizen on earth.

It is my great pleasure to introduce to you the chairman of the reception committee, Missouri's Governor, Hon. Joseph W. Folk.

SPEECH OF GOVERNOR JOSEPH W. FOLK

What we say here may count for little; our words may be of only passing moment and soon forgotten. But those ideals that bring us here will live when those present at this assembly shall have passed away. We come not of ourselves alone to welcome home the distinguished American in whose honor we gather, but to voice the love and faith of millions in the great leader who has again set foot upon his native land—millions who love him because his hands are clean, his heart is pure, and his soul has not been touched nor tainted with the scars of unearned gold. Nor in him alone do we place our trust, nor in aught that is human, but rather in those eternal truths which he has loved and served so well.

We are on the threshold of the greatest political awakening this nation has ever known. It marks the beginning of a new age. The next few years will be distinguished as the time in which industrial problems

are solved, the reign of the special privilege brought to an end, and the doctrine of equal rights fixed in national policies and in the conscience of mankind. Things are not tolerated for a moment now that not long ago were submitted to in silence. Only a few years past bribery was considered merely conventional. Legislative halls were made dens of thieves, and the touch of the unclean dollar of privilege was over all. Dishonesty in public life was either unnoticed, or regarded with despair. Then a dormant public conscience was aroused to the necessity of stamping out the offense that strikes at the heart of free government, and of making the government representative in fact as well as in name.

The energies of this public conscience have been extended from the domain of the public wrong-doer to that of the private wrong-doer, and are probing into the workings of rascals of every kind. The insurance investigations have sent forth their message, the rebate revelations have been seen and heard, and innumerable grand juries have held up graft and fraud to the public view. The curtains have been drawn aside, and revealed to the startled gaze of the people the anarchy of corruption and greed in their bacchanal of avarice.

This awakening that has resulted from the revelations of wrongs is the spirit of true patriotism. This word had almost ceased to have meaning, and was often used as synonymous with war. We are now learning that there may be as much patriotism in giving one's time to the betterment of civic conditions and in getting good men into office, as in baring one's breast to the bullets of a public enemy in time of war. The highest patriotism is the patriotism of service. The people are commencing to appreciate the fact that the government of city, state and nation belongs to them, and that they can take the government into their own hands whenever they wish. No government was ever better than the people made it, or worse than they suffered it to become. The public life of a nation is but a reflection of its private life. This government is no better than any other, except as the virtue and patriotism of the people make it so. The people are beginning to understand that when they undertook to be their own kings they assumed the responsibilities as well as the privileges of sovereignty. This

awakening will go on, for while reforms sometimes die, revolutions never go backwards, and this is a revolution that is being wrought in the hearts of men.

This movement against wrongs is not a crusade against wealth. Wealth in itself is a blessing; the abuse of wealth is a curse. Wealth gained by honest industry is commendable. The poverty of indolence is contemptible. This government does not rest upon the idle rich nor the idle poor, but upon the industry and patriotism of the middle classes. There can be no objection to honest riches, but there is objection to the crimes and privileges out of which tainted riches grow. There is no disposition to injure corporations that obey the law, but the demand is that corporations, even the greatest, obey the law just like anyone else. Special interests should be made to respect the law regulating their conduct, as they ask others to respect the law protecting their property. The need is not so much for new laws as to enforce those laws we have. There has been too much of making of laws to please all of the people, and too little of enforcement of those laws to please special interests.

The regenerated conscience of the people has been assailing these abuses one by one and has now commenced to attack the deeper evil of privilege. Graft is a privilege which is exercised either against the law, or one which the law itself may give. No one ever heard of a legislator being bribed to give equal rights to all the people. It is always for the purpose of obtaining privileges for the few. Graft cannot be fully done away with until special privileges are exterminated and the doctrine of equal rights becomes the standard for governmental action. It matters not whether this privilege be in the form of a tariff so arranged as to foster monopoly, or a trust to control the price of the necessities of life, or rebates to favored shippers. No protection for monopoly is the battle-cry of the newborn patriotism. As monopoly is founded on privilege, without privilege monopoly must fall. The platform of privileges for the few is opposed by the platform of privileges for none. The doctrine of protection for monopoly as against the people is opposed by the doctrine of protection for the people as against monopoly.

The light is breaking, and good men and true will say

let there be light, and yet more light, that we may escape the snares set for our feet and walk in safety along the highway of a larger freedom to a more equalized national existence and higher life.

Let us in this crisis be neither radical nor conservative. Rather let us be conservative in charging wrongdoing, lest injustice be caused in charging where it does not exist, but once sure of the evil let us be radical in its extermination. Let us have neither the conservatism of stagnation nor the radicalism of indiscriminate destruction. We want progress along right lines. States and nations, like men, should never be satisfied, but strive for higher development.

In this epoch so important to American liberty, we ask the people to set up no new gods; we ask them to follow no new paths which may lead into the quicksands of dishonor or despair. Our surest and safest guide is still the old maxim, that there shall be "equal rights to all, special privileges to none." With this axiom as our chart, we cannot lose our course; with this rule for our guidance, the infamies of privilege in every form will be destroyed, and unto all men there will be restored the equal right that belongs to each; the fair and equal opportunity of each and every man to live and labor upon the earth which God has given to all, and to enjoy, untrammled and unrestricted, the gains of honest toil.

The gospel of equal rights sounds the death knell of privilege, and means the uprooting of monopoly throughout the land. This gospel teaches that it is more important that all of the people be prosperous than that a few be very rich; that it is better that all of the people should have all of the wealth than that all of the wealth should be in the hands of a few of the people. The other republics that have lived and died during the flight of time through the ages have been wrecked upon the rock of privilege. But the hope for the perpetuity of this government was never brighter than it is today, because the people are awakened to the dangers ahead. As long as the people are aroused there will be only safety lights for popular government.

The ideal republic is one of charity for all, of brotherhood among men, of equal rights for all mankind. We may not achieve the ideal at any time soon, but we can

strive for it with the assurance that this endeavor will lead us up the heights of attainment, and then face to face with the ideal and the true.

Governor Folk then introduced Augustus Thomas, who delivered the address of welcome:

SPEECH OF AUGUSTUS THOMAS

The Anti-Trust League of the Commercial Travelers of the United States, joined by the representative concourse of your countrymen and theirs, welcome you home. The commercial travelers are to the nation its quick personal media of communication. These members assume to voice this welcome by the warrant of their early discovery that such welcome was the nation's wish. And the nation will hold them answerable that the greeting be in no uncertain tone. The League and its associates, therefore, know that the sentiments to be uttered demand a rude intimacy that shall transcend the reserve of the private meeting. Their appreciation is meant not to put you in the pleasant embarrassment of self-satisfaction, but to inform you of that high level of personal conduct which they believe you have reached, and to fix upon you the obligation of maintaining that standard.

The welcome is not for the politician, but to the man. Not by a party, but from the people.

Therefore in the faith of this kind, and as a parent lays her hands upon the shoulders of a boy, and speaks her frank approval and fond hope, your country greets you. She feels a pride that an unofficial citizen of the republic has stood in palaces and beside ancient thrones, and has been of man's full stature.

Your countrymen rejoice in one whose journey round the globe has been marked by speech and printed utterance that measured always to a statesman's standard. They have been cheered from time to time by eloquence that recalled the brilliant leadership of 1900 and of 1896, and they have seen that, to the wisdom of that day you have brought the added learning of ten full years, in the wide schoolroom of the world. Their trust in you has not been diminished by the fact that, while many men were studying expediency in conference and caucus, you were meditating the simple rules of right in the inspiring lands of Palestine. They feel that the resolution for inter-

national arbitration, and your thrilling appeal that gained its unanimous adoption by a congress in which twenty-six nations were represented, have made the civilized world your perpetual debtor. They are glad that England, recognizing you as a Christian statesman, called you "the Gladstone of America."

History tells them that the first statesman of ancient Greece, in order to equip himself for the highest duty of the citizen, traveled the known countries of his day. His wisdom made that sturdy state in which the Spartan boy permitted his bowels to be torn out by the fox he had hidden beneath his coat; for in that younger time, to steal without detection was to excel.

In your own travel you have followed the precedent of Lycurgus; to be a better citizen of the nation, you have become a citizen of the world. You have conferred with its rulers, studied its peoples, gained knowledge of its laws. You have come home. The problems that confront you are more complex than those that met the sage of Sparta. Your countrymen are not of the primitive material of that early state; but if to take by stealth the property of another is still a civic virtue, you will find that in your absence some of us have not been idle. You will find the productive industries of the country in the hands of a few allied to crush at home competing venture, and paternally protected from outside interruption; a legislatively fostered minority who, at one and the same time, invoke the law for privilege and protection and defy it in predatory combination; who, in order that they may retake from labor also that small part of labor's product which they allow as wage, have, since 1896, and principally by collusion, advanced the cost of life's necessities forty-two per cent.

The American people are beginning to know that a contempt for and an evasion of just laws tend no less toward anarchy when plotted over the director's table than when shouted under a red flag on the railway crossing. The conscience of the people is aroused. It is asking that back of the law in its enactment, and behind the law in its execution, there shall be an incorruptible moral force. The nation does not believe that the streams of national life can be purified by those guilty of its pollution. It believes that the navigator who foretold

the conditions of the channel and marked its dangers on the chart will be a better guide than one of the pilots who drive against a rock and thereupon announce its discovery.

The people welcome you as such a guide; a champion who early saw and stoutly resented the wrongs they suffer—wronges that have continued and grown for a full decade. They welcome you, the man who compassionately proclaimed himself a commoner, and who has been fraternally greeted as one of nature's noblemen by the princes of the earth.

Your confident war against special privilege and your long championship of equal rights have earned their gratitude; have won the esteem of old opponents and strengthened the love and loyalty of friends. That battle does not pause and is not won. In the call for leadership of courage and integrity, your country meets you at her gate with accolade and banner. She gives you the proudest welcome that ever greeted private citizen in the history of the world—the echo of millions of American hearts.

You come alone to take it, but it has been as steadily deserved, as nobly won, as was ever any triumph that cheered a Roman conqueror leading his iron legions through the Appian Way.

Governor Folk introduced Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, who spoke as follows:

SPEECH OF TOM JOHNSON

Ladies and Gentlemen: We are met to welcome home the first citizen of the republic. Not yet the first official, but the first citizen by common consent.

He is a democrat, for he believes in the honesty and the intelligence of the people. He is a republican, for he believes in the republican form of government. Men say he is eloquent, and so he is; but the charm of his eloquence is his sincerity, its strength is his moral courage.

He has finished the long journey around the world, and now we of America know that we have made no mistake in him, for everywhere the people have seen him as we have seen him, and everywhere they have hailed him as the American leader of ideal democracy. Over that principle the thought of the world is agitated today. In

some form or other in all civilized countries democracy is struggling against privilege. Millions of our people have but just begun to learn that this irrepressible conflict is being waged in the United States. They are just beginning to learn that American democracy must abolish special privilege or special privilege will abolish American democracy. They are just beginning to learn their need for the democratic inspiration of another Jefferson and the democratic leader of another Lincoln.

They are learning it fast. And with it they are learning another thing. They are learning that they have among them a simple citizen whose qualities of leadership all the world recognizes. They are learning that for ten years they have had in training an able and sincere leader of the democracy of all political parties against the entrenched interests of special privilege of every kind and degree. They have come to know for the true man that he is, our guest of tonight, William Jennings Bryan.

Mr. Bryan: In the name and in the presence of this splendid audience, and in behalf of that great host of American citizens who believe in equal rights and abhor special privilege, in behalf of every democratic republican as well as every democratic democrat, I welcome you home. We all welcome you as an ideal democrat who is worthy to lead and competent to lead; we welcome you as an American citizen in whose pre-eminence we have an honorable pride; we welcome you because we trust you; we welcome you because we love you.

MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH IN NEW YORK

At the Madison Square Garden meeting, held on the evening of August 30, Mr. Bryan spoke for one hour and twenty minutes. The newspaper dispatches say he was frequently interrupted by great applause. The press dispatches say that a particularly cordial demonstration occurred when Mr. Bryan told his hearers that he favored the government ownership of railroads, advocating the control by the federal government of the trunk lines, and the ownership of all other railroads by the state government. One interruption occurred when Mr. Bryan

referred to socialism, stating that the man who declared that the trust is an economic growth and has come to stay is the one who is helping socialism.

Some one yelled, "three cheers for socialism," but the call was drowned in hisses.

Mr. Bryan quickly said: "My friends, I have no objections to any man expressing himself in favor of socialism, because the socialist, as a rule, is an honest man. He is seeking what he believes to be a benefit and should be met with argument and not with abuse. I deny that the trust is an institution necessary for economic purposes. I deny that it is an economic institution at all. It is not economic, it is political. It rests not on natural laws, but on one-man made laws."

The following is taken from the Associated Press report:

As the guest of the Commercial Travelers' Anti-Trust League, Mr. Bryan was greeted by more than 20,000 persons, who filled the great structure from floor to upper gallery. The streets and avenues outside the Garden were choked for blocks by other thousands, who stood patiently for hours for the privilege of even a fleeting glance at the distinguished visitor. The interior of the Garden was a waving sea of color. Every person in the audience had been provided with an American flag, and every cheer from 20,000 throats was accentuated by the waving of 20,000 staffs bearing the Stars and Stripes.

When Mr. Bryan entered the hall the proceedings which had already begun were brought to a temporary pause while for eight minutes volley after volley of thunderous cheers rolled through the great building.

When Chairman Tom L. Johnson, in his introduction of Mr. Bryan, referred to the guest of the evening as "the first citizen, if not the first official of the land," and Mr. Bryan rose, the gathering broke out in unrestrained cheering while the band played "Hail to the Chief."

So touched was Mr. Bryan by the welcome that, as he stood waiting for the cheers to subside, his eyes filled with tears and he strode nervously from side to side of the narrow platform.

"How can I thank you for this welcome home! I would be hard-hearted indeed if I were not touched by this demonstration; I would be ungrateful if I did not

dedicate myself anew to your service. It was kind of the Commercial Travelers' Anti-Trust League to prepare this reception; it was kind of Governor Folk to come all the way from Missouri to participate in it; it was kind of Mayor Johnson to lend his presence; it was kind of Mr. Thomas to give voice to your good-will in his eloquent and more than complimentary address. I am grateful to you all—most grateful.

Mr. Bryan then began his prepared address, saying:

“Like all travelers who have visited other lands, I return with delight to the land of my birth, more proud of its people, with more confidence in its government, and grateful to the kind Providence that cast my lot in the United States. My national pride has been increased because of the abundant evidence I have seen in the altruistic interest taken by Americans in the people of other countries. No other nation can show such a record of benevolence and disinterested friendship. My love for our form of government has been quickened as I have visited castles and towers, and peered into dark dungeons, and I am glad that our nation, profiting by the experience of the past and yet unhampered by traditions and unfettered by caste, has been permitted to form a new center of civilization on new soil and erect here ‘a government of the people, by the people and for the people.’

“I also return more deeply impressed than ever before with the responsibility that rests upon our nation as an exemplar among the nations, and more solicitous that we, avoiding the causes which have led other nations to decay, may present a higher ideal than has ever before been embodied in a national life and carry human progress to a higher plane than it has before reached.

“I desire, moreover, to acknowledge indebtedness to the American officials who have everywhere shown us all possible courtesy and kindness. I do not know that I can better show my appreciation of the welcome accorded me by my countrymen than to submit some suggestions drawn from observations during the past year.

“A Japanese educator, addressing me through an interpreter, said: ‘I wish you would find the worst thing in Japan and tell us about it so that we may correct it.’ I commended the generous spirit which he manifested, but

assured him that I had not visited Japan in search of faults and blemishes, but rather that I might find the best things in Japan and take them home for the benefit of my own people. Each nation can give lessons to every other, and while our nation is in a position to make the largest contribution, as I believe, to the education of the world, it ought to remain in the attitude of a pupil and be ever ready to profit by the experience of others.

“The first message that I bring from the old world is a message of peace. The cause of arbitration is making real progress in spite of the fact that the nations most prominent in the establishment of The Hague tribunal have themselves been engaged in wars since that court was organized. There is a perceptible growth in sentiment in favor of the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means. It was my good fortune to be present at the last session of the Inter-parliamentary Union, which convened in London on the 23d of July. Twenty-six nations were represented, and these included all the leading nations of the world. This peace congress, as it is generally known, not only adopted resolutions in favor of the limitation of armaments and the arbitration of all questions relating to debts, but unanimously indorsed the proposition that all disputes of every nature should be submitted to an impartial tribunal for investigation, or to the mediation of friendly nations before hostilities are commenced.

“It is not necessary to point out the importance of the position taken. The embodiment of the suggestion in treaties would go a long way toward removing the probability of war. While the idea is of American origin, it was heartily accepted by the representatives of England, France, Germany and other European countries.

“I believe that if our nation would propose to make with every other nation a treaty providing that all questions in dispute between the parties should be submitted to The Hague court, or some other impartial international tribunal, for investigation and report before any declaration of war or commencement of hostilities, it would find many nations willing to enter into such a compact. I am sure from the public utterances of the present prime minister of Great Britain, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, that such a treaty could be made between the two

great English speaking nations and their example would be followed until the danger of war would be almost, if not entirely, removed. To take the lead in such a movement would establish our position as a world power in the best sense of the term.

“What argument can be advanced against such action on the part of the United States? Shall we yield to any other nation in the estimate to be placed upon the value of human life? I confess that my aversion to killing increases with the years. Surely the Creator did not so plan the universe as to make the progress of the race dependent upon wholesale blood letting. I prefer to believe that war, instead of being an agency for good, is rather an evidence of man’s surrender to his passions, and that one of the tests of civilization is man’s willingness to submit his controversies to the arbitrament of reason rather than of force.

“Another subject connected with our foreign relations: I venture to suggest that we may not only promote peace but also advance our commercial interests by announcing as a national policy that our navy will not be used for the collection of private debts. While protecting the lives of our citizens everywhere and guaranteeing personal safety to all who owe allegiance to our flag, we should, in my judgment, announce that persons engaging in business and holding property in other lands for business purposes must be subject to the laws of the countries in which they engage in business enterprises. Many profitable fields of investment are now closed because the people of the smaller nations are afraid that an investment of foreign capital will be made an excuse for a foreign invasion. Several times on this trip this fact has been brought to my attention and I am convinced that for every dollar we could secure to American investors by an attempt to put the government back of their private claims we would lose many dollars by closing the door to investment. Mark the distinction between the protection of the lives of our citizens and the use of the navy to guarantee a profit on investments. We do not imprison for debt in the United States, neither do we put men to death because of their failure to pay what they owe, and our moral prestige as well as our commercial interests will be conserved by assuring all nations that

American investments depend for protection upon the laws of the country to which the investors go.

Before leaving international politics let me add that our nation has lost prestige rather than gained it by our experiment in colonialism. We have given the monarchist a chance to ridicule our Declaration of Independence and the scoffer has twitted us with inconsistency. A tour through the Philippine Islands has deepened the conviction that we should lose no time in announcing our purpose to deal with the Filipinos as we dealt with the Cubans. Every consideration, commercial and political, leads to this conclusion. Such ground as we may need for coaling stations or for a naval base will be gladly conceded by the Filipinos, who simply desire an opportunity to work out their own destiny, inspired by our example and aided by our advice. Insofar as our efforts have been directed towards the education of the Filipinos, we have rendered them a distinct service; but in educating them we must recognize that we are making colonialism impossible. If we intended to hold them as subjects we would not dare to educate them. Self-government with ultimate independence must be assumed if we contemplate universal education in the Philippines. As soon as opportunity offers I shall discuss the Philippine question more at length, and I shall also refer to English rule in India, for it throws light upon our own problems in the Philippines, but these subjects must be reserved until I can speak more in detail.

“In several of the nations of Europe, the legislative department of government is more quickly responsive to public sentiment than is our congress. In England, for instance, where the ministry is formed from the dominant party, when an election is held upon any important issue the government proceeds to put into law the will of the people expressed at the polls. While our system is superior in many respects, it has one defect, viz: that congress does not meet in regular session until thirteen months after the election. During this period there is uncertainty, long drawn out, which to the business community is often more damaging than a change of policy promptly carried into effect. Would not the situation be improved by a constitutional amendment convening the first session of congress within a few

months after the election and compelling the second session to adjourn several days before the following election? Such a change would not only protect legitimate business interests and give the public the benefit of more prompt relief through remedial legislation, but it would protect the people from the jobs that are usually reserved for the short session which is now held after the election and when many of the members feel less responsibility because of defeat at the polls.

“I return more strongly convinced than before of the importance of a change in the methods of electing United States senators. There is noticeable everywhere a distinct movement towards democracy in its broadest sense. In all the countries which I have visited there is a demand that the government be brought nearer to the people; in China a constitution is under consideration; in Japan the people are demanding that the ministry, instead of being chosen by the emperor from among his particular friends, shall be selected from parliament and be in harmony with the dominant sentiment; in India there is agitation in favor of a native congress; in Russia the czar has been compelled to recognize the popular voice in the establishment of a douma, and throughout Europe the movement manifests itself in various forms. In the United States this trend toward democracy has taken the form of a growing demand for the election of United States senators by a direct vote of the people. It would be difficult to overestimate the strategic advantages of this reform, for since every bill must receive the sanction of the senate as well as the house of representatives before it can become a law, no important remedial legislation of a national character is possible until the senate is brought into harmony with the people.

“I am within the limits of the truth when I say that the senate has been for years the bulwark of predatory wealth, and that it even now contains so many members who owe their election to favor-seeking corporations and are so subservient to their masters as to prevent needed legislation. The popular branch of congress has four times declared in favor of this reform by a two-thirds vote and more than two-thirds of the states have demanded it, yet the senate arrogantly and impudently blocks the way.

“The income tax, which some in our country have denounced as a socialistic attack upon wealth, has, I am pleased to report, the indorsement of the most conservative countries in the old world. It is a permanent part of the fiscal system of many of the countries of Europe and in several places it is a graded tax, the rate being highest upon the largest incomes. England has long depended upon the income tax for a considerable part of her revenues and an English commission is now investigating the proposition to change from a uniform to a graded tax.

“I have been absent too long to speak with any authority on the public sentiment in this country at this time, but I am so convinced of the justice of the income tax that I feel sure that the people will sooner or later demand an amendment to the constitution which will specifically authorize an income tax, and thus make it possible for the burdens of the federal government to be apportioned among the people in proportion to their ability to bear them. It is little short of a disgrace to our country that while it is able to command the lives of its citizens in time of war, it cannot, even in the most extreme emergency, compel wealth to bear its share of the expenses of the government which protects it.

“I have referred to the investigation of international controversies under a system which does not bind the parties to accept the findings of the court of inquiry. This plan can be used in disputes between labor and capital; in fact, it was proposed as a means of settling such disputes before it was applied to international controversies. It is as important that we shall have peace at home as that we shall live peaceably with neighboring nations, and peace is only possible when it rests upon justice. In advocating arbitration of differences between large corporate employers and their employes, I believe we are defending the highest interests of the three parties to these disputes, viz: the employers, the employes and the public. The employe cannot be turned over to the employer to be dealt with as the employer may please.

“The question sometimes asked, ‘Can I not conduct my business to suit myself?’ is a plausible one; but when a man in conducting his business attempts to arbitrarily fix the conditions under which hundreds of employes are

to live and to determine the future of thousands of human beings, I answer without hesitation that he has no right to conduct his own business in such a way as to deprive his employes of the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To support this position I need only refer to the laws regulating the safety of mines, the factory laws fixing the age at which children can be employed, and usury laws establishing the rate of interest. The effort of the employer to settle differences without arbitration has done much to embitter him against those who work for him and to estrange them from him—a condition deplorable from every standpoint.

“But if it is unwise to make the employer the sole custodian of the rights and interests of the employes, it is equally unwise to give the employes uncontrolled authority over the rights and interests of the employer. The employes are no more to be trusted to act unselfishly and disinterestedly than the employers. In their zeal to secure a present advantage they may not only do injustice, but even forfeit a larger future gain.

“The strike, the only weapon of the employe at present, is a two-edged sword and may injure the workman as much as the employer, and even when wholly successful is apt to leave a rankling in the bosom of the wage-earner that ought not to be there. Society has, moreover, something at stake as well as the employer and employe, for there can be no considerable strike without considerable loss to the public. Society, therefore, is justified in demanding that the differences between capital and labor shall be settled by peaceful means. If a permanent, impartial board is created, to which either party of an industrial dispute may appeal, or which can on its own motion institute an inquiry, public opinion may be relied upon to enforce the finding. If there is compulsory submission to investigation it is not necessary that there shall be compulsory acceptance of the decision, for a full and fair investigation will, in almost every case, bring about a settlement.

“No reference to the labor question is complete that does not include some mention of what is known as government by injunction. As the main purpose of the writ is to evade trial by jury, it is really an attack upon the jury system and ought to arouse a unanimous pro-

test. However, as the writ is usually invoked in case of a strike, the importance of the subject would be very much reduced by the adoption of a system of arbitration, because arbitration would very much reduce, even if it did not entirely remove, the probability of a strike.

“Just another word in regard to the laboring man. The struggle to secure an eight hour day is an international struggle and it is sure to be settled in favor of the workingman’s contention. The benefits of the labor saving machine have not been distributed with equity. The producer has enormously multiplied his capacity, but so far the owner of the machine has received too much of the increase and the laborer too little. Those who oppose the eight hour day do it, I am convinced, more because of ignorance of conditions than because of lack of sympathy with those who toil. The removal of work from the house to the factory has separated the husband from his wife and the father from his children, while the growth of our cities has put an increasing distance between the home and the workshop. Then, too, more is demanded of the laboring man now than formerly. He is a citizen as well as a laborer, and must have time for the study of public questions if he is to be an intelligent sovereign. To drive him from his bed to his task and from his task to his bed is to deprive the family of his companionship, society of his service and politics of his influence.

“Thus far I have dwelt upon subjects which may not be regarded as strictly partisan, but I am sure that you will pardon me if in this presence I betray my interest in those policies for which the democratic party stands. I have not had an opportunity to make a democratic speech for almost a year, and no one—not even a political enemy—would be so cruel as to forbid me to speak of those policies on this occasion. Our opponents have derived not only partisan pleasure, but partisan advantage as well, from the division caused in our party by the money question. They ought not, therefore, begrudge us the satisfaction that we find in the fact that unexpected conditions have removed the cause of our differences and permitted us to present a united front on present issues. The unlooked for and unprecedented increase in the production of gold has brought a vic-

tory to both the advocates of gold and the advocates of bimetallism—the former keeping the gold standard which they wanted and the latter securing the larger volume of money for which they contended. We who favor bimetallism are satisfied with our victory if the friends of monometallism are satisfied with theirs, and we can invite them to a contest of zeal and endurance in the effort to restore to the people the rights which have been gradually taken from them by the trusts.

“The investigations which have been in progress during the past year have disclosed the business methods of those who a few years ago resented any inspection of their schemes and hid their rascality under high-sounding phrases. These investigations have also disclosed the source of enormous campaign funds which have been used to debauch elections and corrupt the ballot. The people see now what they should have seen before, namely, that no party can exterminate the trusts so long as it owes its political success to campaign contributions secured from the trusts. The great corporations do not contribute their money to any party except for immunity expressly promised or clearly implied. The president has recommended legislation on this subject, but so far his party has failed to respond.

“No important advance can be made until this corrupting influence is eliminated, and I hope that the democratic party will not only challenge the republican party to bring forward effective legislation on this subject, but will set an example by refusing to receive campaign contributions from corporations and by opening the books so that every contributor of any considerable sum may be known to the public before the election. The great majority of corporations are engaged in legitimate business and have nothing to fear from hostile legislation, and they should not be permitted to use the money of the stockholders to advance the political opinions of the officers of the corporations. Contributions should be individual, not corporate, and no party can afford to receive contributions even from individuals when the acceptance of those contributions secretly pledges the party to a course which it cannot openly avow. In other words, politics should be honest, and I

mistake political conditions in America if they do not presage improvement in the conduct of campaigns.

“While men may differ as to the relative importance of issues, and while the next congress will largely shape the lines upon which the presidential campaign of 1908 will be fought, I think it is safe to say that at present the paramount issue in the minds of a large majority of the people is the trust issue.

“I congratulate President Roosevelt upon the steps which he has taken to enforce the anti-trust law, and my gratification is not lessened by the fact that he has followed the democratic rather than the republican platform in every advance he has made. It has been a great embarrassment to him that the platform upon which he was elected was filled with praises of the republican party’s record rather than with promises of reform; even the enthusiastic support given him by the democrats has enabled the champions of the trusts to taunt him with following democratic leadership. He has probably gone as far as he could go without incurring the hostility of the leaders of his own party. The trouble is that the republican party is not in a position to apply effective and thoroughgoing reforms, because it has built up through special legislation the very abuses which need to be eradicated.

“Before any intelligent action can be taken against the trusts we must have a definition of a trust. Because no corporation has an absolute and complete monopoly of any important product, the apologists for the trusts sometimes insist that there are in reality no trusts. Others insist that it is impossible to legislate against such trusts as may exist without doing injury to legitimate business. For the purposes of this discussion it is sufficient to draw the line at the point where competition ceases to be effective and to designate as a trust any corporation which controls so much of the product of any article that it can fix the terms and conditions of sale.

“Legislation which prevents monopoly not only does not injure legitimate business, but actually protects legitimate business from injury. We are indebted to the younger Rockefeller for an illustration which makes this distinction clear. In defending the trust system he is quoted as saying that as the American Beauty rose cannot

be brought to perfection without pinching off ninety-nine buds, so that the one hundredth bud can receive the full strength of the bush, so great industrial organizations are impossible without the elimination of the smaller ones. It is a cruel illustration, but it presents a perfectly accurate picture of trust methods. The democratic party champions the cause of the ninety-nine enterprises which are menaced; they must not be sacrificed that one great combination may flourish and when the subject is understood we shall receive the cordial support of hundreds of thousands of business men who have themselves felt the oppression of the trusts or, who, having observed the effect of the trusts upon others, realize that their safety lies, not in futile attempts at the restraint of trusts, but in legislation which will make a private monopoly impossible.

“There must be no mistaking of the issue and no confusing of the line of battle. The trust, as an institution, will have few open defenders. The policy of the trust defenders will be to insist upon ‘reasonable regulation,’ and then they will rely upon their power to corrupt legislatures and to intimidate executives to prevent the application of any remedies which will interfere with the trusts. Our motto must be: ‘A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable,’ and our plan of attack must contemplate the total and complete overthrow of the monopoly principle in industry. We need not quarrel over remedies. We must show ourselves willing to support any remedy and every remedy which promises substantial advantage to the people in their warfare against monopoly. Something is to be expected from the enforcement of the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law, but this law must be enforced, not against a few trusts, as at present, but against all trusts, and the aim must be to imprison the guilty, not merely to recover a fine. What is a fine of a thousand dollars or even ten thousand dollars to a trust which makes a hundred thousand dollars while the trial is in progress?

“If the criminal clause is not going to be enforced it ought to be repealed. If imprisonment is too severe a punishment for the eminently respectable gentlemen who rob eighty millions of people of hundreds of millions of dollars annually, the language of the statute ought to

be changed, for nothing is more calculated to breed anarchy than the failure to enforce the law against rich criminals while it is rigidly enforced against petty offenders.

But it is not sufficient to enforce existing laws. If ten corporations conspiring together in restraint of trade are threatened with punishment, all they have to do now is to dissolve their separate corporations and turn their property over to a new corporation. The new corporation can proceed to do the same thing that the separate corporations attempted, and yet not violate the law. We need, therefore, new legislation, and the republican party not only fails to enact such legislation, but fails even to promise it. The democratic party must be prepared to propose legislation which will be sufficient.

“Recent investigations have brought to light the fact that nearly all the crookedness revealed in the management of our large corporations has been due largely to the duplication of directorates. A group of men organized, or obtained control of, several corporations doing business with each other and then proceeded to swindle the stockholders of the various corporations for which they acted. No man can serve two masters, and the director who attempts to do so will fail, no matter how much money he may make, before his failure is discovered. Many of the trusts control prices by the same methods. The same group of men secure control of several competing corporations and the management is thus consolidated. It is worth while to consider whether a blow may not be struck at the trusts by a law making it illegal for the same person to act as director or officer of two corporations which deal with each other or are engaged in the same general business.

“A still more far-reaching remedy was proposed by the democratic platform of 1900, namely, the requiring of corporations to take out a federal license before engaging in interstate commerce. This remedy is simple, easily applied and comprehensive. The requiring of a license would not embarrass legitimate corporations—it would scarcely inconvenience them—while it would confine the predatory corporations to the state of their origin. Just as a federal license to sell liquor leaves the possessor of the license to sell only in accordance with the laws of

the state in which he resides, so a corporate license granted by a federal commission would not interfere with the right of each state to regulate foreign corporations doing business within its borders.

“If corporations were required to take out a federal license the federal government could then issue the license upon the terms and conditions which would protect the public. A corporation differs from a human being in that it has no natural rights, and as all of its rights are derived from the statutes it can be limited or restrained according as the public welfare may require. The control which congress has over interstate commerce is complete, and if congress can prevent the transportation of a lottery ticket through the mails, by the express companies or by freight, it can certainly forbid the use of the mails, the railways and the telegraph lines to any corporation which is endeavoring to monopolize an article of commerce, and no party can long be credited with sincerity if it condemns the trusts with words only and then permits the trusts to employ all the instrumentalities of interstate commerce in the carrying out of their nefarious plans. It is far easier to prevent a monopoly than to watch it and punish it, and this prevention can be accomplished in a practical way by refusing a license to any corporation which controls more than a certain proportion of the total product—this proportion to be arbitrarily fixed at a point which will give free operation to competition.

“The tariff question is very closely allied to the trust question and the reduction of the tariff furnishes an easy means of limiting the extortion which the trusts can practice. While absolute free trade would not necessarily make a trust impossible, still it is probable that very few manufacturing establishments would dare to enter into a trust if the president were empowered to put upon the free list articles competing with those controlled by a trust. While I shall take occasion at an early day to consider the tariff question more at length, I cannot permit this opportunity to pass without expressing the opinion that the principle embodied in the protective tariff has been the fruitful source of a great deal of political corruption, and that the high tariff schedules have been a shelter to many of our most iniquitous trusts. It is difficult to condemn the manufacturers for uniting to take

advantage of a high tariff schedule when the schedule is framed on the theory that the industries need all the protection given, and it is not likely that the beneficiaries of these schedules will consent to their reduction so long as the public waits for the tariff to be reformed by its friends.

“But one of the worst features of the tariff, levied not for revenue, but for the avowed purpose of protection, is that it fosters the idea that men should use their votes to advance their own financial interests. The manufacturer has been assured that it is legitimate for him to vote for congressmen who, whatever their opinions on other subjects may be, will legislate larger dividends into his pockets; sheep growers have been encouraged to believe that they should have no higher aim in voting than to raise the price of wool; and laboring men have been urged to make their wages their only concern.

“For a generation the ‘fat’ has been fried out of the manufacturers by the republican campaign committee, and then the manufacturers have been reimbursed by legislation. With the public conscience educated to believe that this open purchase of legislation was entirely proper, no wonder that insurance companies have used the money of their policyholders to carry elections—no wonder that trusts have hastened to purchase immunity from punishment with liberal donations! How can we draw a moral distinction between the man who sells his vote for five dollars on election day and the manufacturer who sells his political influence for fifty or a hundred thousand dollars, payable in dividends? How can we draw a moral line between the senator or congressman elected by the trusts to prevent hostile legislation and the senator or congressman kept in congress by the manufacturers to secure friendly legislation? The party that justifies the one form of bribery cannot be relied upon to condemn the other.

“There never was a time when tariff reform could be more easily entered upon, for the manufacturers by selling abroad cheaper than at home, as many of them do, have not only shown their ingratitude toward those who built the tariff wall for them, but they have demonstrated their ability to sell in competition with the world. The high tariff has long been a burden to the consumers in

the United States and it is growing more and more a menace to our foreign commerce because it arouses resentment and provokes retaliation.

“The railroad question is also interwoven with the trust question. Nearly all the private monopolies have received rebates or secured other advantages over competitors. Absolute equality of treatment at the hands of the railroads would go far toward crippling the trusts, and I rejoice that the president has had the courage to press the question upon congress. While the law, as it was finally enacted, is not all that could be wished, it deserves a fair trial.

“Rate regulation was absolutely necessary and the new law furnishes some relief from the unbearable condition which previously existed, but we must not forget that the vesting of this enormous power in the hands of a commission appointed by the president introduces a new danger. If an appointive board has the power to fix rates and can, by the exercise of that power, increase or decrease by hundreds of millions of dollars the annual revenues of the railroads, will not the railroads feel that they have a large pecuniary interest in the election of a president friendly to the railroads? Experience has demonstrated that municipal corruption is largely traceable to the fact that franchised corporations desire to control the city council and thus increase dividends of the franchised corporations. If the railroad managers adopt the same policy, the sentiment in favor of the ownership of the railroads by the government is likely to increase as rapidly throughout the country as the sentiment in favor of municipal ownership has increased in the cities.

“I have already reached the conclusion that railroads partake so much of the nature of a monopoly that they must ultimately become public property and be managed by public officials in the interest of the whole community in accordance with the well defined theory that public ownership is necessary where competition is impossible. I do not know that the country is ready for this change; I do not know that a majority of my own party favor it, but I believe that an increasing number of the members of all parties see in public ownership the only sure remedy for discrimination between persons and places and for

extortionate rates for the carrying of freight and passengers.

“Believing, however, that the operation of all the railroads by the federal government would so centralize the government as to almost obliterate state lines, I prefer to see only the trunk lines operated by the federal government and the local lines by the several state governments. Some have opposed this dual ownership as impracticable, but investigation in Europe has convinced me that it is entirely practicable. Nearly all the railroads of Germany are owned by the several states, the empire not even owning trunk lines, and yet the interstate traffic is in no wise obstructed. In traveling from Constantinople to Vienna one passes through Turkey, Bulgaria, Servia, Hungary and a part of Austria without a change of cars, although each country owns and operates its own roads and different languages are spoken on the different divisions of the lines. Sweden and Norway each owns its railroads, but they have no trouble about interstate traffic, although their political relations are somewhat strained. The ownership and operation of the local lines by the several state governments is not only feasible but it suits itself to conditions existing in the various states. In those states where the people are ripe for a change, the local lines can be purchased or new lines be built at once, while private ownership can continue in those states in which the people still prefer private ownership. Some states have been more careful than others to prevent the watering of stock and in the acquiring of roads each state can act according to the situation which it has to meet.

“As to the right of the governments, federal and state, to own and operate railroads there can be no doubt. If we can deepen the water in the lakes and build connecting canals in order to cheapen railroad transportation during half of the year, we can build a railroad and cheapen rates the whole year; if we can spend several hundred millions on the Panama canal to lower transcontinental rates, we can build a railroad from New York to San Francisco to lower both transcontinental and local rates. The United States mail is increasing so rapidly that we shall soon be able to pay the interest on the cost of trunk lines out of the money which we now pay to railroads for carrying through mails. If any of you question the pro-

priety of my mentioning this subject, I beg to remind you that the president could not have secured the passage of the rate bill had he not appealed to the fear of the more radical remedy of government ownership, and I may add, nothing will so restrain the railroad magnates from attempting to capture the interstate commerce commission as the same fear. The high-handed manner in which they have violated law and ignored authority, together with the corruption discovered in high places, has done more to create sentiment in favor of public ownership than all the speeches and arguments of the opponents of private ownership.

“I have referred to the railroad question as a part of the trust question because they are so interwoven that it is difficult to consider one without the other.

“Just a word more in regard to the trusts. Some defend them on the ground that they are an economic development and that they cannot be prevented without great injury to our industrial system. This may be answered in two ways: First, trusts are a political development rather than an economic one; and, second, the trust system could not be permitted to continue even though it did result in a net economic gain. It is political because it rests upon the corporation and the corporation rests upon a statutory foundation. The trust, instead of being a natural development, is a form of legalized larceny, and can exist only so long as the law permits it to exist. That there is an economic advantage in production on a large scale may be admitted, but because a million yards of cloth can be produced in one factory at a lower price per yard than one hundred thousand yards can be produced in the same factory, it does not follow that cloth would or could be produced at a still lower price per yard if all the cloth consumed in the United States were produced in one factory or under one management. There is a point beyond which the economic advantage of a large production ceases. The moment an industry approaches the position of a monopoly it begins to lose in economic efficiency, for a monopoly discourages invention, invites deterioration in quality and destroys a most potent factor in production, viz.: individual ambition. But the political objections to a trust overcome any economic advantage which it can possibly have. No economic advantage can

justify an industrial despotism or compensate the nation for the loss of independence among its producers. Political liberty could not long endure under an industrial system which permitted a few powerful magnates to control the means of livelihood of the rest of the people.

“Landlordism, the curse of Europe, is an innocent institution in comparison with the trust when the trust is carried to its logical conclusion. The man who argues that there is an economic advantage in private monopoly is aiding socialism. The socialist, asserting the economic superiority of the monopoly, insists that its benefits shall accrue to the whole people, and his conclusion cannot be denied if his assumption is admitted. The democratic party, if I understand its position, denies the economic as well as the political advantage of private monopoly and promises to oppose it wherever it manifests itself. It offers as an alternative competition where competition is possible and public monopoly wherever circumstances are such as to prevent competition.

“Socialism presents a consistent theory, but a theory which, in my judgment, does not take human nature into account. Its strength is in its attack upon evils, the existence of which is confessed; its weakness is that it would substitute a new disease—if not a worse one—for the disease from which we suffer. The socialist is honest in the belief that he has found a remedy for human ills, and he must be answered with argument, not with abuse. The best way to oppose socialism is to remedy the abuses which have grown up under individualism but which are not a necessary part of individualism, and the sooner the remedy is applied the better.

“As I was leaving home I set forth my reasons for opposing the socialistic doctrine that the government should own and operate all the means of production and transportation; my observations during the past year have strengthened my conviction on that subject. Because I am anxious to preserve individualism, I am earnest in my desire to see the trusts exterminated, root and branch, that the door of opportunity may be open to every American citizen.

“I shall reserve for another occasion a discussion of the rapidly growing appropriations made by the party in power. It is natural that those who look upon taxa-

tion as a blessing should view governmental extravagance with complacency. Yet even the desire to find ways of spending the revenues brought into the treasury by a high tariff can hardly account for the reckless expenditures of the last session of congress.

“But at this time I desire to center your thoughts upon the overshadowing evil of the day—the trust, with the plutocratic tendencies that result therefrom. It demands a remedy and the people are prepared to administer strenuous treatment. The democratic party offers a solution which is both reasonable and adequate—a solution in which time honored principles are applied to new conditions.

“The democratic party is not the enemy of property or of property rights; it is, on the contrary, the best defender of both, because it defends human rights and human rights are the only foundation upon which property and property rights can rest securely. The democratic party does not menace a single dollar legitimately accumulated; on the contrary, it insists upon the protection of rich and poor alike in the enjoyment of that which they have honestly earned. The democratic party does not discourage thrift, but, on the contrary, stimulates each individual to the highest endeavor by assuring him that he will not be deprived of the fruits of his toil. If we can but repeal the laws which enable men to reap where they have not sown—laws which enable them to garner into their overflowing barns the harvests that belong to others—no one will be able to accumulate enough to make his fortune dangerous to the country. Special privilege and the use of the taxing power for private gain—these are the twin pillars upon which plutocracy rests. To take away these supports and to elevate the beneficiaries of special legislation to the plane of honest effort ought to be the purpose of our party.

“And who can suffer injury by just taxation, impartial laws and the application of the Jeffersonian doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none? Only those whose accumulations are stained with dishonesty and whose immoral methods have given them a distorted view of business, society and government. Accumulating by conscious frauds more money than they can use upon themselves, wisely distribute or safely leave to their chil-

dren, these denounce as public enemies all who question their methods or throw a light upon their crimes.

“Plutoocracy is abhorrent to a republic; it is more despotic than monarchy, more heartless than aristocracy, more selfish than bureaucracy. It preys upon the nation in time of peace and conspires against it in the hour of its calamity. Conscienceless, compassionless and devoid of wisdom, it enervates its votaries while it impoverishes its victims. It is already sapping the strength of the nation, vulgarizing social life and making a mockery of morals. The time is ripe for the overthrow of this giant wrong. In the name of the counting-rooms, which it has defiled; in the name of business honor which it has polluted; in the name of the home which it has despoiled; in the name of religion which it has disgraced; in the name of the people whom it has oppressed, let us make our appeal to the awakened conscience of the nation.

“And if I may be permitted to suggest a battle hymn, I propose a stanza slightly changed from one of the most touching of the poems of Burns, Scotland’s democratic bard:

“Columbia! My dear, my native soil,
For whom my warmest wish to heaven is sent,
Long may thy hardy sons of rustic toil
Be blest with health, and peace, and sweet content.
And, O, may Heaven their simple lives prevent
From luxury’s contagion, weak and vile;
Then, though unearned wealth to wickedness be lent,
A virtuous populace will rise and stand
A wall of fire around their much loved land.”

IN NEW HAVEN, CONN.

Mr. Bryan visited New Haven, Conn., Friday, August 31. Press dispatches say that he was everywhere received with great demonstrations. At 6 o’clock in the evening Mr. Bryan left New Haven for Bridgeport, Conn., addressing great gatherings there as in New Haven. At New Haven Mr. Bryan was greeted by a delegation from Rhode Island headed by former Governor Garvin. At New Haven addresses were delivered by former Governor

Garvin of Rhode Island, George Fred Williams of Massachusetts and John J. Lentz of Ohio.

MR. WILLIAMS' SPEECH

For the people of New England, and especially those of Massachusetts and Boston, the Hon. George Fred Williams expressed the feeling which was held throughout by the residents of this section of welcome to Mr. Bryan on his return from abroad. His speech was as follows:

This is the day when men of all parties and shades of opinion are gathered to do honor to an illustrious citizen. No political campaign arouses ill-feeling and we can see each other as men earnestly desiring, each in his own way, to advance the interests of the republic.

Knowing as I do from intimate personal acquaintance the noble qualities of manhood which distinguish our guest, I can conceive no better text for consideration than the virtues which make this man beloved the more as he is the better understood. Nothing is more offensive than fulsome flattery, but in these days when the muck-rake has laid open such noisome conditions, it is a relief to dwell upon the virtues of a man whom no weapons of slander seem to wound and no temptations allure. It is said that of the dead nothing but good should be spoken. Happy must be the living of whom nothing but good can be spoken; so shines a good man in a naughty world.

I firmly believe that no purer minded man has tendered his service to the American people than William J. Bryan. Vulgarity, scoffing, pessimism, uncharity, hypocrisy are never on his lips. If pride seems at times to make him too masterful, it is pride of good deeds, noble purposes and lofty ambitions. Who has withstood more reviling, more injustice, more ridicule than he? Yet without embitterment and discouragement, he has ever brought the soft answer to men and visited his severity only upon wrong deeds and purposes. No one but a great man could emerge from the fierce conflicts he has led without malice, reproach or hatred.

His absence has been felt and his home-coming is thus celebrated because a Christian civilization cannot spare a Christian leader, friend and patriot.

No one can dispute his title as the greatest democrat of this age. The only tinge of royalty which Bryan has developed even among emperors and courts is that he is the Prince of Idealists. Some complain that he at times holds out his principles with a defiant and arrogant mien; yet it is noticeable that his defiance is always aimed at injustice and his assertiveness is an intolerance of wrong.

It has been claimed that idealism is impossible in statesmanship; but perhaps the impossible is now to be realized. There are some things that have been shown to us lately of which good men of all parties are ashamed. We have had our confidence in commercial honor widely shaken; the kings of finance and industry have been exposed in the practices of extortion, dishonesty and injustice, until the very bulwarks of morality seem to be crumbling. Men who have claimed to be the custodians and exemplars of commercial and public morality have shown themselves to us as whited sepulchers. Is it in any way wonderful that we should turn with joy to this, our leader, who has persisted through an age of graft in keeping the eyes of his soul fixed upon the stars?

If our civilization has appeared to be corrupt, it has been through the loss or debasement of our ideals, and the first work to be done is to get back to a purer standard of public and commercial life. We hail with relief the cast of morality which at any cost demands the removal from the party organization of any man who holds his place by fraud. He does not require to change his party allegiance who says as a patriot today, God give us leaders who will not accept power through corruption; who will not go down to gain success, but lead ever upward.

No man has taught me as he has taught the lesson of faith in the people, of abiding confidence that at last the truth will prevail by the suffrage of a majority. How often we, in our weakness, despair that the ballot will ever be used by the masses for their own rescue, that the people will select faithful advocates and recognize the deceptions and bribes with which the artful separate their dupes into factions. We know that the ballot is a sufficient instrument for freedom if it could be used aright; we know that a skillful minority united by the ties of greed, purchasing talent, and deluding the weak, actually

imposes its rule upon the masses of men upon whom it feeds.

In our despair and even disgust we lose courage, we complain, condemn and protest; we rebel that we have not the power to expose the machinations which enable the strong and wealthy to gather to themselves the fruits of suffering toil.

For ten years Bryan has bent beneath the weight of this power. But with sublime strength and faith he stands erect, undaunted, hopeful, confident, always cheerful and sympathetic, ever certain that justice will at last prevail and the people come to their own.

I suspect it is this mighty endurance and faith freighting all his words and acts which compel us to be his followers; it is these which draw the people to him with ties of affection and confidence; it is these which add to his influence year by year and bring him today the plaudits even of those whose blows he has survived.

Such a man may not receive the rewards of office. It may be that the goal of his ideals will move forward as he advances; but as sure as the revolutions of the sun will be his honor and glory when a thankful people shall grave the record of his life.

While Mr. Bryan was receiving callers at New Haven, a delegation of natives from India visited him. This delegation was headed by Tundit (professor) Mohammed Barakutullah. They presented an address to Mr. Bryan in which they thanked him for his reference in his speech to British rule in India.

“We, the children of Hindustan, residing in New York, respectfully approach your noble presence to offer our sincere and hearty thanks on behalf of three hundred million people of India for the great service you have rendered to that country by exposing the falsehood and hypocrisy which characterized the British rule in the Indian empire. That you took the trouble of paying a visit to our afflicted fatherland, made a thorough investigation of the causes of poverty, famine and plague—the normal conditions of the present India—on the spot, made genuine efforts to penetrate the surface of outward glamor of British administration in India, broke the veil of well organized system of subtle tyranny, rapine and plunder, and having discovered the truth about the ingeni-

ous methods of British bureaucracy at Calcutta, gave it out with impartiality to the world at large, has greatly touched all the Indians in this country and millions at home, across the continents and oceans.”

Mr. Bryan thanked the committee and said that at another time he would refer to the subject in his public utterances.

AFTER NEW YORK

Saturday afternoon Mr. Bryan visited Newark, N. J., where he was given a cordial reception. He then visited Jersey City. Mr. Bryan left New York Sunday evening, going to Detroit where on Monday he was given a great reception in that city. Tuesday afternoon and evening he was entertained in Chicago by the Jefferson club and the Iroquois club. He left Chicago early Wednesday morning and arrived at Lincoln Wednesday evening, September 5, at 5:30 o'clock.

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN AT THE NEWSPAPERMEN'S DINNER AT HEALY'S RESTAURANT, NEW YORK CITY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1906

Mr. Chairman, and Fellow-members of a great Profession: I am twice obliged to you tonight; first, I am under obligations to you for coming here, and still more for staying here. I have delayed you and my only excuse is that I was over in New Jersey receiving a part of the welcome of the Eastern states before departing with the home-folks. I appreciate the courtesy that you show, the compliment that you pay me in coming here on this occasion and in giving me an opportunity to meet you face to face. I hardly know what I ought to talk to you about. I have a good deal of difficulty in keeping my non-partisan and partisan speeches entirely separate. (Laughter and applause.) I have a sense of propriety that leads me to endeavor to do that which the occasion requires. Sometimes I find myself in a company where

I am permitted to touch upon partisan themes and betray tendencies that I have towards certain political principles and policies; at other times I meet people upon a broader plane and when I am not at liberty to discuss questions that are partisan in their nature. As I meet you tonight two thoughts are uppermost in my mind. The first is, that the newspaperman ought to be glad that he lives in the United States. (Applause.) This is the greatest nation in the world for the newspaperman as well as for any other man or woman. It is impossible for one to visit other countries without having an increasing appreciation of the superiority of the United States. (Applause.) I might occupy the whole evening in enumerating the evidences of this superiority, but I shall not claim much of your time.

The American newspaper has an opportunity that is not given in any other country. I am aware that in England they have free speech; I am aware that in England they respect free speech. At a dinner in London an Englishman asked me what I thought of the Englishman, and I told him that I thought the Englishman had made great contributions to the world's progress; that his greatest contribution was free speech. This is even a greater contribution than parliamentary government, for you cannot well have parliamentary government without free speech. In regard to free speech England is our equal and I concede it ungrudgingly. But there are other things in England that to my mind do not give the newspaperman as broad a field as he has in our country. In England they have an idea of rank in society that we in this country can hardly appreciate. I believe it is even stronger in England than in some of the countries on the Continent; and if you must recognize rank, you are not in a position, as you are in the United States, to defend a man because he is a man, no matter who his father was. (Applause.) In this country the newspaper is the moulder of public opinion. I do not know of any country which is so blessed with newspapers. I think I may say that the progress of the nation can be measured quite accurately by the number of newspapers in proportion to the population. (Applause.) In Japan they have newspapers in the capital, they have many dailies, weeklies and monthlies, and as you walk about a Japanese

city you see men with their newspapers sitting at the windows of their homes. Go over into China and see what a difference there is. I rode eight hundred miles through the interior of China on a railroad and never saw one single newspaper during the entire journey. But in the cities they have some newspapers, and just in proportion as the newspapers are springing up China is making progress.

But, my friends, if in this country the newspaperman has a great opportunity, in this country he also carries a great responsibility. You will not deny the proposition that responsibility is proportioned to opportunity. There is no other law by which we can be judged, and the great opportunity that the American newspaperman has exactly measures his great responsibility. (Applause.) I do not like to discuss a question without reaching down to the moral principle upon which it rests, for the older I grow the more convinced I am that there is no great question that is not in its essence a moral question. (Applause.) No question is ever settled until the justice or injustice of the question is determined, and in no way can you appeal to the people with such hope of success as in appealing to the conscience, to the moral sense of the people. (Applause.) We are idealists, we may talk about being practical, we may scoff at ideals, but there is no one person in this hall who would sell his ideals for all the money in the universe. (Applause.) If the proposition were made directly, "How much will you take for your ideals?" there is not a man in this audience who would sell an ideal. It is the priceless thing, it is the thing we cherish above all things else. But the danger is that we may sacrifice our ideals when we do not realize that we are really selling them. A question was asked 1900 years ago, and to my mind it was one of the greatest questions ever asked; it was a question that embodied an argument unanswerable—What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? What shall a man demand in exchange for his soul? What is the price of the soul? The ideal is man's conception of life, man's conception of morals.

I hope you will not think that I am preaching when I tell you that we as newspapermen have a problem before us and that it is this: How to stop in the editorial rooms

the selling of conscience for a salary. (Applause.) Gentlemen, no newspaper can be run without brains. When you have an editorial room in which editorials are written that have influence you must have that editorial room filled with men of brains. The men who in this country have grown rich by predatory means haven't the brains to write editorials. They can make money, but they cannot write editorials. There is one way in which the newspapermen can stop all unlawful accumulation of wealth, all illegal practices, all dishonesty in business, namely, to refuse to write one single word that they cannot put their conscience into. (Applause.) If a corporation starts out to rob a city or a state or a nation, it has to have an advocate in the shape of a newspaper. It cannot get the man who owns the stock, because as a rule the man who has money enough to own the stock of a great paper has not the editorial ability to write a decent editorial for his own paper. I do not mean that he has no sense, because the fact that he accumulates money may be evidence that he has what we call the business sense or the money-making sense. But, my friends, man has a certain amount of energy, and if he devotes that energy merely to the selfish accumulation of wealth he cannot devote it to the things that give the mental equipment to write editorials. I am stating a proposition that you will not dispute if you will investigate it. How many of the great newspapers are edited by the men who own them? Very few. And it is because the great newspapers are not edited by the men that own them, because there is not a moral sense behind the editorial pencil—for this reason, time and time again, you have seen the daily newspapers fight a man and the people elect him in spite of all their editorials. (Applause.) We have had instances of this when a man has announced himself as a candidate for office on some proposition affecting the right of the city to control its franchises. This question comes up in a multitude of ways; but in whatever form it arises, when the interests of the masses are at stake and a man comes out and champions their interests and the newspapers, subsidized, sometimes openly, sometimes indirectly—fight him—if he can make the people believe he is honest you cannot beat him with all your hired editorials.

If we had a different situation, if nothing was written for a newspaper that did not have the sanction of the conscience of the man who wrote it, there would be but few hired organs of predatory wealth. If there was more conscience in the editorial rooms these abuses could not exist.

I ask you if it is not time to appeal to the ideals that we know are in men? We in this country are sharing in the great world-wide ethical awakening. We today are finding an increasing number of men who are beginning to scrutinize business methods, an increasing number of men who are beginning to ask how far greed is going to go. Is it not time that the newspapermen began to search themselves and examine their conduct, and decide where they are going to stand in this ethical movement? Do you agree with me that man has no moral right to gather from the people without giving something to the people in return? Then, my friends, if he has no right to do that, you have no moral right to defend or excuse him when he does. (Applause.) It is just as immoral to defend a thief as it is to co-operate with him; just as immoral to cover up a wickedness that you know as to be guilty of it. The editor stands upon an eminence, he is in a position to see and know what others may not see so soon or know so well. We have recently had an investigation of the business methods of certain insurance companies and I will venture the assertion that a majority of the editors in this room knew as much five years ago as they know today about the crookedness disclosed. I will venture the assertion that a majority of the editors knew that directors who owned stock in one institution were shifting the money from one place to another and putting the profits into their own pockets. And yet you did not speak out. Why were you silent? (A voice: Because we don't want to lose our job.) Because you lack the moral courage to follow your own consciences; but we have these questions to meet.

Sometimes I have been denounced as a radical. I believe it is now generally conceded that I am conservative. (Laughter.) But, my friends, I am afraid I am going to be driven to the conclusion that some who said their one objection to me was free silver had a stronger objection still. (Laughter.) I am afraid that after all it may not

have been so much a difference of opinion as a difference of sympathy. What is there in my life that would make me the enemy of honest accumulations? (Applause.) My father began life poor, working on a farm until he earned enough money to go to school; he obtained a college education, graduating when he was twenty-seven; then he studied law; was for eight years a state senator, for twelve a circuit judge, and later a candidate for congress. He accumulated money, and when he died he left some six hundred acres of land to be divided among his children. He sent me to school; he had enough money to pay my expenses; I never was in real want in my life. I was never so poor that I could not have anything and everything that I actually needed. I began life with a small inheritance. I built a house on money that I borrowed from a relative, and I began to pay him back within two years. I paid him something each year and finally when I removed to Nebraska I sold the property and paid my debt and went out to Nebraska and lived in a rented house until I got enough to buy a house. Fortune has smiled upon me. (Applause.) I now live in a comfortable and commodious house. I can make my living easily. There is not a millionaire in this country who has a surer foundation for his income than I have. (Great applause.) And I do not say it boastingly, because I am not to blame for it. (Laughter.) It is good fortune, it is favorable circumstance; but I repeat it, for I want to make it the basis of what I am going to say. I can travel around the world with my family and reach America with more money in my pocket than I had when I left home. (Applause.) I have no difficulty in earning a living. (A voice: How do you do it?) With my pen and my tongue; and there is not a dollar that has a stain upon it. (Great applause.)

Now, my friends, excuse this digression. I mention it simply to say this: I am interested in my country, but no more so than you are; no more so than you ought to be. I have no doubt of my ability to live in comfort all my life, to have everything I need, to be enabled to get anything I please, and it is not dependent upon my holding any office whatsoever. (Applause.) I can leave my children all I want to leave them, all that I think it well to leave them, and I can help any causes in which I feel an interest. I want to leave my children something more

valuable than a fortune. If I leave them money it may take wings of the morning and fly away. If I leave them too much money it may make them quarrel when I am dead. I want to leave my children something more valuable than money. I want to leave them a government that will protect them in the enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. (Applause.) Gentlemen, that is the legacy that we all want to leave to our children. You can help to leave it to your children—a more valuable legacy than you can leave in any other way. My father left me only about \$3,000, but he was an upright man and labored to secure justice in government, and when I go back to the city of my birth and among the people who knew him, they take my hand and say, “If you are as good a man as your father you are all right.” And I would rather have inherited that from him than possess all the wealth of Rockefeller and Morgan combined. (Continued applause.)

Now, we have to act up to our responsibilities. We see in this country the encroachments of wealth. I care not who is to blame. It is not so much our duty to find out who did it as to find a remedy for it. (Applause.) A man asked me the other day why some of the men who have been very bitter in opposing our ideas have changed their views, and my reply was that people who live in a valley are apt to watch the dams above them, for they know that if a flood comes the higher the dam the greater the destruction. Gentlemen, you have been damming the tide of public opinion, and the sooner you remedy the abuses the less radical will be the remedies applied. (Applause.) You know instances where a man has had a slight scratch on his finger and because he neglected it the poison spread to the arm until he had to have the arm amputated or lose his life. It is as true in the body politic as in the body physical. Poison will manifest itself, and when you see something wrong do not denounce the man who points it out, but apply a remedy. If we had done ten years ago what people are willing to do now we would have saved the ten years of reckless dissipation that we have seen. We would have saved the honor of brave men. I find no pleasure in these exposures. To be sure there may be some gratification in knowing just where the corruption money came

from (laughter), but I want you to believe me when I say that the pleasure that I find in the information that is given is not equal to my sorrow that the investigating committees in getting the information before the public found it necessary to bring down the gray hairs of so many in sorrow to the grave. (Applause.) I saw the other day that a man had died—they supposed had committed suicide—and they found that he had taken five millions of dollars out of the bank, and on investigation they learned that the directors had not examined the bank for two years and a half. There are cases where people know of these things and yet allow them to go on, and because we say that there should be laws so strict that these things cannot happen they sometimes say that we are the enemies of wealth. Whenever I see that some man has taken his own life in mortification because he did something that the law permitted him to do, I feel that his death cannot be laid at my door, for I have never excused the system that brought him to his grave. We should take up this subject and put industry and society upon an honest basis. Sometimes when a man has escaped the penitentiary he says: "I have done nothing illegal." I refuse to accept the criminal statutes as my measure of morality. (Applause.) It has to be a higher measure than that. (Applause.) I assert that no man who gets property and money without giving to society an equivalent gets it honestly. That is the moral principle. All that I ask for, all that you can ask for—and yet we all ought to ask for that—is that we shall make our laws and our institutions come as near as possible to giving to each individual a reward commensurate with his contribution to society. (Applause.) If a man can earn \$100 a day he ought to have it. If he has an ability that enables him to give to society services worth \$1,000 a day, he ought to have \$1,000 a day, and I will protect him so far as I can in the enjoyment of his \$1,000 as fully as I will protect the man who earns a dollar a day. (Applause.) The economic law of rewards is that each man shall receive in proportion as he earns; then we can add to that a spiritual law that those who are strong must help to bear the burdens of the weak. (Applause.) A man of large ability and great strength must give more because he is able to give more. This is the

only doctrine that will bear analysis; we ought to do for the world in proportion to our ability and as the world needs. You may call it a sermon, but you do not write an editorial on a public question that does not involve the things I am talking about. Is it not time that we who stand as members of this honorable profession shall investigate these questions and resolve that whatever influence we have, whether it be much or little, shall on every question be thrown on the side of every question that we believe to be right? But some say: "If I could do some great good I would, but what can I do? If I were editor-in-chief I would do certain things, but I am only assistant editor." Or, "If I owned this paper it would not be run this way; but what can I do, I am but a hired man?" My friends, you can do this: You can say to the proprietor: "I will not use my brains to oppose what I believe to be right or to defend that which I believe to be wrong." When a man says: "I want you to write for me and say what I want said," tell him that however poor you are you are not for sale on those terms. If we could have that sort of independence a miracle would be wrought in a very short time. If in the editorial rooms of this city and other cities we had men who would stand up and say, "I will not sell my soul or compromise my conscience," it would not be long before the policies of many of the papers would be different on public questions. If the editor refuses and the proprietor says, "You can go," he will have to get somebody else; but if this spirit can be infused among our people he cannot get anybody else. And then, too, the man who says, "It is wrong," shames the man who is going to do the wrong. (Applause.) The man who says, "It is wrong," has an influence that you cannot estimate. I was speaking to a man in Philadelphia less than two years ago, a young lawyer, and I referred to the corruption of his city, for it seemed to me that Philadelphia surpassed any other city in that respect. It differed from other cities in that Philadelphia seemed to be indifferent to its corruption. And I said, "Why don't you do something?" He said, "If I could do anything I would, but what can I do?" And yet, since that conversation a movement was started in Philadelphia among a few people, people not conspicuous either, but they had right on their side, and that

movement spread until Philadelphia was redeemed and stands today as a proof that there is no such thing as total depravity. (Applause.) For years to come it will be possible to point to Philadelphia to show what can be done by people who are in earnest. And yet that movement started not with a man of great influence, but started with obscure people who were earnest, honest and courageous. What can a human being do? You can measure the influence that one body can exert on another; you can estimate the influence that one mind can exercise over another; but no human being can estimate the influence that one heart can exert on the heart of the human race. (Applause.) One heart full of love, one heart willing to do and dare, kindles enthusiasm and makes the impossible possible.

But, my friends, I did not start out to make you a speech; I am down here, a plain farmer from Nebraska (laughter), just passing through New York because there was no way around it. I am trying to get back to my farm, and yet I am here presuming to speak to moulders of public opinion who have it in their power to confine me to my farm forever or to lift me to the highest pinnacle of fame. (Laughter and applause.) I never like to make a speech unless I feel that something ought to be said, and when I have said something that I think ought to be said I feel that the time has not been wasted. I believe this is a subject upon which somebody ought to say something, and I have said what I believe ought to be said. If I can add anything else to emphasize what I have said—if to the responsibility that you feel as citizens of this nation, I can add a larger and broader responsibility, it may be worth while to say a word more. Eighty millions of people, with a destiny yet unknown—is it not something to affect that destiny for good?

But, my friends, the opportunity of America is even greater than that. America acts not for herself alone, but for the world. I sat one morning at breakfast in the city of Belgrade and I said to the man next to me—I did not know whether he could speak English or not—“Do you speak English?” He answered that he could, and I entered into conversation with him. Before we were through he said: “When I was one in the cabinet at home

I made for my country a homestead law patterned after the homestead law of the United States and it has done great good." There is not a nation in this world that is not looking to this country; we are giving inspiration to all countries. We have nerved the arm of men to fight for political and religious liberty. (Applause.) We have helped the world. Our light shines throughout the world and when we do anything good in this country for our people it has its influence on lands everywhere. (Applause.) I found that everywhere the name of America is known and that the example of America has influence. Oh what an opportunity! When people can do something, not for 80 millions, but for 1500 millions! And, my friends, I believe that in the years to come our country is going to leave the world under additional obligations to it because of the light which it gives forth, and the example which it sets. In the great struggle between plutocracy on the one side and the masses of the people on the other, our action is going to affect the civilized world. My hope is that we may so act that the people who struggle beneath oppression anywhere shall be able to look upward to our flag and thank God that there is one flag that stands for justice and for the rights of man. (Long continued applause.)

THE SULLIVAN CASE

Mr. Bryan delivered two addresses at Chicago, Tuesday, September 4. In the afternoon he addressed the Iroquois Club at luncheon and in the evening he addressed the Jefferson Club at a banquet. Following are extracts from Mr. Bryan's evening address:

"The trust issue is at present the paramount issue, and unless more is done in the next two years than has been done in the last two to apply remedies on this subject, it is likely to be more prominent as an issue two years hence than now. There has not been a time since the trust question began to be discussed when anything like a majority of the people could be counted as defenders of the trust system. The trust has lived and thrived and fattened upon the public because of the ability of

the trust magnates to control politics through party machinery and through candidates selected by them for office or corrupted by them in office. The democratic party has the opportunity of its life, and upon it rests a responsibility such as it has seldom borne. The president has awakened the public to a realization of the dangers involved in trust supremacy, but his party is powerless to apply a remedy because of the control which the great monopolistic corporations exercise over the party, and the democratic party cannot hope to win the confidence of the people and secure a victory at the polls so long as its honesty of purpose can be doubted.

“The honesty of a party’s purpose is shown, not merely by its platform or the speeches of its candidates and supporters, but by the character of the men who are intrusted with the party management.

“Illinois presents a case in point, and I take this opportunity to state my position in regard to the national committeeman from this state, Mr. Roger Sullivan. As you all know, I wrote him a letter, asking him to resign from the national committee in the interest of the democratic party. I explained to him that his corporate connections made it impossible for him to help the party so long as he was in official position, but stated that were that the only objection, the matter might be dealt with at the state convention two years hence. I pointed out to him that as he held his seat by fraud, there could be no harmony in the democratic party in the state until he, by resigning, showed his respect for the wishes of the majority of the delegates of the last state convention. Had he resigned he would have been given credit for a desire to advance the interests of the party, but instead of doing so he asked for an indorsement from the state convention. He charged that I was deceived by Mr. Dunlap. The charge was so obviously untrue that it ought not to have deceived anyone. I examined into the conduct of the Springfield convention before I took part in the attempt to unseat him, and at the St. Louis convention I had in writing a request for his repudiation signed by more than half of the delegates to the convention. Had Mr. Sullivan any of the instincts of a democrat, had he the first conception of what democracy means, he would not have consented to hold his place

against the wishes of the convention. The most fundamental of all democratic principles is the right of the majority to rule, and the man who consciously and purposely ignores it has no claim to the name of democrat. At the recent state convention the delegates, although they did not vote directly on the question to ask his resignation, voted to table the resolution and that may be accepted as a vote of indorsement. This gives him his position for two years more. It must be remembered, however, that the issue against Mr. Sullivan was not raised in time to have it settled at the primaries, and his indorsement must be accepted, not as an indorsement by the voters, but as an indorsement by the convention, and anyone acquainted with politics will recognize that there is often a wide distinction between these two kinds of indorsement.

“The question now is, what can the democracy of Illinois do to register its protest against the kind of politics for which Mr. Sullivan stands? That is the question in which I, as a democrat, am interested, for the question which arises in Illinois will arise in all the other states where the corporations attempt to obtain control of the party organization, and the position which democrats take on this Illinois controversy must be consistent with the position that they take on similar questions in other states.

“What is the objection to Mr. Sullivan?

“He is a high official in a franchise holding corporation, which is constantly seeking favors at the hands of the government. He is familiar with all the methods employed by such corporations to gain from local and state governments special favors and privileges. I hold that no man who is officially connected with a corporation that is seeking privileges ought to act as a member of a political organization, because he cannot represent his corporation and the people at the same time. He cannot serve the public while he is seeking to promote the financial interests of the corporation with which he is connected. The national committeeman is usually consulted by the administration in the making of appointments, and a man like Mr. Sullivan would not be a fair judge as to the merits of different democratic applicants. I do not know how you feel about it, but I am opposed to allow-

ing a man situated as he is to use the public treasury to pay the debts that he owes to those who help his corporation to take advantage of the public, and therefore, I insist that the fight should be commenced today to prevent his re-election to the national committee. And what I say of him, I say of aspirants for positions in the party organization in other states. If the democratic party has not virtue enough to spew out those who traffic in politics for the advantage of the corporations to which they belong, it does not deserve victory nor can it hope for it.

“Mark the distinctions between the legitimate corporations organized for business purposes only, and the corporations which secure special privileges and grow rich out of favors secured, not from the people themselves, but from representatives of the people.

“If you say that I have no right to interfere in the politics of this state, I reply that I am simply applying to the politics of Illinois a principle which I believe ought to be applied universally, and I am too much interested in the success of the democratic party and in the success of the principles for which it stands, to allow those who are friendly to me to be deceived by the resolution that was adopted at the last state convention. I do not regard it as a compliment to be indorsed for the presidency by a convention which indorsed Mr. Sullivan. I told them in advance that I did not want an indorsement under such circumstances and I repudiate it. If my nomination for any office depended upon that indorsement, I would not accept it. Mr. Sullivan is not my friend, although he pretended to be before this discussion arose. He would not have allowed me to be indorsed if he could have prevented it, but instead of opposing me like a man, he attempted to link his name with mine and thus secure an indorsement for himself. I object to him as a political associate. He is an able man, a clever man, and personally a very genial fellow. The corporations could not afford to employ any other kind to do their political work; but my only political asset is the confidence that the people have in my sincerity, and I do not want to have that confidence shattered by intimacy with men of his political methods. Those who voted to indorse me were either deceived themselves or thought they could deceive me. If they were deceived, they will be glad to

be undeceived; if they thought to deceive me, they will have more respect for me when they find that they did not succeed.

“What can the democrats of Illinois do at this time? Let me suggest that every candidate for office who wants the people to have confidence in him should announce that he is opposed to Mr. Sullivan’s methods, that he repudiates his leadership, and will oppose his re-election. He can thus make an issue between the aggressions of corporate wealth and the people, and let the people know on which side he stands. I do not hesitate to express the opinion that no man running on the democratic ticket in Illinois is entitled to the support of democrats in this crisis who either stands with Mr. Sullivan or is afraid to oppose him. It is not the time for cowards. There are times when men can slide into office by dodging issues, but when the life of the party and its chances for success depend upon its establishing its character, those who are not with the people are against them, and those who refuse to speak out must expect their silence to be construed as acquiescence in corporate domination.

“Do you ask me whether a candidate can advance his chances for election by repudiating Mr. Sullivan and the state committee, which he controls, or which at least sympathizes with him? I cannot answer, but I deny that any candidate has a right to make his action depend upon expediency. I will express it as an opinion, however, that the man who opposes Mr. Sullivan boldly will be stronger with the people than the man who either indorses him or is silent. Mr. Sullivan asphyxiated the state convention, but I do not believe that he can asphyxiate the voters of the state. Some of the political leaders may be willing to let the Ogden Gas Company dominate the democratic party in Illinois, but I will not believe that the people will consent to it until the issue has been made and their verdict has been rendered.”

IN NEBRASKA

As soon as I return from a three weeks’ trip through the South I shall enter the campaign in Nebraska and several other states from which invitations have been

received. I feel deeply interested in the result in this state. The republicans have nominated an excellent man for governor. Mr. Sheldon was a captain in my regiment, and I learned to admire him during our association in Florida and Georgia. If it were purely a personal matter I might rejoice in his election, but our candidate, Mr. Shallenberger, is his equal in character and ability and has had larger experience in public affairs. In addition to this, Mr. Shallenberger is running on a better platform and would, if elected, be more free to carry out needed reforms. I have known Mr. Shallenberger for many years, have confidence in his integrity and am proud of the record which he made in congress. He was one of the best congressmen this state ever sent to Washington and he will, I believe, make one of the best governors this state has had. He is not only in favor of the rigid enforcement of railroad regulation and the two cent passenger fare, but he advocated the government ownership of railroads before I did.

The election in Nebraska is not only important because of its bearing upon state matters, but it is also important because of its influence upon the next national campaign. The vote this year will be taken as an indication of the trend of public sentiment. We are entering upon a great fight for the extermination of the trusts and for the protection of the public from exploitation at the hands of the railroads. The republican party has shown its inability to deal effectively with these and kindred subjects. Wherever the president has attempted to do anything he has been compelled to follow the democratic rather than the republican platform and the republicans in the house and senate have not supported him. The republican senate emasculated his rate bill, and a republican congress opposed his meat inspection bill.

The best way to stand by the president is to elect democrats to congress and the senate, for the democrats have stood by him better than the republicans upon the most important questions.

Even the president, while prosecuting some trusts, has not aimed a blow at the principle of private monopoly and so far he has not dared to oppose the protected industries even when they are selling abroad cheaper than they sell at home. A democratic victory in Nebraska

would show the republican leaders that something must be done; a republican victory would simply reassure them and delay remedial legislation. Our democratic candidates for congress stand much nearer the people than the republican candidates and their election would have a wholesome influence at this time. Mr. Green, the candidate for lieutenant governor, and nearly all the other candidates on the fusion state ticket, are old time personal and political friends and I shall be glad to give them any assistance I can upon my return.

Hon. W. H. Thompson, our candidate for the United States senate, is admirably qualified for the position to which he aspires, and he has earned the honor by faithful service during nearly two decades. We need him in the United States senate at this time to secure the election of United States senators by the people—a reform which nine-tenths of the people, republicans as well as democrats, favor, but which a republican senate delays. I am glad that the democrats and populists are working together and our ticket ought to have the earnest support of all the members of these parties and a large republican vote besides.

W. J. BRYAN.

MR. BRYAN'S RECEPTION AT LINCOLN

Mr. and Mrs. Bryan and party arrived at Lincoln at 5 o'clock on the afternoon of Wednesday, September 5. The following are extracts from the report of the *Nebraska State Journal*, published at Lincoln:

William Jennings Bryan came home to his home folks yesterday. Since landing on American soil he has been meeting "home folks," but the meeting last evening excelled all, and the Lincoln reception was the one that most touched his heart. He said so. That statement was made from the north balcony of the state capitol before a sea of upturned faces, covering between three and four acres. From the train he had been followed by his enthusiastic admirers to the home of his brother. There he was compelled to say a few words expressing his pleasure at meeting home friends. He dismissed his admirers there that he might refresh himself, promising

to meet them later on at the state capitol. When he appeared on the balcony at 7:30, before a field covered with human beings crowded together as thickly as they could stand, he was greeted with a mighty cheer—one that began at that point in the crowd where he could first be seen and rolled over the mass like a mighty wave as he came into full view. Thousands who were there could not hear a word he said, but they saw him and they made known their presence. The voice of Mr. Bryan, strong and clear as it is, was not equal to the task set, and only those in a limited area could understand clearly what he said. Thousands stood with upturned faces during his entire address, unable to hear a word, but pleased and entertained at the scene before them.

Mr. and Mrs. Bryan returned home from their globe girding tour in good health, although fatigued by inconveniences of travel and the strenuous life they have been leading during the past week. Reports that have gained currency in the east to the effect that Mr. Bryan is in poor health are untrue. His friends who met him here congratulated him on his personal appearance. He never appeared more natural than when he faced the audience at the capitol. The non-partisan character of the welcome, the congratulations that reached him on every side, the great array of citizens spread before him and the ring of welcome in the air on his home coming day were features to please, and Mr. Bryan was pleased. Mr. Bryan's ability to rest when opportunity offers has aided him in the strenuous week just ended. It was related that on the way from Omaha last evening he slept part of the way. Dropping down in a seat in the car he was soon recuperating lost energy in refreshing sleep.

After a year's absence from his home city many of his neighbors desired to greet him. He rode with bared head through the streets, recognizing his friends and neighbors on every hand. Passing down South Seventeenth street, where the family formerly lived, his attention was frequently directed to personal friends waving to him from the curb. At the reception they met him and shook his hand, congratulated him on his safe return, and emphasized the home welcoming. His partisan friends

were more than usually exuberant, and they predicted for him political success sufficient to cure the political failures he has endured in the past.

Mr. Bryan arrived in the city at 5 p. m. A mounted escort was on hand to take him to the home of his brother, Charles W. Bryan, at Nineteenth and Washington streets. Notwithstanding the fact that no parade was planned, there was a parade. Six Nebraska bands furnished music, and hundreds of people followed the carriages containing Mr. Bryan, his family and his friends the entire distance. The following along O street was too great for the width of that wide thoroughfare, and traffic of all kinds was suspended while it passed. When Mr. Bryan arrived at the home of his brother, people crowded about the front porch and demanded a speech. He was worn from the journey and in need of refreshments, yet he smilingly acquiesced and thanked the people for their interest in him and their welcome on his return.

From the depot to the state house thousands followed the carriages, the bands, and the footmen. At the state house the size of the parade diminished appreciably, people going to the lawn where they remained until the speaking and reception, two hours later. From the moment the procession passed the state house the crowd began to gather there, and it increased in size rapidly from that time on until the end of the program.

In the early evening Mrs. Bryan stayed in the room adjoining the balcony for the speakers and chatted with members of the reception committee. She looked very well but showed many signs of fatigue when her face was not animated. A friend took her to a window from which the crowd could be seen in its immensity and suggested that it would be entirely too great an ordeal for her to attempt to shake hands with so many people. "I have shaken hands wherever else we have stopped," she said, "and of course I want to shake hands with the home people." When the crowd was admitted she was most gracious in distributing her greetings.

Mrs. Bryan has an inflexible rule of never submitting to a personal interview, but in talking with friends she referred briefly to experiences abroad. She said that

the trip was particularly wearing on account of the hardships encountered in the far-away countries visited, due to the lack of conveniences and comforts in the mode of living. The conditions of the women among other nations, of course, interested her greatly. She said that such a trip could not fail to strengthen the patriotism of a traveler.

The supreme court rooms at the state house were filled with members of the reception committee at 7:30 and quite a number of them found places on the balcony. There and in the governor's office Mr. Bryan met members of the committee, the governor and state officers.

Mayor Brown acted as presiding officer at the state house. He introduced Dr. George W. Martin, pastor of the little country church which the Bryans attend, who offered the following prayer:

“Most Glorious God, our Heavenly Father, in whom we live and have our being, we render unto Thy name humble thanks for the mercies shown and protection given to Thy servant, our illustrious fellow citizen, whom we delight to honor, in his journey around the world. We rejoice that Thou hast been pleased to conduct him safely, and permitted him to return with his family to their home. We adore Thee, that righteousness exalteth a nation, and that the man who trusteth in Thee shall be blessed, and as we have learned that every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, grant to us as a nation whose foundation is laid upon the eternal truths of God, that spirit which shall enable us to do for the best interests of all the people, and may no selfish motive be permitted to influence the actions of those in authority. We are thankful that harmony and prosperity prevail in our land, and may those who may be chosen to direct the affairs of state be guided by divine power. Most Gracious God, as Thy servant has hitherto been led in a precious way, we beseech Thee to impress upon his mind and heart the truths he has received, so that he may be able to fill the position to which he may be divinely called to the happiness of the world and Thy glory. Amen.”

MAYOR BROWN SPEAKS

Mayor Brown then said: "Twelve days ago I left Lincoln with a party of good Nebraskans to meet at New York on his return after a year's absence our most distinguished citizen and his family, and it affords me the greatest pleasure, as the executive officer of our beautiful city, that I am able this evening to welcome him home.

"I regret exceedingly that every one of you could not be with me to see the ovation that has been given him at every point since he put his feet upon American soil. It has been one continuous outburst of enthusiasm. Pride in my citizenship of Lincoln and my position as the city's executive has increased with every mile we have traveled.

"We in Lincoln have long known his work, and it has been most pleasing to me to witness the growing recognition elsewhere of his moral and intellectual grandeur. And now, fellow citizens, I realize that no words of mine, though I were gifted with his eloquence, could begin to speak as does the presence of such a gathering as this.

"Before introducing Governor Mickey, who will extend the greetings of the state, Mr. Bryan, I, as mayor, welcome you home, not as a statesman, not as a democrat, but as that dearest to us all, our beloved neighbor."

Mayor Brown introduced Governor Mickey, who welcomed Mr. Bryan home.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME

Governor Mickey said: "Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bryan, Ladies and Gentlemen: The poet and the musician have immortalized in both verse and song that noble sentiment so dear to every true heart, 'There's no place like home.' And so in welcoming back to his own city the distinguished neighbor who has long been separated from us we feel that there is added pathos to our greeting on this occasion because here is the family rooftree, here are the triumphs of energy and effort, here are the close associations of former years, here is home. One may wander in absorbed interest amid the pomp and splendor of other civilizations, he may be inspired by the evidences of art and culture which greet his eye and impress his mind, his charity may be deepened and his sympathy broadened

by closer contact with those whose lot has been cast in the lowlier walks of life, and yet there is always the longing for home. The heart and the affections must have an abiding place, and in that domestic center of peace and love the impressions gained by travel and research are rounded into full fruition.

“We are glad, Mr. Bryan, that you have a home in our midst. We are glad that you are an illustrious example of what the head of an American home should be. We are glad that Providence has spared the life and health of yourself and family in your arduous travels and that we can once more look into your face and listen to the greetings of your kindly voice. Not only the city of Lincoln, but the entire commonwealth shares in the felicity of this occasion and extends to you a cordial and sincere welcome back to your own. You have brought unstinted honor to us. You have given fame to your city and state in distant lands and everywhere have sustained the exalted character of an American citizen in a manner that has touched our hearts and challenged our admiration. No effort that we can make at this time can add to your honors. We simply wish to testify our appreciation of your character and attainments and let you know that your home coming is a matter in which we are all interested.

“We wish to congratulate you as well as ourselves upon the prosperous and happy condition in which you find our nation and our state upon your return. There has been something doing all the time you have been away. We are living up to higher ideals of government than when you took your departure. There has been a wonderful awakening of the public conscience on questions affecting civic righteousness. Graft and greed in many instances have been receiving their just deserts and the rights of the few have been gradually giving way to the rights of the many. There has been development and progress all along the line, but there is much more to follow for the new era of better things just beginning.

“We are especially pleased with the action of congress in crystallizing into law the popular will regarding railroad rate legislation, and we believe that this is the entering wedge into an approximately equitable adjustment of the differences existing between the masses of the

people on the one hand and the public service corporations on the other. Again, we are impressed with the wisdom of the Panama canal construction act, a measure which we think will add greatly to our national prestige as well as our commercial development. The passage of the pure food bill is also an upward step and means infinite betterment of the great army of consumers who have long been the victims of the cupidity of unscrupulous manufacturers of food products. These and many other enactments unerringly indicate that the day of better things is upon us and we are glad to challenge your attention to the improvement. Nor is Nebraska lagging in the procession of progress. The public pulse here is keenly alive to every element entering into the attainment of just and equitable laws and the only discordant note is that sounded by the professional 'reformers' whose creed is self interest and whose sincerity is a minus quantity. All parties are afflicted with these unique characters, but fortunately by their fruits we know them. The pendulum swings over a described arc but it is not at the extreme ends that the real work is performed. The middle ground is the real center of energy and from that point proceeds the accomplishment of genuine, practical results.

"I am pleased to note that the first message our friend brings to this country is a 'message of peace.' With interest I have read his utterance regarding the progress of the cause of international arbitration and I am glad to have his assurance that the day is fast approaching when force and violence will give way to a peaceful solution of vexed questions. In this connection it is especially pleasing to recall the very practical and efficient action of President Roosevelt in connection with the drafting and adoption of the Portsmouth treaty, which ended the war between Russia and Japan and determined the final differences between those belligerent nations. In the face of the extreme difficulties presented, and which you will remember, the efforts of the president of this republic were heroic and to him largely belongs the credit for the restoration of peace. This is an indication of the trend of popular sentiment in America along peaceful lines and I believe the time is coming, and not far dis-

tant, when pacific diplomacy at Washington will dissipate the war clouds, no matter on what horizon they appear.

“We all believe that the ultimate destiny of America is to become the dominating influence in the control of the world’s affairs. There are many evidences that we have arrived at that state of development already, but if so we believe our pre-eminence will become more marked as the years pass by. Such a national attainment brings with it an infinite responsibility. It is a responsibility which all citizens must share. If we are, or are to become, the great national exemplar of power, dignity and enlightenment each individual must live well his part and make some substantial contribution to the fund of national excellence. Our personal tasks and duties cannot be discharged by others. It is only as we assume and perform the individual obligations of citizenship that the condition of the body politic can be raised to the highest plane. We must have leaders, but it ought not to be necessary for these leaders to live far in advance of public opinion. Rather it should be their happy lot to crystallize public thought into definite action instead of educating the popular mind to the necessity for such action.

“It is not possible for us all to see alike and there are honest differences of opinion affecting every great question. The best assurance we have of continued progress is that all national problems are studied from more than one viewpoint. All virtue is not confined to one political party, nor is all evil bound up in the other. We need more of the spirit of tolerance and reason in our mutual relations. It would be a blessing if we could have less of politics and more of patriotism.

“But we are here to briefly welcome our distinguished guest back to the ‘simple life,’ though we doubt if we can hold him to it very long. Speaking from the standpoint of my party, he has caused us a good deal of uneasiness in the past and has strong symptoms of continuing to do so in the future. There is that breadth, virility and emphasis about him which must find expression and it is but natural that his party looks to him as its leader. We hope that the inspiration of this formal home-coming, expressive as it is of the confidence, devotion and esteem of those who know him best, may give him renewed courage for the discharge of his arduous duties and

strengthen him in the advocacy of all principles which make for the national good.”

Mayor Brown then presented Mr. Bryan, who said:

“Mr. Mayor, Governor, Members of the Reception Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen: In the Arabic language there are some six hundred words which mean ‘camel,’ and for the last few days I have been wishing that there were that many words in the English language which meant ‘thank you.’ I have had occasion to use the old familiar term ‘thank you’ a great many times since I landed in New York. In London I had occasion to regret that I could speak but one language in that meeting where the representatives of twenty-six nations were assembled; but if I could speak all the languages known to man I would not be able to express the gratitude which my wife and I feel for the generous welcome which has been extended to us on our return home. The home folks met us in the harbor of New York, and I never looked into the faces of a group of friends more gladly in my life. They took charge of us, and they have floated us upon a stream of welcome 1,500 miles long, several leagues wide, and of immeasurable depth, until that stream has emptied itself into this ocean of good-will. To come home to those among whom we live and find this kindly feeling touches our hearts; to find those who differ from us in political opinion vieing with those who agree with us to make our reception delightful, more than pays us for anything that we have been able to do.

“It is kind of our dear old minister to offer the invocation and my heart joins his in its ascent to the throne of God in gratitude for that providence which has kept us amid the dangers of foreign lands and brought us safely through the perils of the deep. It is kind in the chief executive of the city to welcome us to this, his rich domain; and it is kind in the governor of this great state to join in giving us a greeting as we come home. The fact that Governor Mickey, with whom I have not always been able to entirely agree, has overlooked the opposition that has sometimes arisen, only shows how much there is in life that we can enjoy together, and how little, after all, political differences ought to count between men. I might describe it thus, that the things that we hold in common

are like the sunshine of the day, while partisan differences are like the clouds that come and in a moment pass away.

“I am glad to be here with you, and I speak for my wife and children as well as for myself, when I thank you a thousand, thousand times. I do not know how I can repay you for the joy you have given us, unless you will permit me as occasion offers to bring such lessons as I am able to bring from what we have observed in other lands. When we conceived this trip around the earth, it was with the belief that there would be education in it. We thought so highly of it that we were willing to take the children out of school for a year, and I believe that it was worth more than a year’s education. But it has been instructive far beyond what we imagined, and we have been able to store up information that will not only be valuable in the years to come, but will give us something to reflect upon in the closing years of our lives. I have for years appreciated the honor and the responsibility of American citizenship. Twenty-two years ago when I returned to my college to receive the Masters’ Degree I took as the subject of my address, ‘American Citizenship,’ and as I recall the language that I then used I am sure that even then I understood somewhat of the importance of our nation’s position among the nations of the earth. During the nearly a quarter of a century that has elapsed my appreciation of my nation’s greatness has increased, but never has my pride in my nation grown as it has during the past year.

“Following the sun in his course around the globe, I have noted everywhere the effect of American influence. Before I left home I had spoken at times of altruism and its part in the world’s affairs. But, my friends, I have learned something of altruism since I was last among you, and I affirm without fear of contradiction that there is no nation on earth which manifests such disinterested friendship for the human race as this dear land of ours. Not only do I affirm that our nation has no equal living, but I affirm that history presents no example like ours. In many ways our nation is leading the world. I have found in every land I have visited a growth of ideas that underlie our government. A century and a quarter ago certain political doctrines were planted on American soil,

and those doctrines have grown and spread until there is not a nation on earth that has not felt the impulse that was started in this country at that time. There is not a nation in the world in which the democratic idea is not moving and moving powerfully today. Go into Japan and you will find that they not only have a representative government, but that they are continually endeavoring to make that government more responsive to the sentiment of the people. Go into China, that great nation which has slumbered for twenty centuries, and you will find that there is a stirring there and that the Dowager Empress has within a year sent commissioners abroad to investigate the institutions of other lands with the purpose of granting a constitutional government to the flowery kingdom.

“Within a year public opinion in Russia has forced a reluctant czar to grant a douma, and while that douma has been dissolved it has been dissolved with the promise that another shall take its place. Not only do you find the democratic sentiment—and I need not tell you that I use the word in no partisan sense—not only is this spreading, but education is spreading throughout the world.

“It is still true that millions, yes, hundreds of millions, sit in darkness. It is true that in one of the nations of the Orient scarcely one in a hundred can read intelligently a letter written to him. It is true that in another Oriental nation less than one per cent of the women can read and write. It is true that you find many places where there is great intellectual darkness, but my friends, in every nation which I visited there is growth, there is progress. A viceroy of China declared that in five years he had established four thousand schools in his one district, that in a nation which until recently knew nothing of the public school. I found that even in Turkey they are beginning to realize the necessity for education, and the governor of one of the Turkish states told me that it was necessary that the people of Turkey should be educated if they were going to hold any place among the nations of the earth. Not only are they establishing public schools, but they are establishing private schools. Not only private schools, but schools supported by contributions from abroad.

“All over the Orient you will find schools established by Americans and supported by money contributed each year by Americans interested in the cause of education. And after having visited these schools, and the churches which stand beside them at every point at which we stopped in the Orient, we reached Bombay and found there also these schools supported by American money. I told them that if we could not boast that the sun never set upon our possessions we could boast that it never set upon American philanthropy. I am proud of this work that my country is doing, and none of us are wise enough to look into the future and see what may be done by these boys and girls who owe their intellectual training to the benevolence of American citizens. And in the presence of the ladies who grace this occasion let me say, that one who travels abroad, especially in the Orient, learns to appreciate what America does for the woman. There is no other nation in which woman stands as high as she does in the United States. There is no other nation in which woman so nearly approaches the position that the Creator intended her to fill. I have had some difficulty in bringing my countrymen to accept the double standard as applied to money. (Laughter.) I think, however, they will agree with me when I apply the double standard to man and woman, and they will forgive me if I consent to a change in the ratio from 16 to 1 to 1 to 1. (Laughter and applause.)

“Another thought that has impressed itself upon me is the superiority of our religion over the religions of the east. When I visited China I had a high conception of the philosophy of Confucius, but when I had seen Confucianism applied to human life and exemplified in Chinese society; when I had studied the words of Confucius I lost my admiration for the philosophy of Confucius. I found that there were several points where this system came into direct antagonism with the teachings of Christ. I have heard it said that Confucius gave what was equivalent to the golden rule when he said: ‘Do not unto others that which you would not have others do unto you.’ But if you will examine the difference you will find that there is a world wide space between the negative doctrine of Confucius and the positive doctrine of the Nazarene. The negative doctrine is not sufficient.

Life means something better than negative harmlessness; it means positive helpfulness prompted by love for mankind.

“Once when Confucius was asked what he thought of the doctrine that you should do good to those who injure you, his reply was that you should recompense good with good, and evil with justice; but Christ says love your enemies, and do good to those that hate you. How can you know what justice is if revenge is rankling in your bosom? Christ gave us the doctrine that takes from the heart the desire for revenge; by putting love in its place, He makes it possible for men to know what justice is.

“And as we traveled through India and saw the idolatry that one finds there; as we saw them dip up water from the so-called sacred Ganges; as we saw them bathing the limbs of the dead in these waters to consecrate them before they were burned; as we watched them in their devotion and in their superstitions, our hearts turned with love and longing to the little churches of this country where God is worshiped in a different way.

“But, my friends, I am not here to speak to you tonight. It has been announced that we are to have the pleasure of shaking hands with you as soon as I have concluded my remarks. I have been taking a survey of this audience. Mrs. Bryan and I have at times shaken hands with as many as 3,600 an hour, and I have been looking over this audience and wondering how high the sun would be in the sky tomorrow morning when we are through. As we have not had our full quota of sleep since we landed in New York I must not postpone that sleep too long. I shall not occupy more of your time than to say that we come home again with delight. We have seen nothing abroad that is so dear to us as home.

“Tonight we shall not rest on the trembling bosom of the mighty deep; we shall rest rather on these billowy plains of the boundless west, and I am sure that the alfalfa scented air of these lands will be sweeter than the spicy breezes of Ceylon. And I know that in our home upon the hill where we can meet you and talk over the days when we have been absent we will be far happier than we would be in any castle on the Rhine.”

Mr. Bryan was cheered lustily and long. The doors of the state house were opened and the crowd filed through.

The reception was in the rotunda of the capitol. It was attended by many thousands of people desirous of grasping the hands of Mr. and Mrs. Bryan. The people thronged the capitol grounds and until near the end of the reception it was impossible for one to get within forty feet or more of the entrance of the building. The crowd while waiting, however, was entertained by the elegant display of fireworks from the front of the capitol grounds.

THE RECEPTION AT NORMAL

The immediate neighbors of Mr. Bryan at Normal, the village which Fairview adjoins, tendered to Mr. and Mrs. Bryan a reception Friday evening, September 7. The following is from the Lincoln (Neb.) *Journal's* report:

“Do nothing till you hear from Normal,” was the cablegram said to have been sent to W. J. Bryan by Uncle Jake Wolfe of Normal when Lincoln, Omaha and New York City were striving to be the first to receive Mr. Bryan on his return from abroad. Mr. Bryan could not help it because New York City, Detroit, Chicago and Lincoln got the first chance to receive him. His real home coming was celebrated Friday night at the suburb of Normal, a village a short distance from his country home, “Fairview,” and where he and his family are attendants at the Methodist Episcopal Church at Normal. Mr. and Mrs. Bryan are both teachers of Sunday-school classes in that church and it was there that 400 people of the community gathered to greet them. The grounds surrounding the church were decorated with many Chinese lanterns and with flags and flowers. Many people were obliged to stand during the reception and the rendition of the program that had been arranged. J. A. Brown presided. The singing of America was first on the program. Dr. George W. Martin, pastor of the church, made a brief address of welcome on behalf of the church. He assured Mr. Bryan that the people of the church ap-

preciated him and were glad he had been returned to them. J. V. Wolfe extended a hearty welcome on behalf of the citizens of Normal. D. R. Tuttle welcomed him on behalf of the Sunday-school. Mr. Bryan responded with an address on the work of American missionaries in foreign countries and a description of his travels in the Holy Land. He said he came home thoroughly convinced of the propriety of the work being done by American missionaries in foreign lands and of continuing that work. Mrs. Bryan was called for and made a few remarks and presented to Dr. Martin for the church two plates for the taking of collections that were obtained in Jerusalem and which were made of olive wood. Mr. and Mrs. Bryan shook hands with the people and the reception closed with a song.

The following are extracts from the *Lincoln News'* report: "Uncle Jake" Wolfe was presented to voice the welcome of the community of Normal, which he did in the following words: "Mr. and Mrs. Bryan and Family: As we have no governors nor mayors, nor even a justice of the peace or constable, in Normal, I have been called upon as an humble citizen to deliver to you a few words of welcome on your return back to our midst, and to your beautiful home on yonder hill. While it has been my good fortune to perform many pleasing duties, none has ever been so delightfully pleasing as the one now before me. You left us, your nearest neighbors, almost a year ago, and have since been rocked upon the railroads of almost every land, and rocked in the cradle of almost every sea in the known world. While our eyes have not been able to follow you in all your wide and winding paths, our solicitude and our prayers have followed the windings of every highway, and in the wake of every vessel that bore you from us and that has brought you safely back to us again. We meet here this evening in this modest little church, within which are so many pleasing recollections of yourselves, in this village of your real neighbors and home folks, to greet your return and welcome you again to our midst. While I acknowledge that the name Bryan, like a few, and only a few, other names in American history, is too great for any one people to claim or any one country to appropriate to itself, yet history should be kept at least as straight as any lady's bonnet on an Easter

Sunday. These people here tonight, Mr. and Mrs. Bryan, I want to say in the truth of history, are your real home folks, and even in a Bible sense, are your real neighbors. It is true that in a wider sense you belong not only to the city of Lincoln and the state of Nebraska, and to our common country, but to the world and to humanity at large. While this is our common country, known and honored throughout the world, whose government and institutions are the inspiration of every aspiring heart, and the terror of every oppressor's heel, and whose flag is an open sesame to the entrance or the exit of any port of any nation on earth, yet in a narrower, and perhaps in a more selfish, sense we still claim you as a citizen of Normal. Of course we would not rob Nebraska, the state of your adoption, and the one you love so well, and to whose bright star on the blue of our flag you have added so much luster, of the just pride she feels in claiming you as a citizen. Nor of the city of Lincoln, our beautiful capital city, and your former home, and around whose very name cluster so many hallowed memories. But while your abiding place is everywhere and in the hearts of all the people, your home is in Normal, and we who are here tonight are 'it,' with a capital 'I.' Normal is in voting precinct No. 4, in road district No. 3, and in school district No. 2, Lancaster precinct, Lancaster county, Nebraska; and while I would not for the world, Mr. Bryan, in your presence, and with these surroundings, make the slightest allusion to politics, yet it is my candid opinion that you could and would receive a majority, if not the unanimous, vote of all these, your neighbors, for any office to which you might hereafter see fit to aspire. We know you as only near neighbors can know each other. We, however, do not claim to be your only true friends. We simply wish to be reckoned among the number. We know and rejoice in the knowledge that your friends are everywhere, numberless almost as the sands upon the seashore, and scattered like the leaves of the forest. But I was admonished to be short in my remarks. These greetings between friends after long separation are indeed pleasant, and yet how feebly can words express what hearts so often feel. To say that all the citizens of Normal, from Grandfather West to the youngest child that has learned to lisp the

name of Bryan, welcome you back to our midst from your world wide wanderings is all that our poor command of language can express. Few of us, it is true, met you in the bay and greeted you on the waters and guarded and guided your footsteps home. Mr. Cutright, I believe, is the only Normalite who enjoyed that pleasure, and while the reason might be somewhat embarrassing to most, and perhaps all of us, I will say it was not for want of a desire to do so. But you needed no words of men at the beginning to insure you of a hearty welcome home. The handshake, the eye, the voice, every gesture of every Normalite you have met has been a heartier welcome than any words that I could command. But if you remember only one thing that I have said to you this evening, let that one thing be that it is Normal, the small and, it may be, despised town, but the Nazareth of the nations, that welcomes you last and most lovingly."

D. R. Tuttle, the village grocer and head of the Sunday-school, spoke the welcome of the latter organization, and asked the audience to join in the singing of the hymn for which Mr. Bryan had often expressed his preference, No. 104 in the book of "Pentecostal Hymns." "I'll Go Where You Want Me to Go," was its title, and Mr. and Mrs. Bryan joined the audience heartily in singing it.

A FEW WORDS WITH COMMONER SUBSCRIBERS

I am deeply indebted to the subscribers of THE COMMONER for the loyal support which they have given to the paper in my absence and for the interest which they have taken in the extension of its circulation. While I left the paper in good hands and am more than pleased with the manner in which it has been conducted, I am glad to be at the helm again, for there is much I desire to say concerning the issues before the country. The tremendous growth in public sentiment in favor of the policies for which the democratic party has been contending must be gratifying to you as it has been to me. Events have vindicated our position and strengthened public confidence in our party. Even on the money question the soundness of our arguments has been demon-

strated by the improved conditions which have followed an increase in the currency. The money question has been eliminated as an issue only, because an unexpected and unprecedented increase in the production of gold has brought relief from the appreciation of the dollar and lifted prices toward the bimetallic level. On all other questions our position has been strengthened by the failure of the republican party to bring any material relief. It continues a policy of imperialism at an enormous expense to the country, while a promise to the Filipinos, like the promise made to the Cubans, would reduce expenses and restore our country to its legitimate position as an advocate of government resting upon the consent of the governed. It has refused to reform the tariff even where the tariff has become the bulwark of trusts—yes, even when the protected interests have shown their ingratitude by selling abroad at a lower price than they sell at home. It has failed to satisfy the demands of the laboring element of the country. Where the republican party has made any progress, it has made it along democratic lines. It promised to do nothing on the trust question, and where the president has attempted to enforce the law, he has done so in accordance with the demands made by the democratic party years ago. His recommendations on the question were also in line with the democratic platform, but a republican senate very much weakened the bill which the president asked for and which the democratic members of the house and senate almost unanimously favored.

The president has educated the people to an indorsement of many of the democratic policies which were violently denounced a few years ago, and there is every prospect now of a democratic victory in 1908. Whether we shall succeed at the polls rests largely in the hands of the democrats themselves, and I take this opportunity to point out the two things which, in my judgment, will most contribute to that success.

First, the presentation of democratic arguments to the public. Every democrat should make himself a committee of one to get the democratic position before the public, for that position will grow in favor as it is better understood. Democratic speeches which present the democratic position clearly ought to be circulated. The local

papers which champion democratic ideas ought to be heartily supported, not only for the good that the editorials do, but for the encouragement which enthusiastic support gives to those who write the editorials.

Second, the organization of the democratic party must be in sympathy with the people. When the tariff question was the paramount issue, the party demanded that the members of the organization should be in harmony with the party's purpose to reform the tariff; when the money question was the paramount issue, the people demanded that the members of the organization should be in harmony with the party platform on that subject; when imperialism was the paramount issue, the people demanded that the members of the organization should be in harmony with the party's avowed policy. Upon no other basis can a fight be made. Individuals may dissent from parts of the platform—they may even dissent from the party's position on the question declared by the party to be paramount—but candidates and members of the organization, if known to be antagonistic to the party's purpose, cannot render any services sufficiently important to overcome the damage done by their attitude. So today, when the trust issue is the paramount issue, the democratic candidates and the democratic organization must stand out boldly against corporate domination in politics.

NO MAN WHO IS OFFICIALLY CONNECTED WITH A CORPORATION THAT IS SEEKING PRIVILEGES OUGHT TO ACT AS A MEMBER OF A POLITICAL ORGANIZATION BECAUSE HE CANNOT REPRESENT HIS CORPORATION AND THE PEOPLE AT THE SAME TIME. HE CANNOT SERVE THE PARTY WHILE HE IS SEEKING TO PROMOTE THE FINANCIAL INTERESTS OF THE CORPORATION WITH WHICH HE IS CONNECTED.

This may be accepted as axiomatic. It is the statement of an old-fashioned truth which none can dispute. It is simply a paraphrase of the Bible declaration that "no man can serve two masters." Upon so simple a proposition there should be no dispute. If you believe with me in the importance of having the democratic organization free from the taint of corporate control,

I urge you to present this matter to your neighbors and to apply the principle to your local and state as well as national organizations. Doubtless there are many democrats connected with these corporations—some of them officially—who would put the good of the party above the interests of their corporations, but such men know enough about human nature to know how impossible it is to convince the public of their disinterestedness, and if they really feel a deep interest in the party's success they will not thrust themselves upon the party in an official way or even allow themselves to be persuaded to become officers of the party organization. It is no reflection upon them personally to say that they cannot aid their party in this capacity.

Believing that you earnestly desire a real democratic victory—a victory which, instead of being barren of fruit, will bring relief to the people and establish the party in public confidence for years, I take the liberty of presenting these suggestions to you.

W. J. BRYAN.

A WALL STREET CONFESSION

Bryan's COMMONER makes merry over the fact that the *Wall Street Journal* some days ago declared that it has always accepted the quantitative theory of money. THE COMMONER says:

“Can a democrat be blamed if he becomes a bit dizzy these days when he sees men who, in 1896, sneered at the democratic doctrine hurry to plant themselves upon the Chicago platform?”

It is one thing to accept the quantitative theory of money, meaning thereby that the great production of gold, by reason largely of cheapened cost of mining, has so stimulated industry as to advance prices. It is quite another thing to accept the Bryan proposition of the free silver coinage at the rate of 16 to 1.—*Wall Street Journal*.

But when the *Wall Street Journal* has admitted the “quantitative theory” it has agreed to the basis of all arguments in favor of bimetallism.

What the *Journal* calls the “16 to 1 proposition” was the bugaboo raised to frighten those who did not under-

stand the real issue. In order to establish bimetallism a ratio was necessary. When the republican newspapers and periodicals persuaded thoughtless men to sneer at "16 to 1" they did not tell their readers that the thing at which they sneered was the historic ratio, and was in fact then—as it is now—the legal ratio.

The weakness of the "16 to 1" criticism would have been demonstrated had the mints been opened to silver as they are to gold, and it has recently been noted that even the purchase of the comparatively small amount of silver by the treasury department has had a marked influence upon the price of the white metal.

But we will not quarrel with the *Journal* on the "16 to 1 proposition" now that it has boldly confessed the error of the position taken by the single standard advocate in 1896.

MR. BRYAN AND GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

Mr. Bryan's statement at Louisville with respect to his position on government ownership follows:

Before addressing myself to other subjects which I wish to discuss, I beg your indulgence while I present a statement in regard to one question concerning which my attitude has, to some extent, been misrepresented.

In my speech at the New York reception I made some remarks concerning the government ownership of railways and I thought that I had expressed myself so clearly that my position could not be misconstrued even by those who desire to misconstrue it. The New York speech was prepared in advance. It was not only written, but it was carefully revised. It stated exactly what I wanted to state and I have nothing to withdraw or modify in the statement therein made. What I say tonight is rather in the nature of an elaboration of the ideas therein presented.

After quoting from the democratic platform of 1900 that "a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable," and after laying it down as a principle that public ownership should begin where competition ends and that the people should have the benefit of any monopoly that might be found necessary, I stated that I had reached

the conclusion "that railroads partake so much of the nature of a monopoly that they must ultimately become public property and be managed by public officials in the interests of the whole community." I added: "I do not know that the country is ready for this legislation. I do not know that the majority of my own party favors it, but I believe that an increasing number of the members of all parties see in public ownership a sure remedy for discrimination between persons and places and for the extortionate rates for the carrying of freight and passengers."

I then proceeded to outline a system of public ownership whereby the advantages of public ownership might be secured to the people without the dangers of centralization. This system contemplates federal ownership of the trunk lines only and the ownership of local lines by the several states. I further expressed it as my opinion that the railroads themselves were responsible for the growth of the sentiment in favor of public ownership and said that, while I believed that the rate bill recently enacted should be given a fair trial, we might expect to see the railroads still more active in politics unless our experience with them differed from the experience we had had with franchise holding corporations.

This statement of my views has been assailed by some as an attempt to force these views upon the democratic party, and by some as an announcement of an intention to insist upon the incorporation of these views in the next democratic national platform.

Let me answer these two charges. I have tried to make it clear that I expressed my own opinion and I have never sought to compel the acceptance of my opinion by anyone else. Reserving the right to do my own thinking, I respect the right of everyone else to do his thinking. I have too much respect for the rights of others to ask them to accept any views that I may entertain unless those views commend themselves to others and I have too much confidence in the independent thought in my own party to expect that any considerable number of democrats would acknowledge my right to do their thinking for them even if I were undemocratic enough to assert such a right.

As to platforms, I have contended always that they should be made by the voters. I have, in my speeches and through my paper, insisted that the platform should be the expression of the wishes of the voters of the party and not be the arbitrary production of one man or a few leaders.

If you ask me whether the question of government ownership will be an issue in the campaign of 1908, I answer, I do not know. If you ask me whether it ought to be in the platform, I reply, I cannot tell until I know what the democratic voters think upon the subject. If the democrats believe that the next platform should contain a plank in favor of government ownership, then that plank ought to be included. If the democrats think it ought not to contain such a plank, then such a plank ought not to be included. It rests with the party to make the platform and individuals can only advise. I have spoken for myself and for myself only, and I did not know how the suggestion would be received. I am now prepared to confess to you that it has been received more favorably than I expected. It has not been treated as harshly as I thought possibly it would be treated. That it would be denounced bitterly by some I fully expected; that it would be gravely discussed by others I hoped. There is this, however, that I do expect, namely, that those democrats who opposed government ownership will accompany their declaration against it with the assertion that they will favor government ownership whenever they are convinced that the country must choose between government ownership of the roads and railroad ownership of the government. I cannot conceive how a democrat can announce himself as opposed to government ownership, no matter to what extent the railroads carry their interference with politics and their corruption of officials. I think I may also reasonably expect that democrats who oppose government ownership will say that if government ownership must come, they prefer a system whereby the state may be preserved and the centralizing influence be reduced to a minimum. Such a plan I have proposed, and I have proposed it because I want the people to consider it and not be driven to the federal ownership of all railroads as the only alternative to private ownership. The dual plan of fed-

eral ownership of trunk lines and state ownership of local lines not only preserves the state, and even strengthens its position, but it permits the gradual adoption of government ownership as the people of different sections are ready to adopt it.

I have been slow in reaching this position and I can therefore be patient with those who now stand where I stood for years, urging strict regulation and hoping that that would be found feasible. I still advocate strict regulation and shall rejoice if experience proves that that regulation can be made effective. I will go farther than that and say that I believe we can have more efficient regulation under a democratic administration with a democratic senate and house than we are likely to have under a republican administration with a republican senate and house, and yet I would not be honest with you if I did not frankly admit that observation has convinced me that no such efficient regulation is possible, and that government ownership can be undertaken on the plan outlined with less danger to the country than is involved in private ownership as we have had it or as we are likely to have it. I have been brought to regard public ownership as the ultimate remedy by railroad history which is as familiar to you as to me. Among the reasons that have led me to believe that we must, in the end, look to government ownership for relief, I shall mention two or three. First and foremost is the corrupting influence of the railroad in politics. There is not a state in the Union that has not felt this influence to a greater or less extent. The railroads have insisted upon controlling legislatures; they have insisted upon naming executives; they have insisted upon controlling the nomination and appointment of judges; they have endeavored to put their representatives on tax boards that they might escape just taxation; they have watered their stock, raised their rates and enjoined the states whenever they have attempted to regulate rates; they have obstructed legislation when hostile to them and advanced, by secret means, legislation favorable to them. Let me give you an illustration:

The interstate commerce law was enacted nineteen years ago. After about nine years this was practically nullified by the supreme court, and for ten years the rail-

road influence has been sufficient in the senate and house to prevent an amendment asked for time and again by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That railroad influence has been strong enough to keep the republican party from adopting any platform declaration in favor of rate regulation. When the president, following the democratic platform, insisted upon regulation he was met with the opposition of the railroads, and every step, every point gained in favor of the people was gained after a strenuous fight. The bill was improved by an amendment proposed by Senator Stone, of Missouri, restoring the criminal penalty which had been taken out of the interstate commerce law by the Elkins law. This same amendment had been presented, in substance, in the house, by Congressman James, of Kentucky, and had been defeated by republican votes. The bill was further improved by an amendment proposed by Senator Culberson, of Texas, forbidding the use of passes, and it should have been still further improved by the amendment proposed by Senator Bailey, of Texas, limiting the court review, but the railroad influence was strong enough to defeat this amendment.

I have no idea that the railroads are going to permit regulation without a struggle and I fear that their influence will be strong enough to very much delay, if it does not entirely defeat, remedial legislation. You, in this state, know something of the railroad in politics. When I visited the state and spoke for Mr. Goebel I heard him charge upon every platform that the railroads were spending large sums in opposition to his election and I have always believed that the railroad influence was largely responsible for the assassination of that brave defender of the rights of the people.

Another reason which has led me to favor government ownership, is the fact that the people are annually plundered of an enormous sum by extortionate rates; that places are discriminated against and individuals driven out of business by favoritism shown by the railroads. You say that all these things can be corrected without interference with private ownership. I shall be glad if experience proves that they can be, but I no longer hope for it. President Roosevelt, although expressing himself against government ownership, has announced that

only successful regulation can prevent government ownership. Is there any democrat who is not willing to go as far as President Roosevelt and admit the necessity of government ownership in case the people are convinced of the failure of regulation? I cannot believe it.

Then, while we attempt to make regulation effective, while we endeavor to make the experiment under the most favorable conditions, namely, with the democratic party in power, let us not hesitate to inform the railroads that they must keep out of politics; that they must keep their hands off of legislation; that they must abstain from interfering with the party machinery and warn them that they can only maintain their private control of the railroads by accepting such regulation as the people may see fit to apply in their own interest and for their own protection. Without this threat our cause would be hopeless. It remains to be seen whether, with this threat, we shall be able to secure justice to the shippers, to the traveling public and to the taxpayers.

MR. BRYAN AT ST. LOUIS, LOUISVILLE AND CINCINNATI

Mr. Bryan left Lincoln, September 10, for a trip through the South, visiting St. Louis, Louisville and Cincinnati.

THE ST. LOUIS RECEPTION

The Associated Press report describes the St. Louis reception in this way:

A tremendous ovation was tendered William J. Bryan by the 12,000 people gathered when he stepped upon the platform and took his seat. With one accord the audience arose, waved flags and shouted until the strains of "America" by the band were drowned out. The ovation continued for four minutes and was finally silenced by National Committeeman William A. Rothwell, who started to make a speech of introduction. He had scarcely begun before a clamor arose for Bryan. Chairman Rothwell thereupon cut short his speech and presented Mr. Bryan with a wave of his hand.

Motioning for silence with a palm leaf fan, Mr. Bryan said in part:

“Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: It’s warm enough when you keep still. I don’t want you to increase the misery by exertion. You have cheered enough to cheer my heart and I am glad to be here. I have been trying to find home for more than a week and I have found it so homelike everywhere that I can hardly tell where I live. I have always suspected that Missouri felt friendly. She has shown it on many occasions, but never more so than tonight.

“Now I want to show it is better to trust the democratic principles to the democratic party than trust them to the one man whose party denounces him for following them. I want to remind you that the most popular act of Mr. Roosevelt’s administration was his bringing of peace between two nations. He settled the coal strike after a loss of \$99,000,000 to employers, employes and the public. It was a grand act. I applauded him for it. But where did he get the doctrine?—in the republican platform? No, he got it from the democratic platform, and I wrote the plank myself. If he could gain popularity by settling one strike that cost \$99,000,000, why ought not our party have some credit for proposing a plan which, if put into law, would make the strike unnecessary? Why has not the republican party followed it up by making a national law that will make it unnecessary for a man to starve his wife and family in order to get justice.

“If the president can become the only popular man in the republican party because he does something spasmodically along democratic lines, what would be the popularity of the man who does something and has always been a democrat? Where did Mr. Roosevelt find his mandate for his action regarding the rate bill. He had to go to the democratic platform. The most apt part of the Elkins bill is the penitentiary sentence for its violation.

“The railroads have been the most corrupting influence in politics in the past twenty years. By the use of passes the railroads have packed conventions. This law was suggested by the democratic party. I shall soon have occasion to talk on railroads again, but I want

tonight to impress upon you that the railroad question solution was the product of the democratic party.

“The president has now been in office almost five years. How many trust magnates are in the penitentiary? We have a great many trusts in this country violating the law. My friends, I ask you to figure out on the basis of the number of trust magnates imprisoned during the past five years how many generations will it take to solve the trust question?”

“My friends, if these things prove to you that the democratic forethought is better than republican afterthought, wouldn't it be better to vote for democrats than for those who have followed at the tail end of the democratic procession.”

In an extemporaneous speech delivered in Druid's Hall Mr. Bryan touched on government ownership of railroads.

“If there is any sentiment in the country today favoring government ownership of railroads it is because the railroads have created the notion that they own the government,” he said. “Just in proportion as the railroads regard the rights of the people, just in that proportion will we get along well together. The railroad is the servant of the people. When it seeks to become the master of the people it usurps a place not rightfully belonging to it.”

THE LOUISVILLE RECEPTION

The Associated Press dispatch referring to the Louisville reception says:

On the occasion of his entry into the South, where his recent declaration as to government ownership of railroads has aroused the most opposition, William J. Bryan tonight made a more explicit statement as to his position in the matter. In dead silence he made a lengthy statement elaborating his position, but declared that “the making of platforms rests with the voters of the whole party, and I never have, and never will attempt to force my opinions or those of any few men on the people.” While thus indicating that the doctrine of government ownership is in the hands of the voters, Mr. Bryan's speech indicated plainly that nothing has as yet occurred to shake his belief in the ultimate efficacy and necessity

of it. He declared that he would gladly make any sacrifice in exchange for the assurance that regulation instead of government ownership would answer the needs of the people, but he expressed grave doubts as to whether regulation would ever suffice. He also took pains to present arguments to convince his hearers that government ownership of trunk lines and state ownership of state lines will not only preserve the rights of the states, but will permit the people of each to adopt government ownership when they are ready for it.

A tremendous yell arose when at the finish of the statement Mr. Bryan, with all the emphasis he could muster, recalled to his hearers that: "Whenever I saw a danger threatening the people I have spoken out without asking anybody's permission or querying what the effect might be on me."

Entering the southland for the first time in two years, Mr. Bryan today received a welcome that in warmth and spontaneity has not been surpassed by any greetings given him since his return from his tour of the world. His arrival in the city provoked a great outburst of acclamations from thousands of marchers, and yet more thousands on the streets. His reception at the armory tonight, where he addressed a crowd of 12,000 people, was nothing less than a volcanic eruption of enthusiasm. Although the attendance of southern notables was smaller than at first expected, on account of Mr. Bryan's recent acceptances of numerous invitations from other cities, still the mass meeting at the armory was a representative southern gathering, graced by the Kentucky leaders of democracy, a number of prominent democrats from other southern states, and a great mass of citizens from Kentucky and Indiana.

Mr. Bryan was welcomed to Kentucky by his whilom opponent, Mr. Henry Watterson, who presided over the meeting. The other speakers preceding Mr. Bryan were Senator Carmack, of Tennessee, representing the South, and Senator W. J. Stone, of Missouri, who introduced the guest of honor.

When Mr. Bryan entered the hall leaning on the arm of Mr. Watterson, there was a demonstration that lasted ten minutes, thousands of flags being waved in unison with the surges of cheers that swept over the throng.

As soon as the noise had subsided Mr. Watterson began his address of welcome. Mr. Watterson spoke in part as follows:

“There is but one paramount issue for the next presidential battle, and that is the rescue of the government from hands that have misused and debauched it, and its restoration to the custody of the plain, but sovereign people. The parties to it are, upon the one hand, a standing army of trained politicians, held together not alone by the cohesive power of the public patronage, but by a community of interests as unyielding as it is unthinking, richly caparisoned in all the panoply of successful war, and, on the other hand, the mass and body of those who hew the wood and draw the water and pay the taxes, undrilled, unskilled and widely separated, often groping in the dark, sometimes misdirected by divided counsels, always lacking the resources by which results are reached and dangers turned, but never yet united except to conquer. It is veteran troops against the raw militia; an unequal though not a bootless array, as many well-fought fields in days of old bears witness. Give us but half the discipline of the regulars and a tithe of their equipment and we shall drive them before us across the barricades of criminal wealth, though led by Theodore Roosevelt himself.

“I recognize as our chieftain in this approaching conflict the Hon. William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska.

“It costs me no sacrifice either of personal preference or pride of opinion to make this declaration. Mr. Bryan and I have not always agreed as to the means; we have never disagreed as to the end. The appeal to the moral nature of the people, which he has made with so much eloquence and power, I was making when he was a boy. He grew to manhood under my teachings. If at times I have raised the warning finger of the schoolmaster—even threatened the rod—he was big enough and old enough and good-looking enough to stand it, and to survive it, and has thrived in spite of it—maybe by reason of it and in any event he has quite outgrown it. I, too, have lived and learned apace, and one of the things I have learned has been to look more to the objective point and less to non-essential matters of differences, to agree

to disagree with my comrades and friends; on great occasions and in great affairs to send all minor differences to the rear the better to march abreast against the common enemy.

“We purpose to reform, not to revolutionize, the government; we purpose to re-establish democratic institutions in the nation’s capital, returning to the voters what belongs to the voters. We purpose to drive from the floor of the senate those who sit there, not as servants of the people, but as corporation counsel. We purpose to drive from the floor of the house the speaker and his rules’ committee, who have made an autocracy of that which was created a legislative body. In a word, we purpose to readjust the lost balance between the people and their lawmakers.

“Our jury is the nation; our proof, the record of the republican party; our witness, Theodore Roosevelt; our attorney, Mr. Bryan, of Nebraska.”

Mr. Watterson’s speech touched the pent up enthusiasm almost at the start, and when at the close he pointed to Mr. Bryan and said: “Here he is, God bless him and give him wisdom,” the audience yelled for five minutes. Mr. Watterson finally commanded silence long enough to introduce Senator Carmack, of Tennessee.

Senator Carmack was followed by Senator W. J. Stone, of Missouri, who in a few words introduced Mr. Bryan. The demonstration that greeted Mr. Bryan on his entrance to the hall was renewed as the Nebraskan arose to speak. Mr. Bryan announced that he would “read a statement concerning a topic which has been generally discussed since he had touched on it during his speech at New York.” He then read his statement.

AT CINCINNATI

Mr. Bryan left Louisville for Cincinnati Thursday morning. An extract from the Associated Press report concerning the Cincinnati meeting follows:

Introduced by Mayor E. J. Dempsey, and speaking from a stand erected over the diamond of the Cincinnati ball park, W. J. Bryan tonight addressed an immense audience which occupied all the seats in the grand stand and several thousand additional chairs. Mr. Bryan

arrived from Louisville at noon and spent the afternoon receiving callers. He was given an enthusiastic welcome.

THE CINCINNATI RECEPTION

At the reception given to Mr. Bryan at Cincinnati, Mayor Dempsey spoke as follows:

“Ladies and Gentlemen, Fellow Citizens of Cincinnati, of the State of Ohio and our Neighboring Commonwealths: We are gathered here tonight to do honor to a most distinguished individual, in fact, to him who is today the most distinguished private citizen in all of this great republic. This great concourse of citizens is but one of a series which has from day to day greeted him since he once again set foot on his native shores. It needs from me no extended explanation of the meaning of these vast outpourings of the people. The standard bearer of a great principle, the advocate of living truths, has once more come unto his own, and his own are rejecting him not. It was not always thus, in the history of this republic, with those who appeared in the vanguard of policies looking to the liberty and welfare of the people.

“A half century ago the vital question in this country was the abolition or the perpetuation of slavery, and every school child today knows how the pioneers of African freedom were hooted at and stoned and rotten-egged, and their newspapers and printing presses destroyed and thrown into the rivers and creeks. Nevertheless William H. Seward, then governor of New York, declared that the conflict between slavery and freedom was an irrepressible one, and that however much there might be of compromising, of procrastinating, of temporizing—a decisive battle would inevitably be fought between the two ideas, in which the one would survive and the other perish. Abraham Lincoln later emphasized Seward’s thought by his own declaration that this country could not be half slave and half free; it must be wholly one or the other; and you all known the outcome of that conflict.

“A similar situation confronts us now, and it is bound to result in a similar conflict. The living question before the people of this great republic today is whether the doctrine of special privilege, with all of its baleful effects and attendant evils, is to prevail against the funda-

mental American principle of equal rights to all of the people. There may be temporizing, there may be procrastination, there may be compromising, but the conflict between these two ideas is as irrepressible as the old conflict between the ideas of slavery and freedom. Involved in that conflict will also be the principle of civic righteousness in city, state and nation—a doctrine that calls for absolute honesty and fidelity on the part of public officials in the administration of public affairs, no matter how high or how low the official may be.

“The public magazines and a portion of the independent daily press have during the last five years revealed to us the shocking extent to which corruption, either in direct or indirect form, has permeated our whole body politic, from the councilman or selectman of an ordinary municipality up unto the very ranks of that august body, the United States senate. And the most alarming and regretful phase of the whole situation was the seeming apathy of the public and of a great portion of the public press after the disclosures had been made.

“Right here in our own country and city we had, and to some extent still have, as glaring an instance of this seeming indifference to official perfidy and official delinquency as can be found anywhere throughout the country. For nearly twenty years this city and county have been cursed by the domination of as precious a set of political rascals and freebooters as ever disgraced God’s footstool. Through the hard work of an investigating commission authorized by the last general assembly, the transactions of this gang were uncovered, two of the most important discoveries being that an attempt had been made to tamper with the judiciary in the decision of an important case, and that for years this gang had been appropriating to itself the interest on public moneys loaned by them to the banks.

“Notwithstanding these revelations, and notwithstanding the recipients of the stolen money, under compulsion, paid it back with contemptuous indifference, no great shock seems to have been experienced by the community at large, and of a daily press, consisting of four English and four German papers, but two, one English and one German, made any editorial comment thereon. It is a startling statement to make, but it seems to be

true, that the sin of these political conspirators consisted, not in the crimes committed by them, not in attempting unduly to influence judges, but in being found out in their nefarious dealings. Thank God that this sentiment is changing in this community, although we still have one sheet that goes into hysterical jubilations over the merits of the old gang, and sees no guile, but naught save wisdom and honesty in them. Thank God, also, that the sentiment is changing, and has changed throughout the country, and that the public conscience has at last been aroused.

“What has been needed is a leader who will guide that public conscience right and direct the public mind into channels conducive to sound, honest and sincere thinking. When the American people set themselves to thinking seriously about any given problem, situation or condition of affairs they never fail to hit the right solution. Why, I know not; it may be Providence, or it may be because of the sound, hard common sense which bottoms most of them. President Roosevelt is a man of whom any democrat can speak kindly, affectionately, and often enthusiastically, and this without any treason to democratic allegiance. Most of the policies announced and carried out by him are of democratic origin, and many of them have had their inception in the brain of him who is your honored guest this evening.

“But President Roosevelt is not the man for the present crisis, not because of any lack of the qualifications that I deem necessary in such a leader, but because he is hampered by the traditions of his own party and is fettered by the political environment surrounding him. No republican platform would ever declare against special privilege, and if a republican of the Roosevelt type should be found morally courageous enough to attempt it, not one of the senatorial coterie, or the public and quasi-public corporations' clique that dominate the policies and declarations of that party would ever permit it.

“Consequently the American people must turn somewhere else; and to some one who is as honest as President Roosevelt, as courageous, as frank and as persevering, but who, also, in addition to these qualities, has the interest and the welfare of the plain, common people

of this country so close to his heart that no seduction or blandishments of any kind can win him away from them.

“It is in the democratic party alone that, at this juncture, relief can be found against the evils that are facing us. That party is, and always has been, the party of the people, and from its foundation has stood unalterably for the right of the people against the aggressions of corporations, organized wealth and those who seek special favors and privileges.

“The man whom common consent seems to designate as the one meet for this crisis in our affairs it will be my pleasure in a few moments to present to you. Some of us may not be quite ready to agree with all of the propositions and principles that he may advance, or that he may stand for, but however that may be, there is not one of us in this great audience who will not take home to-night with us something of benefit and of profit from what he may have to say. For Mr. Bryan is honest with himself in his thinking, and he will be honest and candid and straightforward with us in the expression of his thoughts, with the attendant result that each one of us must leave here to do some thinking for himself, and to make some research because of that thinking. That is just what Mr. Bryan desires—he wants to set us all thinking, and when the great American public gets to thinking—remember what I said before.

“Ladies and gentlemen, I present to you the great commoner, William Jennings Bryan.”

On the same occasion Mr. Bryan, after paying a high tribute to Mayor Dempsey, said:

“I have been around the world, and everywhere I find that the seeds of democracy have been sown, and that they are bearing fruit. In all nations and in every clime the people are turning toward democracy and recognize the external truth of the principles which it stands for. Everywhere you will find the reformer and that reforms are being accomplished, and you will find that everywhere people are beginning to realize the necessity of bringing the government closer to the people.

“I believe that there is a new era coming in this country, and there are evidences given of late which bear

me out. I believe that the time has come when the convictions of men are more powerful than the party lash. Take the case of Philadelphia. Only a short time ago it was said to be the most corrupt city politically in the United States. I remember hearing that the ministers of the city had got together and offered up prayers for the mayor. I have faith in prayer, but I believe that they ought to have prayed that the citizens would be guided to elect a mayor who would be the right man for the place. However, the mayor afterward allied himself with the honest people of Philadelphia.

“Now, next to Philadelphia, Cincinnati was known as the most corrupt city politically in the United States. Every form of corruption known to corrupt politicians was to be found here. Corrupt corporations conducted by respected men seemed to control the situation. Men who wanted people arrested for buying votes at \$5 per vote immediately turned around and gave \$5,000 with which to buy 5,000 votes. These same men who controlled the corporations and were known as respectable men had no consciences. The politicians grew fat by robbing the people. The good people were almost in despair of ever getting rid of that gang of politicians, but, yet look what happened. They rose in their might and elected a good man and an honest man as mayor (at this there were cheers for Mayor Dempsey), and you must remember that he needs your moral support. Do not expect him to accomplish everything in a few months? An organization entrenched as the Cincinnati organization was cannot be wiped out in a few months. You must stand by your mayor in his fight to eradicate them entirely.

“You had your papers who sold their columns to things that editors knew to be wrong. You had your city councilmen who obtained thousands of dollars and who embezzled public authority for their own advantage. You had politicians of high and low degree who robbed the public. In spite of this situation you did elect a reform mayor and an honest man. Now, my friends, he has commenced a work of reform. I doubt not that he has back of him a large majority of the thinking people of this city. I have no doubt that he has behind him the

moral purpose and conscience of Cincinnati. There is just one danger, and that is that having put him in as a watchman over the city you may expect the outcome too soon. Let me remind you that the danger to any moral government is that special interest never sleeps, while the people are often hard to awaken. Good friends, if people did not go to sleep at night there would be no such thing as burglary, and if citizens did not go to sleep there would be no such thing as corrupt government in the United States.

“The country is in the grasp of the representatives of private wealth. It ought not to be hard for a man to be honest, nor ought it to be difficult to pick out an honest man. It is not difficult to find men who know right from wrong. The difficult thing is to find men with the moral courage that is necessary to stand as defenders of the rights of the people against the temptations that are present to those in power.

“Now let me appeal to you to stand by your mayor in the fight he has to make. Do not expect that everything will be done in a day. Just remember that when you gave him the undertaking to reform the city where conditions have become as they are here, the mayor has every possible obstacle thrown in his way. He is to meet the devices that the organized few are able to throw in his path. Give him time to do his work, and tell him that when you enlisted under his banner you enlisted, not for three months, nor for nine months, but that you enlisted for the war, no matter how long the war lasts.

“Now, the conditions you had in this city you have also in the state. You have a temporary change. You have dethroned the boss in the city, but you have not dethroned the boss in the state. Bossism is still strong in your state.

“I have been reading something of the state convention, and I want to thank a congressman from the lake named Burton for what he has done. I never met Mr. Burton until about the 23d of July. I met him in London at the Peace Conference. I liked his looks when I saw him; I liked his words when I heard him, and I liked the man when I got acquainted with him. He spoke there in the interest of peace and against great appropriations in preparation for wars that should never come. He

spoke in the presence of twenty-six different nations, and, my friends, his earnest pleas had more effect on the people who had to have the speech translated than they have had on the representatives in the state convention."

IS IT TRUE?

Referring to Mr. Bryan's declaration concerning corporation agents and party organization, the *Penn's Grove* (New Jersey) *Record* clears the ground of all non-essentials and hits the nail on the head when it says: "The only point that calls for decision is the soundness of his position. Is he correct when he says that 'no man who is officially connected with a corporation that is seeking privileges ought to act as a member of a political organization?' The time will come, we believe, when the people will answer this question in the affirmative, and when that time arrives we shall see many new faces on the political horizon."

THE ADMISSIONS OF A STANDPATTER

Secretary Shaw, who, by grace of President Roosevelt presides over the treasury department, seems to have an ambition to be known as the prince of standpatters. As a member of the president's cabinet, he has been exposed to reform, but has never caught it. He is apparently immune to reform, believing that the republican party has done everything that it ought to have done, has done nothing that it ought not to have done and that there is no error in it. This genial and talented apostle of the doctrine of contentment has recently visited the South for the purpose of palming off upon southern democrats some second-hand high tariff garments which the republicans of Iowa have outgrown. Having seen his ideas repudiated by his own party in Iowa, he presents them to the people of remote sections with as much assurance as he used to present them in his own state.

It is fortunate for the democratic party that it has among its opponents so candid a man as Secretary Shaw,

for in his speech at Saulsbury, N. C., he admitted practically all that the democrats contend for when they advocate tariff reform, although he made the admissions without intending to do so. There was a refreshing innocence in the manner in which he would state a proposition in one part of his speech and answer it in another. For instance, in the first part of his speech he attempted to minimize the amount of goods sold abroad cheaper than at home and in this effort he used the following language: "A non-partisan industrial commission was appointed by congress in 1898, which, after spending more than three years in the investigation, filed its report in 1902, which was published in eighteen large volumes. This report contains all available evidence on this subject. After making careful compilations from the data therein contained, Senator Gallinger, of New Hampshire, stated on the floor of the United States senate, in April, 1904, that approximately \$4,000,000 worth of American manufactured products are annually sold abroad cheaper than in our own domestic market. No one has ever attempted to disprove Senator Gallinger's conclusions, though our political opponents continue to speak of the practice as well-nigh universal. This \$4,000,000 worth can be far more than accounted for by the advantage given to exporters under our drawback laws, and it is quite likely the estimate is too low."

While he admits that this estimate is likely too low, he evidently intends his hearers to believe that it is not much too low, that the total sum exported and sold below the high price is not much beyond the \$4,000,000, for he says that Senator Gallinger made the estimate from the testimony filling eighteen large volumes, taken by a commission during three years of investigation, and he affirms that no one has ever attempted to disprove Senator Gallinger's conclusions. In the latter part of the same speech Secretary Shaw says: "We exported during the last fiscal year approximately \$570,000,000 of manufactured products exclusive of prepared and partially prepared foods. Of this total probably \$20,000,000 was produced in bonded smelters and factories, and no duty was collected on the material consumed. On approximately \$120,000,000 a drawback of about five per cent. was recovered. Thus it will be seen that nearly twenty-

five per cent. of our exported manufactures leave this country costing the exporter less than corresponding articles which he places on the American market." From the above quotation, it will be seen that we exported approximately \$120,000,000 worth of goods upon which a drawback of five per cent. was recovered by the manufacturers, and he explains that the manufacturers were thus enabled to sell abroad at prices five per cent. lower than they could afford to sell at home. In other words, the manufacturers draw from the treasury \$6,000,000 in drawbacks on this export for the express purpose of being able to sell those exports abroad for \$6,000,000 less than the American people would have to pay for them if sold here. If the manufacturers after receiving the drawback, sold abroad at the same price at which they sold in this country, it is evident that they did not need the drawback which the government gave them. If they sold abroad at a lower price, because of the drawback given them, then the amount exported and sold cheaper abroad than at home was \$120,000,000 instead of \$4,000,000. Secretary Shaw is welcome to take either horn of the dilemma. According to his statement, we paid the manufacturers (in drawbacks) to sell \$120,000,000 abroad cheaper than at home. If they only sold \$4,000,000 abroad cheaper than at home they made a double profit on the \$120,000,000 and collected the five per cent. from the foreigner after collecting it from the treasury. If they dealt honestly with the government and sold the entire amount abroad cheaper than at home, then they sold thirty times as much as the secretary estimated they did, his estimate being \$4,000,000 or a little more. Now which position is he going to take?

Secretary Shaw's contention is that we only sell abroad cheaper than at home, because of the rebate or drawback given and to make his argument clear, he says: "Perhaps I can make this drawback principle clearer by means of an illustration. The American producer of steel billets has a minimum protection of \$6.72 per ton. The producer of spikes and bolts has a protection of \$13.44 and \$33.60 per ton respectively. The American Iron and Steel Manufacturing Company of Lebanon, Pa., was paid last year in round numbers \$10,000 drawbacks on the ex-

portation of \$75,000 worth of railway spikes and bolts produced from imported steel billets. * * *

This drawback enables this concern to sell \$75,000 worth of spikes and bolts abroad for \$65,000 and make the same profit as if sold at home for \$75,000. It being impossible to protect the American product of spikes and bolts in the foreign market, the law authorizes this refund to him on proof of exportation, with manifest intent that he shall sell his product abroad that much below the American market price."

This illustration makes the subject much clearer than the secretary intended. This one illustration admits three of the contentions of tariff reformers.

First, that our manufacturers are selling abroad cheaper than at home. For awhile the republicans denied this. Now the head of the treasury department admits it and tries to explain it. Let no republican hereafter deny that we do sell abroad cheaper than at home.

Second, the illustration proves that the consumer pays the tariff. The drawback of \$10,000 given to the American Iron and Steel Manufacturing Company of Lebanon, Pa., was given because that company imported steel billets upon which it had paid a tariff. This is an important admission, for the republican orators have constantly insisted that the tax was not paid by the consumer, but by the foreigner. If the farmer complains that he is taxed on imported articles, the republican spellbinder assures him that he does not pay the tax, but some foreigner pays it for the privilege of trading in the United States; but when a Pennsylvania steel company imports steel billets, he has no difficulty in convincing the treasury department that the tax is paid by the consumer and that the consumer having paid the tax ought to get it back from the treasury. It is customary for the republicans to insist that a part of the tax at least is paid by the foreigner, even when they are not bold enough to contend that all of it is paid by the foreigner. In the case of this Pennsylvania steel company there is no quibbling over fractions or parts. The secretary of the treasury accepts without hesitation the statement that all of the tariff was paid by the consumer. Let no republican hereafter contradict the secretary of the treasury by saying that the consumer does not pay the tax.

Third, this illustration given by Secretary Shaw establishes another proposition for which the tariff reformer has contended, namely, that American labor does not need the protection given by the present tariff. Every republican who defends the tariff, defends it on the ground that the laborer would draw less wages if the tariff was reduced. But the illustration given by Secretary Shaw proves that in the manufacture of spikes and bolts the laborer does not need any protection, for as soon as the manufacturer receives his rebate for the tariff paid on the raw material—in other words, as soon as he is able to obtain his raw material free from tax—he is able to manufacture and sell abroad in competition with the world. The drawback was not intended to help pay the laborer. There is no pretense that the laborer needs any protection. He makes the bold statement that the American Iron and Steel Manufacturing Company of Lebanon, Pa., was able to send its product abroad, pay the freight upon it, and compete in the open market with the “pauper labor of the old world.” The inference is clear that the tariff is not necessary for the protection of labor, and that with free raw material (for that is all that the drawback means) our manufacturers could export and sell in other countries. And if our manufacturers can sell abroad, how can a high tariff be regarded as necessary to enable them to sell in the home market?

In one illustration, therefore, Secretary Shaw has admitted that our manufacturers sell abroad cheaper than at home, that the tariff is a tax upon the consumer, and that the laboring man in this country though better paid, produces so cheaply that his employer can export in competition with the world, if given free raw material.

In another part of his speech, Secretary Shaw affirms that in some cases foreigners make a discount of from five to twenty-five per cent. when they sell in the United States. He cites a case where something like fifteen per cent. discount is made. According to his theory, under absolute free trade in this country, we would be in danger of being flooded with foreign goods, sold cheaper here than in Europe. According to his own figures, the discount is from five to twenty-five per cent. He can hardly be credited with good faith, when he holds out before the public the danger of a flood of foreign goods, for he

knows that no reduction is likely to take place which would bring the average tariff rate below the highest point which even his figures show to be sufficient to prevent a flood. The last tariff law which the democrats passed left the average rate on manufactures considerably above twenty-five per cent. A tariff for revenue only would prevent any such dumping as he fears, even if his most extravagant figures could be accepted at their face value. In order to relieve him from any nervous fears he may have, the democrats might agree to leave a tariff of twenty-five per cent. until the people have a chance to try and satisfy themselves of its safety before attempting to reduce it below that point. But the absurdity of Secretary Shaw's position is shown by the fact that he does not propose any reduction in any schedule, no matter how much the people suffer from extortion because of that schedule. He favors a tariff twice as high as would be necessary to avoid any possible danger from this source, measuring his fears by his own figures.

Just one other point. In the course of this remarkable confession he gives figures to show that many American products are sold abroad at higher prices than they are sold at home. The beauty about the democratic position is that no matter how a republican expresses himself he is easily answered. If the republican asserts that we sell abroad cheaper than at home, we reply that we ought to sell at home as cheaply as abroad, for it is unfair to the American people to burden them with a high tariff on all that they use, while we give foreigners a benefit that we deny to our own people. On the contrary, if the republicans say that we sell abroad at a higher price than at home, we reply that goods that can be exported and sold at a higher price than at home ought not to fear competition in America from the goods with which they compete abroad.

It is a fatal defect of republican argument that it does not hold together. No protectionist can make a speech of any length without contradicting himself and answering his own arguments, and it is a poor high tariff speech that does not admit something of the democratic contention. Secretary Shaw's speeches have already convinced many republicans that we do not need such a tariff as we now have, and it is not strange that his

speeches lead democrats to the same conclusion. The more high tariff speeches the distinguished secretary makes, if he follows the line of his Saulsbury speech, the stronger will be the tariff reform sentiment in the United States.

DANGEROUS

Although Mr. Bryan is not a candidate for office he is now described as "a dangerous man," and it is noticeable that this description comes from men who in 1896 claimed that the Hydes, the McCurdys and the Depews stood for national honor.

There were in Mr. Bryan's 1896 speeches many references to this charge that he was "a dangerous man."

For instance, in a speech delivered at Battery D, Chicago, during the 1896 campaign, Mr. Bryan said:

"They tell you that I will not enforce the law. My friends, the fear of these people is not that I will refuse to enforce the law; their fear is that I will enforce the law. They know that I entertain old-fashioned ideas upon this subject, and that according to my ideas the big criminals should wear striped clothes as well as the little criminals. I want to say to you that I believe in enforcing the law against all classes of society, and those who believe in that policy are better friends of the government than those who would make scapegoats of little criminals and then let the big ones run at large to run the government itself. The very men who would suffer most from the enforcement of law are the ones who seem to be most troubled. They are not afraid that I will encourage lawlessness, but they know that, if I am elected, the trusts will not select the attorney general."

At Ottumwa, Iowa, Mr. Bryan said: "My friends, you have been told that I am a dangerous man. There is nothing in my past life, either public or private, that justifies any citizen in saying that my election would be a menace to law and order, or to our form of government, or to the welfare of society; but there is much in what I have said and done to create a suspicion that my election would be a menace to those who have been living on what other people have earned."

RAILROAD INFLUENCE

In the course of his speech at Memphis, Mr. Bryan referred to the speech made by Secretary Shaw at that place, during which speech the secretary discussed government ownership of railroads. Mr. Bryan reminded the audience that President Roosevelt had in two messages declared that government ownership was the only alternative if the people failed to secure effective regulation, and asked why Secretary Shaw had not attacked the proposition of government ownership when the president suggested it as an alternative. After setting forth his plan, which he proposed as a substitute for the national ownership contemplated by the president, and showing that the dual plan, federal ownership of trunk lines and state ownership of local lines, would give the advantages of government ownership without the dangers of centralization, he said:

“One of the things which led me to believe that the ultimate remedy is to be found in ownership is the corruption which the railroads have brought into politics; and there is one illustration of this corruption with which Secretary Shaw himself is familiar. When he was governor of Iowa, the Iowa penitentiary held a convicted criminal named Frank Shercliff. Shercliff belonged to a group of men who were influential in ward politics and Governor Shaw was asked to pardon him in order that he might assist in the election of a republican congressman and the request was made by a railroad lobbyist, who made the request for a pardon in return for favors rendered by the republican congressman in the passage of a railroad measure. I will read you the letter which was found in the files of the governor’s office, after Secretary Shaw retired from the governorship of Iowa. I will omit the name of the republican congressman, who is now out of politics, and the writer of the letter, who is now dead; I will also omit the name of one person mentioned in the letter, because I do not know anything about his connection with the matter. Otherwise, the letter is as follows:

“Cedar Rapids, Ia., Sept. 15, 1900.— Hon. Leslie M. Shaw, Des Moines, Ia. My dear Governor: When I was in Washington last winter I became acquainted with—

He helped pass our bill for the settlement of the Sioux City and Pacific indebtedness. As soon as the bill was passed 'Dave,' as he is familiarly called in Washington, came to me and asked for a parole of Frank Shercliff, who is now in the penitentiary for robbing somebody on the Sioux City and Pacific road. My son and Mr. —, I understand, have written you urging you not to pardon or parole him. 'Dave' don't ask that he be pardoned, but paroled on good behavior, and he tells me that the judge who tried him and the attorney who prosecuted him will make a request, or have made a request, to you to parole him. I suppose there is no doubt he is guilty of the crime charged, but 'Dave' says he has been punished pretty well now, and that it will be worth three or four hundred votes from the relatives of Shercliff if he can be paroled. 'Dave' is one of the best fellows I ever met in Washington and I want to beseech you in his behalf to parole this man, if you possibly can. Of course I don't know the details of this matter, but 'Dave' was so kind and helpful to me in Washington last winter that I am very anxious that he should be gratified by this parole, provided, of course, that it is not going to do too much injustice to the public. Very truly yours,

“—————”

“Now here is an attempt on the part of a railroad lobbyist to secure the pardon of a criminal on the ground that the pardon will help elect a republican congressman, whose election is urged on the ground that the republican congressman had helped the railroad in the passage of a measure in which the road was interested. It would not be possible to find a better illustration of the extent to which the railroads are interfering in politics. Here is a great agricultural state strongly republican, presided over by a high minded citizen, for Mr. Shaw is a high minded man, who is intensely republican, and yet this lobbyist had the impudence to ask for the pardon of a criminal for political purposes, and as a reason for doing so, he boldly stated that he wanted to pay the congressman back for services rendered the railroad. Now if a lobbyist will approach a man like Secretary Shaw with such a proposition, what influence do you suppose would be brought to bear upon less conspicuous men, or men of

less integrity? Among the files there was another letter from a railroad attorney asking for the pardon. The pardon was afterwards granted. I would not, of course, assume that in granting the pardon Secretary Shaw was influenced by these requests, but I regret that he did not in some way admonish these railroad attorneys that their request was in itself an insult. Secretary Shaw seems to be very much afraid of government ownership, but I doubt if he can find an instance where government ownership has introduced the demoralizing influences that, according to this letter, have been at work in his own state under private ownership."

RAILROAD QUESTION IN THE SOUTH

Mr. Bryan has recently made a tour of the southern states and in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana he presented the dual plan of government ownership advanced two years ago and again presented at Madison Square Garden on the 30th of last August. These were the only southern states which he visited excepting Arkansas, and he did not stop at any point in Arkansas long enough to make an extended speech. His object in discussing the railroad question was not to make converts to the plan presented, but rather to explain it in order that those who desired to consider it might not be misled by the statements of unfriendly newspapers. While the subject was treated incidentally, and never at any considerable length, the following summary gives the substance of what he said at various points:

"My object in presenting the dual plan of railroad ownership is not to enter upon a discussion of it in detail, but to present the plan so that you may discuss it intelligently if you think it worthy of consideration. Having become convinced of the futility of railroad regulation to protect and safeguard the rights of the people, I announced that conclusion some two years ago. In answer to the charge that I am attempting to force this issue upon the party, it is sufficient to say that when the plan was first proposed, just after the St. Louis convention of 1904, I was in a

position to speak for myself without being suspected of an attempt to force my views upon anyone. I had just been relieved of the responsibility of leadership by a convention that did not conceal its hostility to me, and if ever a man was in a position to speak for himself and express his own views, I was in such a position. Two years have elapsed since that time—half of which time has been spent abroad. On my return I delivered a speech discussing public questions. It was necessary to include the railroad question in that speech or to avoid it. If I had attempted to avoid the question, it would have been presented to me by those who knew of my former utterances, and no advantage would have been gained either to myself or the party by keeping silent until forced to express myself; but there was no reason for avoiding the question, and I had no thought of remaining silent upon a subject of great and growing importance. Having to express an opinion, I could only express my own opinion, and as no one during my public life has ever asked me to do his thinking for him, I did not think it necessary to consult others as to what I myself should think. According to the democratic theory of government each one thinks for himself, and those who think ought to have the courage to express themselves. If I should try to make my opinion suit others, and they should try to make their opinion suit me, neither would be able to find out what the other thought; but if each one does his own thinking and then frankly expresses his opinion, then it is possible to ascertain the will of the majority, and the will of the majority governs.

“A number of things have contributed to convince me of the impossibility of the effectiveness of regulation as applied to railroads, the main thing being the corruption which the railroads have brought into politics. In my own state we tried, some fifteen years ago, to obtain a reduction in railroad rates. After a hard struggle the bill was passed through the legislature, but the governor vetoed it. At the same session the railroads bribed one of the members of the legislature, and as he did not dare to remain in the state and betray his constituents, the railroads took him on a special engine to the state line and he has never returned to Nebraska since. At the next session the bill passed in spite of the efforts of the rail-

roads, and this time was signed by the governor, but the railroads immediately enjoined the enforcement of the law and we are still waiting for a reduction of freight rates although the railroads are able to pay dividends on a large amount of watered stock and fictitious capitalization.

“There is not a state in the Union that has not had experience with the railroad lobby, although the people of the South have probably had less experience than the people of the North. Railroad development of the South came after the development of the North, and during the period of development the railroads were able to secure almost anything they wanted. But when the period of active development ends, the people begin to ask themselves whether they can afford to allow the railroads to own a state because they have developed it, and in the end the people always attempt control; but an attempt to control the railroads is always followed by resistance and by the employment of corrupt means, with which all the railroad lobbyists are familiar. I am not fully informed as to the situation in each of the states of the South, but in several of them the democratic platforms are demanding more stringent legislation and protesting against the influence of the railroads in politics. In several of the states democratic candidates have been nominated for governor on planks demanding effective control of the railroads. I would have sooner reached the conclusion that government ownership will ultimately be necessary, but for the fact that I feared and still fear the centralizing influence of national ownership—to have all of the railroads owned by the federal government, and to have the station agents, freight handlers, track repairers, bridge builders and trainmen all appointed from Washington would practically obliterate state lines and absorb the state in one consolidated and centralized system.

“I am a believer in our dual form of government, under which the state is supreme in its local affairs and the federal government supreme in interstate and international affairs. I would not admit the necessity for government ownership until I had worked out a plan by which the federal government would own only the necessary trunk lines and the state governments the local lines. By a trunk line I do not mean every line which runs

through two states, but only those trunk lines which may be necessary to regulate interstate rates and give the states a national outlet for their local lines. These trunk lines need not be numerous, and the states should be permitted to use them on equitable terms for local trains run in connection with the state railroads. I believe it would be an advantage to allow all railroads—even those in private hands—to use the trunk lines, for the consolidation of lines has been forced upon the smaller roads, which found in consolidation the only outlet for their freight. If local lines could tap one of the main arteries, it would be independent of the large systems and able to hold its own.

“The state ownership of railroads is not only free from the objection based upon centralization, but really strengthens the position of the state. The tendency for a century has been to enlarge the powers of the federal government and to decry the relative importance of the state. State ownership of all the railroads but the few trunk lines would very much strengthen the states’ position and make the states a bulwark against centralization.

“The dual plan is a democratic plan in harmony with democratic teachings and gives the advantages of government ownership without the dangers of national ownership. This system of confining national ownership to trunk lines and reserving the local lines for the states has another advantage, namely, that it makes the adoption of the system gradual. If we attempted national ownership, the federal government would extend its network of roads through every state, and in carrying out the will of the majority of the people of the United States, the wishes of particular sections could not be considered. The plan which I propose leaves each state to deal with the subject when it pleases and as it pleases. No matter what the federal government may do in regard to trunk lines, each state will be at liberty to retain private ownership of local lines as long as it likes and to convert the private lines into state lines whenever the people desire it. What is more democratic than to let the people do as they please and have what they like?

“The advantages of the dual plan, therefore, are, first, that the importance of the state is preserved and the

dangers of centralization reduced to a minimum, and, second, that the system can be adopted gradually as the people of the various states are ready for it, and each state can profit by the experience of other states. It is argued that the government cannot operate a railroad as well as a private corporation. A single trunk line, operated by the government, would do more to settle this disputed question than all the arguments that could be made. If experiment proves that private ownership is better, the states need not attempt public ownership. If, on the contrary, experience proves, as it has in Europe, that public ownership is better, the states can adopt it at their leisure.

“I need only repeat that government ownership is proposed, not as an immediate remedy, but as the ultimate remedy. If democratic friends declare that they prefer private ownership to public ownership, I answer that I would prefer private ownership to public ownership if I believed it possible to regulate the roads in a manner satisfactory to the public. It is because I have lost faith in regulation that I have suggested ownership. If further experience with regulation satisfies the people, they will not be called upon to consider the question of public ownership, and as I for years opposed public ownership in the hope of securing efficient regulation, I can be patient with those who still hope and can wait for events to convince them as events have convinced me.

“No one will deny that the trend of events is toward government ownership. Ten years ago, when I was denounced as too radical, I neither advocated government ownership nor suggested the possibility of it—I was still hoping for regulation. Since that time the president himself has held out the possibility of government ownership as a threat to compel the railroads to consent to regulation. I was only about six months ahead of the president in suggesting government ownership as a remedy, the difference between his position and mine being, he regards government ownership as fraught with danger and still hopes that successful regulation may make government ownership unnecessary. I go a step farther and express it as my opinion that experience has already proved the futility of regulation and propose a plan which eliminates the greatest evil of government owner-

ship—the centralization of so much power in the hands of the federal government. Without this alternative of government ownership it would be entirely impossible to drive the railroads out of politics. Even with this threat I am very much afraid that we shall not be able to keep the railroad representatives away from congress and the state legislatures.

“There is just one other objection to which I wish to refer, namely—that under government ownership an administration could keep itself in power. Under the dual system proposed only the trunk lines would be under the control of the federal government, and their employes would be few compared with the entire number of railroad employes in the country. As the various states would own the local lines within their borders, the influence of one state would counteract the influence of another state. Then, too, under a proper civil service the interference of the railroad employes in politics would be reduced to a minimum. Some twelve years ago I proposed a change in the civil service law which would give to each party its proportionate representation in the civil service. This plan would preserve the merit system in the appointments but would give each party its share of the offices, and the employes would counteract each other’s influence. I might add that having passed through two campaigns, I have been able to form an opinion of the civil service employes as compared with the railroad employes. The president was against me in both my campaigns. In the first a democratic president was using his influence in behalf of the republican candidate, and in the second election the republican candidate was at the head of all the departments of the government. In both campaigns the civil service employes gave me less trouble than the railroad employes, who were coerced by their employers into the support of the republican ticket, and I say without hesitation that I would rather risk the influence which a president can bring to bear upon civil service employes than to risk the influence which railroad owners can bring to bear upon railroad employes.

“But as my only desire is to study the question and leave you to consider it now or at such future time as you think it an issue, I will not go into details. When the time comes for the discussion of the proposition as

an important issue I shall be glad to take up all branches of the subject, and show that the dual plan is not only democratic but practical, and that the dangers of government ownership under such a plan are less than the dangers of private ownership if we can judge private ownership by past experience, and I believe that the advantages of government ownership under this plan are much superior to the advantages of private ownership as we now have it."

I have not only found a hearing in the South, but I have found much more encouragement than I had expected. While the majority of the democratic leaders of the South, in fact, nearly all of them, are opposed to government ownership at this time, they, with but few exceptions, admit that government ownership will be necessary if regulation fails. No democrat can stand before an intelligent body of citizens and declare himself in favor of private ownership without adding that he will favor government ownership if he has to choose between the government ownership of the railroads and the railroads' ownership of the government. This is the position which the leading democrats of the South now occupy, but it is too early to know the opinion of the rank and file of the party. It must be remembered that the populist party developed strength all over the South, in some places having almost if not quite a majority of the white vote. These populists have gone back into the democratic party, but they have not surrendered their belief in the government ownership of railroads, which was one of the main planks in the populist platform. If the populists of the South would favor national ownership, which involves the enlargement of the influence of the federal government at the expense of the state, they would be much more apt to favor state ownership, which would add to the importance of the state and at the same time give the people the benefit of public ownership.

President Roosevelt has sounded the alarm and warned the railroads that their continued management of the public highways will depend upon the effectiveness of the legislative control. What democrat can say less? What democrat would advise making the democratic party the champion of the railroads in the fight which is approaching? Aside from the principle involved, it would be

suicidal to the party to take a position which would alienate the patrons of the railroads and please only the railroad magnates who have for a generation been discriminating against persons and places, extorting from the public through rates unreasonably high and corrupting politics in every part of the country.

Regulation is to have a fair trial, but the railroads must know that their interference in politics will only hasten the day of public ownership, and the people ought to be considering whether in event of government ownership they will prefer the centralization plan of national ownership or the dual plan, which contemplates the national ownership of the trunk lines and the state ownership of all other lines.

CHARLES DUNCAN M'IVER

On another page will be found a well deserved tribute to the late Charles Duncan McIver from the pen of Dr. Albert Shaw, the editor of the *Review of Reviews*. Dr. McIver died suddenly on a special train which carried Mr. Bryan through North Carolina a few days ago. The latter's first visit to North Carolina was made twelve years ago at Dr. McIver's invitation and from that day they were close personal, as well as political, friends. Dr. McIver was a rare man. Having worked his way up from an humble station he first showed what an ambitious young man could do for himself, and then he dedicated himself to the task of showing what a noble and unselfish man could do for his fellows. He received flattering offers to go into other occupations, but he regarded his occupation, that of teaching, as a calling to him and resisted the temptation. He did not leave much money, but he left what money cannot buy—a good name which, as the wise man says, is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favor, which is to be preferred to silver and gold. The fortune which he left cannot be computed in dollars, and is a legacy to the entire land. So great was the sorrow caused by his death that the political meeting which was arranged for his city that evening was converted into a memorial meeting. How this

old world would be transformed if all of its people cherished the ideal which Dr. McIver followed along an ever brightening way.

PRAYER MEETING OR PRIMARY?

Bishop Joseph F. Berry of the Methodist Episcopal church addressed the new ministers who were being admitted to full membership by the Rock River Conference at Chicago last week. The bishop talked about good citizenship and delivered one remark that should be especially studied by churchmen everywhere. "Good government is the most important thing in the immediate range of man's endeavor," said Bishop Berry. "If the primary election and prayer meeting come the same night, the righteous man's business is at the primary." Continuing, Bishop Berry said:

"It would have been heresy some years ago, and may yet be so considered in some quarters, to proclaim that a vote at the ballot box is more important than a prayer meeting. But we should be practical enough never to lose sight of the aim of the righteous to vanquish evil. In these momentous and stormy times we should do the work of good citizenship during these hours and in those places in which alone it can be effectively done. Then we can return to our prayer meetings and give thanks to God that the forces of evil are curbed, at least, if not completely vanquished. There is not a city in the nation in which legalized social impurities could not be suppressed at civic elections if the religious and good-government forces would only go out and do it."

"YET IT MUST END"

Goldwin Smith has written for the *North American Review* an interesting article entitled "British Empire in India." In this article Dr. Smith says: "British empire in India is in no danger of being brought to an end by a Russian invasion. It does not seem to be in

much danger of being brought to an end by eternal rebellion. Yet it must end. Such is the decree of nature. In that climate British children cannot be reared. No race can forever hold and rule a land in which it cannot rear its children. In what form the end will come it has hitherto been impossible to divine. 'By accident' was the only reply which one who had held high office in India could make to such a question on that subject."

Dr. Smith's reminder should not be lost upon those American citizens who insist that our flag in the Philippines must "stay put."

DEMOCRACY IS GROWING

This year several hundred thousand young men will cast their first vote and THE COMMONER addresses a word to them.

The democratic and republican parties have opposed each other for about fifty years. The republican party was organized just before the war and the purpose of its organization was to oppose the extension of slavery. As a result of the war between the states it became the party of emancipation, although Lincoln never declared in favor of emancipation prior to his election. Since the war the republican party has been in power with the exception of the years when Grover Cleveland was president, and then it had control of either the senate or the house for most of the time.

The democratic party is as old as our constitutional history and having survived all of its defeats is now not only vigorous, but confident. These two parties represent different tendencies and these tendencies ought to be understood by those who are about to enter upon the exercise of the privileges of citizenship.

The democratic party leans toward the people; the republican party leans away from the people. The democratic party has faith in the people; the republican party has not. Democrats look back to Jefferson as the founder of their political faith; Republican leaders are admirers of Hamilton. When one knows the difference between Jefferson and Hamilton he knows the difference

between the dominant thought of those who admire Jefferson and those who admire Hamilton. Jefferson not only believed in popular elections, but he believed in having the elections frequent enough to keep the representative under the control of the voters; he recognized the frailty of man and knew that too long a tenure in office would lead the office-holder to look out for himself and forget the people who elected him. Hamilton, on the other hand, did not have faith in the people and he desired to remove the government as far as possible from the people; he drew up a form of government and tried to secure its adoption, but happily he failed to engraft his ideas upon the constitution. His plan provided for a president elected for life, for senators elected for life and for governors of the several states appointed by the president for life. It was a centralized system which betrayed in every part a lack of trust in the masses. It is significant of the fundamental differences between the two parties that democrats grow more and more fond of Jefferson while republican leaders talk more and more about Hamilton. As an evidence that this distinction is a real one, it is only necessary to review the history of the effort to secure the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people.

Something more than fourteen years ago a resolution was adopted by the house of representatives, then democratic, submitting the necessary amendment to the people; the next house, also democratic, acted favorably upon this resolution; then two republican houses adjourned without action. Why did two democratic houses favor the election of senators by the people and two republican houses oppose it? Is there any other reason than that the democrats have more faith in popular elections? After awhile public sentiment became so strong that even a republican house was compelled to pass a similar resolution, but in doing so it followed the example of the democratic houses before it and that, too, after an interval of some eight years.

The democratic national platforms of 1900 and 1904 contained planks in favor of the popular election of senators, but no republican national platform has yet indorsed this reform. How can this be explained? It is either because the republican party lacks faith in the

people or because the leaders are under the domination of the corporations which oppose the popular election of senators.

Let the young voter consider the questions which are at issue and he will find that the democratic party looks at these questions from the standpoint of the common people, while the republican leaders are constantly doing the bidding of the trusts, syndicates and other large corporations. Which party will ultimately triumph? No student of history can doubt that democracy will win. In every civilized country there are two parties, one democratic and one aristocratic—one leaning toward the people and the other leaning away from them—and in every country the democratic party is growing and the aristocratic party is diminishing in strength. Great Britain has witnessed a recent triumph of its democratic party, for the liberal party is the democratic party of Great Britain. In the House of Lords the conservatives outnumber the liberals in the ratio of 12 to 1, but in the House of Commons the liberals have 200 majority. This new democratic government, with Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman at its head, is preparing a home rule measure for Ireland, a measure for the protection of tenants of England and another measure depriving the landlords of their multiple votes; at present a landlord can vote in each district where he has land, but in the new law he will be restricted to one vote and be compelled to choose his residence.

Thus democracy grows in Great Britain. In Russia, the most despotic of the governments, a *duma* has already been established and at the election the democratic vote overwhelmed the votes cast by the czar's party. Democracy grows in Japan, in China, in India and throughout the world. It grows because it is founded upon living truth. Those who trust the people make no mistake; those who distrust the people will sooner or later find themselves in a minority, for the doctrine of self-government has been vindicated and will triumph everywhere.

If the young voter will read the speeches made by democrats and compare those speeches with the speeches made by republicans he will find that the democrat seeks to make society prosperous by making the masses prosperous, believing that prosperity comes up from the

people; the republican leaders seek to make society prosperous by making the corporations prosperous, believing that prosperity comes down from the employer to the employes.

Young voter, on which side will you fight—with the people for popular government, brought near to the people—for government of the people, by the people and for the people; or will you distrust the capacity of the people for self-government and build upon an intermediate power between them and those in authority? Will you protect the exploiter, the grafter and the plunderer, those who grow rich upon the earnings of the public, and having grown rich, debauch society, politics and government? Citizenship in a republic involves responsibility; prove that you appreciate that responsibility by, first, studying the differences between the parties and the differences between the policies presented by them and then make your vote represent a freeman's will, always remembering that truth will triumph whether you fight for it or fight against it. You may delay the triumph of the truth, but you cannot prevent it.

SAM JONES

Sam Jones, the famous evangelist, is dead, and his death removes from the scene of action a man whose life work resulted in great and permanent good to the world. His earnestness, his evident sincerity and his plain, commonsense way of putting things, made him a favorite with the people. No one ever was in doubt as to where Sam Jones stood on any question confronting the people, and many of his quaint and blunt sayings have passed into proverbs. Many years ago Sam Jones was engaged in a great union revival meeting at Plattsburg, Mo. One of the visiting ministers asked him one day why he did not use better language and refrain from so many "slang" expressions. "My dear brother," replied Mr. Jones, "I am a fisher of men. I judge the efficacy of my bait by the results I get. When one of your soft-spoken namby-pamby little preachers can show a bigger string of fish than I can I'll try his kind of

bait." For a quarter of a century Sam Jones was a prominent figure in the pulpit and on the lecture platform, and if life is measured by what men put into it, instead of what men get out of it, then Sam Jones' life was a success.

NOT CENTRALIZATION

One of the Chicago papers reports that some of the members of the Chicago Democratic Club found it difficult to locate themselves on public questions. The aforesaid paper says of these democrats: "They see Bryan, an advocate of a nationalization of railroads and federal incorporation of all big concerns, the recognized leader of democracy."

The editor of the paper ought to know, and the members of the democratic club have reason to know, that Mr. Bryan does not favor the nationalization of railroads, but has proposed a dual plan as a substitute for this very nationalization. Mr. Bryan's plan limits federal ownership to trunk lines and contemplates state ownership of state lines, the change to be made when the people are ready for it. As for the "federal incorporation of all big concerns," Mr. Bryan has expressly opposed such incorporation and has repeatedly pointed out the danger of federal incorporation of industrial enterprises. He insists that all industrial corporations should be incorporated by the state, and that the federal government should then apply such restrictions as will prevent any corporation from becoming a monopoly.

The members of the club referred to are probably not as much at sea as the republican editors would like to have them, and if any of them are at sea it is their own fault. The democratic party believes in local self-government and would keep the government as near the people as possible.

MENACE OF THE MULTI-MILLIONAIRE

For ten years the democratic party has been calling public attention to the menace of the multi-millionaire. It has been pointing out the immoral methods employed

by him in the accumulation of his money and the corrupting influence he has exerted on politics. During the last few years an increasing number of well-to-do republicans have been listening with interest to democratic speeches, but now even a few republicans of prominence are becoming alarmed. Secretary Shaw isn't scared, and Vice-President Fairbanks has so far failed to raise any danger signal. But President Roosevelt has already suggested an inheritance tax as a means of making the multimillionaire disgorge.

Now comes Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, with a speech that sounds strangely democratic. The senator made a speech at Dunkirk, Ind., on the 20th of October, and the *Cincinnati Enquirer* quotes him as saying: "Every reform measure and every proposed law for the nation's good has been fought by mighty financial interests whose practices and immunities the proposed law threatened. There seems to be a strange insanity created in the piling up of unhealthy fortunes with unhealthy haste, by unhealthy methods—an insanity that makes men who are worth scores of millions of dollars fight any law which will reduce even a small percentage of their enormous profit."

Mr. Beveridge then cites the case of an Arizona mining company which opposed statehood for fear its taxes might be increased. He adds: "This fact brings up another and, perhaps, the most serious problem immediately before us for solution. It is the problem of the more equal distribution of wealth, and especially of the limitation of what President Roosevelt calls swollen fortunes."

Mr. Beveridge calls attention to Rockefeller, and says that he is reputed to be worth \$800,000,000, and that in the hands of Rockefeller's son this will probably be increased in a lifetime to \$2,000,000,000. "This," he declares, "is wrong. It is dangerous to the public."

"I am not the enemy of wealth," says Senator Beveridge. "I believe in fostering and encouraging that industrial enterprise which makes men accumulate money. But when a fortune reaches a point where it is no longer the result of individual effort and thought and thrift, but accumulates of its own course, it ceases to be a bless-

ing and becomes a curse. No man should own \$1,000,000,000. No man should own \$100,000,000. No man in a republic of free and equal men should have the immeasurable power that the possession of such enormous riches gives him. It is bad enough from every point of view, but the deadly thing about it is that the managers of this great wealth constantly interfere with the people's government. This is manifest in our legislatures, it is apparent in our elections, it is present in our primaries. And it has got to be stopped. We cannot permit this government of, by and for the people to become a government of, by and for merely wealthy men and great financial institutions. The multiplication of rich men in public life is not a good sign in free institutions."

This might be attributed to a democratic speaker and no one would ever notice the mistake. Probably a corporation republican would be led to denounce the language as demagogic and incendiary, if it were attributed to a democrat. But what is to be thought when a republican senator uses this language? Can anyone doubt longer the truth of the democratic indictment of republican misrule? Where are these multi-millionaires whose fortunes menace the country? Are they to be found among the farmers who have been enjoying "a home market?" Are they to be found among the working men for whom the republican party has seemed so solicitous? Are these fortunes in the possession of the country merchants who have been voting the republican ticket with great regularity? No. Millionaires do not grow in the country, or in the villages. They are the product of hot-house legislation. They have been built up and pampered by the republican party which, for a quarter of a century, has acted upon the theory that if the corporations were made prosperous some of their prosperity would leak through on the people. Bonuses have been voted to the manufacturers and trust magnates on the theory that they would generously divide with their employes. It is fortunate for the country that we are at the end of this delusion and that the people at large are getting their eyes open to the fact that predatory wealth must be checked and the opportunities of the average man enlarged.

The remedy proposed by the republicans is an inherit-

ance tax. Although better than nothing, this is an inadequate remedy. Instead of allowing these commercial highwaymen to spend their lives plundering the public, and then grabbing a part of it when they die, the democrats propose to enforce the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. This will put all on an equal footing and give everyone a fair chance. When the beneficiaries of republican legislation are stripped of special privileges and made to earn their living like the farmer and the laborer their fortunes will not be so swollen as to require heroic treatment.

Republican! Can't you help us this year to begin the reform of these abuses?

A DIVIDED HOUSE

The irresistible conflict in the republican party is well illustrated by the speeches of Senator Beveridge and Vice-President Fairbanks. The senator is a reformer; the vice-president is a "standpatter." Senator Beveridge is out ringing a bell and shouting: "Wake up, you are in danger;" Vice-President Fairbanks carries a bottle of chloroform and whispers: "Sleep on; all is well." And yet they live in the same state and both call themselves republicans.

MR. ROOSEVELT AND GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

In his message in December, 1904, President Roosevelt said:

"The government must, in increasing degree, supervise and regulate the workings of the railways engaged in interstate commerce, and such increased supervision is the only alternative to an increase of the present evils on the one hand or a still more radical policy on the other."

President Roosevelt, in the annual message which he sent to congress at the beginning of the session recently ended, said:

“The question of transportation lies at the root of all industrial success, and the revolution in transportation which has taken place during the last half century has been the most important factor in the growth of the new industrial conditions. Most emphatically we do not wish to see the man of great talents refused the reward for his talents. Still less do we wish to see him penalized; but we do desire to see the system of railroad transportation so handled that the strong man shall be given no advantage over the weak man. We wish to insure as fair treatment for the small town as for the big city; for the small shipper as for the big shipper. In the old days the highway of commerce, whether by water or by a road on land, was open to all; it belonged to the public and the traffic along it was free. At present the railway is this highway, and we must do our best to see that it is kept open to all on equal terms. Unlike the old highway it is a very difficult and complex thing to manage, and it is far better that it should be managed by private individuals than by the government. But it can only be so managed on condition that justice is done the public. It is because, in my judgment, public ownership of railroads is highly undesirable, and would probably in this country entail far-reaching disaster, that I wish to see such supervision and regulation of them in the interest of the public as will make it evident that there is no need for public ownership. The opponents of government regulation dwell upon the difficulties to be encountered and the intricate and involved nature of the problem. Their contention is true. It is a complicated and delicate problem, and all kinds of difficulties are sure to arise in connection with any plan of solution, while no plan will bring all the benefits hoped for by its more optimistic adherents. Moreover, under any healthy plan, the benefits will develop gradually and not rapidly. Finally, we must clearly understand that the public servants who are to do this peculiarly responsible and delicate work must themselves be of the highest type both as regards integrity and efficiency. They must be well paid, for otherwise able men cannot in the long run be secured; and they must possess a lofty probity which will revolt as quickly at the thought of pandering to any gust of popular prejudice against rich men as at the

thought of anything even remotely resembling subserviency to rich men. But while I fully admit the difficulties in the way, I do not for a moment admit that these difficulties warrant us in stopping in our effort to secure a wise and just system. They should have no other effect than to spur us on to the exercise of the resolution, the even-handed justice, and the fertility of resource which we like to think as typically American, and which will in the end achieve good results in this as in other fields of activity. The task is a great one and underlies the task of dealing with the whole industrial problem. But the fact that it is a great problem does not warrant us in shrinking from the attempt to solve it. At present we face such utter lack of supervision, such freedom from the restraints of law, that excellent men have often been literally forced into doing what they deplored because otherwise they were left at the mercy of unscrupulous competitors. To rail at and assail the men who have done as they best could under such conditions accomplishes little. What we need to do is to develop an orderly system; and such a system can only come through the gradually increased exercise of the right of efficient government control.”

President Roosevelt, in a message delivered to congress on May 4, said:

“But in addition to these secret rates the Standard Oil profits immensely by open rates, which are so arranged as to give it an overwhelming advantage over its independent competitors. The refusal of the railroads in certain cases to prorate produces analogous effects. Thus in New England the refusal of certain railway systems to prorate has resulted in keeping the Standard Oil in absolute monopolistic control of the field, enabling it to charge from three to four hundred thousand dollars a year more to consumers of oil in New England than they would have had to pay had the price paid been that obtaining in the competitive fields. This is a characteristic example of the numerous evils which are inevitable under a system in which the big shipper and the railroad are left free to crush out all individual initiative and all power of independent action because of the absence of adequate and thorough-going govern-

mental control. Exactly similar conditions obtain in a large part of the west and southwest.

“The argument is sometimes advanced against conferring upon some governmental body the power of supervision and control over interstate commerce, that to do so tends to weaken individual initiative. Investigations such as this conclusively disprove any such allegation. On the contrary, the proper play for individual initiative can only be secured by such governmental supervision as will curb those monopolies which crush out all individual initiative. The railroad itself cannot without such government aid protect the interests of its own stockholders as against one of these great corporations loosely known as ‘trusts.’

“The time has come when no oil or coal lands held by the government, either upon the public domain proper or in territory owned by the Indian tribes, should be alienated. The fee of such lands should be kept in the United States government whether or not the profits arising from it are to be given to any Indian tribe, and the lands should be leased only on such terms and for such periods as will enable the government to keep entire control thereof.”

THE ELECTIONS OF 1906

The elections of 1906 indicate a trend in favor of the democratic party. The details prove that the democratic party is growing stronger as the republican policies are developed. In New York the party has won a signal victory in spite of the tremendous efforts put forth in behalf of the administration. The republicans had all the money they wanted; they had the support of all the great corporations; and at the close they had whatever influence the administration could lend. The fact that the democrats elected every state officer excepting the governor shows that in the Empire state the republican party has been repudiated. The defeat of Mr. Hearst, the democratic and independent candidate for governor, while a great disappointment to his friends and to the party, is explained by the facts which rob Mr. Hughes' victory of both glory and political significance. Mr. McCarren,

whom Mr. Hearst denounced as a boss, threw his influence to Hughes and cut down Mr. Hearst's vote in Brooklyn. Mayor McClellan, the legality of whose election Mr. Hearst has denied, used his influence for Mr. Hughes and cut down the Hearst vote in New York. Mr. Jerome, the prosecuting attorney of New York, who had also been attacked by Mr. Hearst, supported the republican ticket, and his influence was felt in Greater New York. Mr. Croker, during the last days of the campaign, made an attack upon Mr. Hearst, which doubtless weakened the democratic candidate among the Tammanyites. Mr. Murphy, the head of Tammany, while supporting the ticket, could not put much enthusiasm into the campaign owing to the personal controversies which he had had with Mr. Hearst. It is evident, therefore that Mr. Hughes owes his victory not to republican votes but to democratic votes brought to him by the very men whom he and the republican leaders have been denouncing for years.

President Roosevelt cannot find very much cause for rejoicing in the New York returns. To have his own state go democratic cannot be gratifying to him, and to find that his personal attack upon Mr. Hearst had little influence on the result compared with the influence exerted by McCarren, Murphy and Croker will not gladden his Thanksgiving day. The president's personal attack on Mr. Hearst was in bad taste, to say the least, and the failure of that attack to favorably impress the public ought to be a warning for the future.

Mr. Hearst is, of course, disappointed, and yet, when all the facts are known, he has much to congratulate himself upon. He made a tremendous fight against great odds, and while he himself failed of election, his heroic struggle brought victory to the rest of the ticket. As the rest of the ticket stood for the same principles for which he contended, it is evident that he has been vindicated on the position taken, and this must be more gratifying to him than any personal victory could be. His personal enemies have contributed to his defeat, but the triumph of his ideas still leaves him in a position to continue the fight for the protection of the public against the encroachments of predatory wealth.

If the trend toward democracy continues as strong

for the next two years as it has been for the last two years, New York can be counted among the democratic states in 1908, and Mr. Hearst is in a position to do valiant work in securing a national triumph for progressive, democratic ideas.

The democratic gains in congress have not been as great as the party expected, but they have been sufficient to make it probable that the democrats will control the congress to be elected in 1908. In nearly all the legislatures in the middle states the democrats have made decided gains and these promise much for the senatorial contests which take place two years hence.

In Iowa, Kansas and California the democrats made a splendid fight for their gubernatorial ticket. The reduction of Governor Cummins' majority from more than seventy thousand to about twenty thousand put Iowa in the doubtful states for two years hence. Kansas and California can no longer be claimed as certainly republican. The fight made by Mr. Harris in the former state and by Mr. Bell in the latter give more than a reasonable hope of success two years hence.

The victory in Missouri will bring joy to every democratic heart. A wail went up when Missouri dropped out of the democratic column two years ago. Her return is greeted with widespread rejoicing. Oklahoma, the new state, comes in with a rousing democratic majority. The constitution will be written by democrats, and she will send two senators to fight in the interest of the wealth producers. Democracy welcomes Oklahoma to a seat near the head of the table.

In Nebraska the democrats hoped, with the aid of the populists, to elect their state ticket and their candidate for the United States senate. In this they failed, but they have made substantial gains throughout the state as shown by the vote on congressmen and the legislative ticket as well as by the state ticket. They have gained one congressman and came within less than two hundred votes of gaining another. In two other districts the republican majorities have been so much reduced that we can reasonably count on four democratic congressmen two years from now. In the legislature the fusionists will have about four times as many as they had two years ago.

The republicans have had an effective campaign cry

in "stand by the president." While the record showed that the democrats in the senate and the house stood by the president better than the republicans, the admirers of the president very naturally gave weight to his appeal for a republican congress although in making the appeal the president put a personal victory above the reforms which he has been advocating. Two years from now that appeal will be of no avail, for the president will not be in office after March 4, 1909. Even if he were a candidate—which no friend of his can assume after his repeated declarations—he would have to confront the third term issue, and who would say that that issue alone would not lose the president enough votes to make his race hopeless? The popular vote as indicated by the congressional elections shows that the republicans even now have a narrow margin to go on, and that margin will be quickly wiped out if the president allowed himself to be drawn into a race for a third term.

Now as to the future. The democrats, united in a real fight against the encroachments of organized wealth, see victory before them. The republicans divided, will enter the campaign without spirit and with little confidence in success. The fight in the republican ranks between the reformers and the standpatters will grow more fierce as the months go by, for the character of the republican party is to be determined by this fight. If the standpatters win, the reformers will have to take refuge in the democratic party; if the reformers win their fight in the republican party, there is no place on earth for the standpatters. It is a struggle that must end in complete victory for one side and in complete overthrow of the other side. Events have caused this division because those events have shown more clearly each year the dangers of corporate domination over politics. The democrats have assisted the division by advocating remedial legislation, and the president has contributed to the educational work more than anyone else. If this were a personal difference it could be smoothed over, but it is a vital difference, and the feeling between the two elements of the party is such that either element would rather see the party defeated than have the other element succeed. There is no republican in sight who can harmonize the two elements, and there is no republican be-

longing to either element of the party who can command the support of the other element. All that the democratic party has to do is to stand steadfast by its position and offer democratic principles for the solution of all the problems that vex the country.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FIRST VOTERS

Young man, great responsibility attaches to your first vote. As you begin, so you are likely to continue. The momentum that carries you into a party at the beginning of your political life is apt to keep you in that party unless some convulsion shakes you out of it. Start right, and in order that you may start right, examine the principles of the parties and the policies which they advocate.

There are two great party organizations in the United States, one fifty years old, and the other more than a century old. The republican party has been in power almost uninterruptedly for more than half a century, and under its reign abuses have grown up which threaten the perpetuity of the government and endanger our civilization. So great are these abuses that republican reformers are now pointing out that something must be done—and what can be done? The first thing is to undo the things that have been done, and the party to undo these abuses is not the party which has done them, but the party which has protested against these abuses and pointed out remedies.

The republican party has turned the taxing power over to private individuals; it has allowed monopolies to grow up and assume control of the industries of the country by granting privileges by law and by giving immunity to the large violators of the law; the republican party has permitted the fortunes of the predatory rich to become so large that government is corrupted, politics debauched and business polluted.

The democratic party proposes to withdraw the taxing power from private hands, to so legislate as to make a private monopoly impossible and to enforce the law without discrimination. It proposes to protect legitimate wealth and punish those who attempt to plunder the pub-

lic for private gain. On which side do you stand, young man? Are you with the masses in their effort to restore the government to its old foundation and make it a government of the people, for the people and by the people? or are you with the republican leaders in their effort to perpetuate the party in power by selling immunity in return for campaign contributions?

There are always two parties in the country, and one is necessarily nearer to the people than the other. In this country the democratic party is nearer to the people than the republican party. Its leaders have more faith in the people and are more anxious to keep the government under the control of the people. Take the election of United States senators by the people as a test. The democrats want to give to the voters a chance to elect and to control their representatives in the United States senate. The democratic party in the house of representatives passed the first resolution for the submission of the necessary constitutional amendment. They did this eight years before any republican congress did it. The democratic party has twice demanded this reform in its national platform. The republican party has not done so. Why do democratic leaders insist upon this reform and republican leaders oppose it? There can be but one answer—the democratic party is nearer to the people than the republican party. Young man, will you stand with the people or against them?

The answer to this question affects your country. If you are with the people your influence, be it great or small, will hasten their victory. If you are against the people your influence may retard that victory. But while in the first instance it is your country that may gain or lose by your action, you must remember that in the long run your own position in politics will depend upon your conduct. You cannot fool the people always. You may lead them astray if you dare, but they will punish you when they find you out. You may work for the people without their recognizing it at first, but you can trust them to discover the character of your work and to reward you accordingly.

Readers of *THE COMMONER*, look after the young man, the first voter. It is much easier to start him right than it is to convert one who, in changing his party affiliations,

may sever ties of great strength and long standing. If every democrat will pick out a young republican and furnish him literature between now and 1908 a vast army of recruits can be gathered. THE COMMONER will make itself as useful as possible to these young men. If you think that this paper will help you in your effort to bring the first voters into the democratic party, won't you bring THE COMMONER to their attention? There is no literature like a newspaper. Speeches are read and too often thrown away while newspapers come every week and each issue reinforces the arguments made by former issues. No single argument can equal in effect the argument which is presented weekly. If each reader of THE COMMONER will pick out a young republican who will vote for the first time in 1908 and secure his subscription, many congressional districts can be carried and many state legislatures be made democratic. Will you try?

A special rate of sixty cents per year will be given to anyone who will cast his first vote in 1908. In order to obtain this rate it will be necessary to say that the new subscriber will be a "first voter" in 1908.

TO THE DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

While we did not secure a majority in congress at the recent election, we made gains enough to give us a firm basis for our party's hope of securing a democratic majority in the congress to be elected two years hence. Now is the time to lay the foundation for success, and there is nothing that will contribute so much to success as deserving it. The house of representatives has ceased to be a deliberative body. The rules put it within the power of a few men to control legislation. The committee on rules is so small that it does not represent the country; it represents no one but the speaker. The committee on rules ought to be larger. If it were composed of fifteen members selected from various sections of the country, it would be possible for the house of representatives to be brought into closer harmony with the entire nation and it would not be so easy to strangle

legislation. Is it not worth while for the democratic minority to make a fight for a larger committee on rules?

The speaker has too much power, and he derives it from the custom which has put the appointment of committees in his hands. The committees ought not to be appointed by the speaker; they ought to be selected by a caucus. The members of the committee ought to be under obligations to their constituents first and to the party second. At present they are under obligation to the speaker first, to the party second and to their constituents third. While the democratic party cannot make the rules of the house until it secures a majority of the members, it can and should begin its fight now. It has been customary for the minority candidate for speaker to select the minority members of committees, and this enables the minority leader to coerce by arbitrary authority whereas he should lead by argument and by superior wisdom. THE COMMONER ventures to suggest that the democratic minority should assert the right of a caucus to select the minority members of the committee. It will add strength to the party in the next campaign if democratic candidates will present the advantages of the caucus plan over the one man rule.

If the democrats in the house of representatives will make a fight for a committee on rules large enough to represent the whole country and put themselves in opposition to the one man power which has dwarfed the position of the members and enshrined the speaker as boss, the election of a democratic congress in 1908 will be made easier.

VIGILANCE THE PRICE OF LIBERTY

Now that the election of 1906 is over and the lines are being drawn for the presidential campaign of 1908, it behooves the democrats to be on their guard lest the party be crippled by an organization out of harmony with the party's purpose. In 1904 the party took a backward step, and it did so because many good democrats, discouraged by defeat, yielded to the temptation held out by Wall street, which offered to help the democratic party secure some of its reforms if it would aban-

don others. When the time came, Wall street did what Wall street always has done, namely—threw its influence to the party which it thought could win. The lesson was a useful one to democrats, and immediately after the election the progressive element in the party asserted itself. The platforms adopted by the democratic state conventions of this year leave no doubt as to the party's position. There will be no contest in the national convention of 1908 on platform. The party will be drawn up solidly against the encroachments of predatory wealth, and its position will be clear and explicit on all the issues ripe for settlement, but the organization is almost as necessary as the platform. Our fight must be made upon a moral plane, for we seek justice. Our people must appeal to the conscience of the country, and that conscience awakened will sweep everything before it. We cannot fight upon a moral plane with an immoral organization; we cannot appeal to the conscience of the country with a conscienceless crowd in charge of the party machinery. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, that the organization shall be in the hands of those who are in sympathy with the party's purpose and whose records will not give the lie to the party's promises.

There are many democrats who are voting the ticket whose prominence in the party would be a detriment to the party. If these men are really sincere in their desire to help the party they will not force themselves into the foreground, and if they try to force themselves into the foreground the party ought to thwart their purpose. The fight at this time is against the encroachments of the predatory corporations, and these corporations can be divided into two classes, first, those that hold franchises or favors from the government, and, second, those which for pecuniary reasons attempt to control the legislative, the executive or the judicial branch of the government. No one who is connected with such a corporation should aspire to a position in a party organization, for he cannot serve the public and his corporation at the same time. He must choose which he will serve. If he wants to stay in politics he must sever his connection with the corporations. If he wants to remain with the corporations, he must sever himself from politics. The city councils and the state legislatures

have constantly to deal with the franchise corporations of the cities; therefore, those who are connected with those corporations ought not to be permitted to be a part of the party organization. The trusts have to be dealt with by state and federal legislation, and, therefore, no one connected with the trusts ought to be a member of the party organization. The railroads are constantly before the state and federal congress and before state and federal courts. No one who is so connected with the railroads as to make him subservient to them or biased in their favor should be a part of the party organization. It is no reflection upon a railroad attorney or a corporation attorney to say that he cannot serve two masters. No one who is not consumed with egotism and inordinately vain would imagine himself able to decide impartially between the people on the one side and his corporation on the other.

Let every aspirant for a position in the party organization be scrutinized. If his present position or his past record is open to objection, let him stand aside. The party has more important work than apologizing for its representatives, and no representative ought to desire to make himself an issue. The corporations will attempt to control the organization, and they will have candidates for every vacancy from precinct committeeman to the top of the organization. The people must have their candidates, and it is well to begin at once and pick out the right man for each place and have him ready.

The party has a splendid chance to win. Its principles have been vindicated. It stands upon the people's side of all public questions. All that it has to do now is to convince the public that it can be trusted, and it cannot win the confidence of the public if it loads itself down with objectionable and odorous representatives. Draw the line, not in anger but in fairness and justice, and see to it that the party organization is clean and incorruptible.

Organize! Organize now, and put only trustworthy men on guard!

MORE TOM JOHNSONS

The *Lincoln* (Neb.) *Journal*, republican, admits that "Tom Johnsons with an interest in street car affairs are not found in every community." That is true, but Tom Johnson's fight will encourage imitators so that there will be likely to be more of his kind in the future than there have been in the past. One brave fighter is worth a regiment of cowards.

KEEP AN EYE ON THIS BILL

The American Bankers' Association, in session at Washington City, has decided to make a determined move in behalf of asset currency. Associated Press dispatches say that Chairman Fowler, of the house committee on currency, and Comptroller of the Currency Ridgley, attended the session, and "the plans determined upon met with their full approval." The Washington correspondent for the *Chicago Tribune* says that "for the first time in many years there is a chance that the long needed reform in the currency may be accomplished." By "reform" is meant asset currency. Whether it is known as emergency currency or by some other harmless sounding name it is the policy against which republican newspapers preached vigorously several years ago, when it was presented in the Fowler bill and the Aldrich bill. Then they told us there was not the slightest danger of such a measure being seriously considered; and now it is plain from the tone of these republican papers that many editors, who heretofore condemned the policy, are now prepared to embrace it; that many editors who are on record as denouncing the policy as absurd are now preparing to call it the "most patriotic and business-like proposition that has ever been presented to the people."

It is plain the American people are face to face with a determined effort to force upon them an asset currency, and this effort is to be made by men who, a few years ago, protested vigorously against the restoration of bimetallism. Then they protested against a "fifty cent dollar," but now they are pleading earnestly for a no

cent dollar. Then they wanted the money which the people are to use to have "a solid and substantial basis"; but now they want money issued on wind—and they want to furnish the wind.

It will be well for the American people to prepare for a systematic campaign along these lines. Soon Americans will be hearing—if, indeed, they have not already heard it through their local sages—that there is something radically wrong with our currency, and that "a more elastic currency" or "an emergency currency" is necessary to meet the demands of "business." Elastic currency" or "emergency currency," or by whatever name it may be known, it is the same old asset currency for which Congressman Fowler has for years contended; the same currency provided for in the Fowler bill, in the McCleary bill, in the Aldrich bill and in similar measures, every one of which measures was condemned by republican editors and repudiated by republican orators, the people being assured that there was not the slightest danger that the republican party would adopt such measures. But the advocacy of such measures after election day is eminently characteristic of the republican party.

The national banks have altogether more power than they should have. The enormous advantages now enjoyed by national banks should be withdrawn, rather than increased. The asset currency is the thing for which the money trust has for years contended and one of the things it most desires. It will be a sorry day for the American people when they sleep so soundly as to permit these money gamblers to place upon the statute books such a measure as is contemplated by the American Bankers' Association.

Do not forget to drop your representative and your senator a line to let him know that your eyes are upon him. Tell him frankly that the man who goes on record with a vote in favor of asset currency places upon himself an indelible brand—the brand of Wall street.

SOME OF THE "DREAMERS" OF HISTORY

Following is an abstract of Mr. Bryan's speech on "Dreams" delivered at Lincoln just before the close of the campaign:

Senator Beveridge, in his speech in this city, paid the compliment of calling me a dreamer. It did not impress me at first, although I appreciated the kindly tone in which this distinguished representative of the republican party has spoken of me. A few days afterwards Governor Cummins of Iowa called me a dreamer. Then I sat up and took notice. Not long after that Speaker Cannon called me a dreamer. This made the matter look serious. And then Governor Hanley of Indiana followed and brought the same accusation against me. With these four witnesses testifying against me I might find it difficult to escape conviction, and I have decided to plead guilty and justify. Finding that I could not escape the charge, I began to look up the subject of dreams and to inquire of the dreamer's position in history. Philosophers tell us that the dream of today is the reality of tomorrow, and a poet has gone even farther and declared:

"The dreamer lives forever and
The toiler dies in a day."

But it is not safe to build an argument upon a poem, for poets sometimes take license with truth as with language. I have greater faith in the Bible than I have in a poem, and therefore I went to the Bible as I am wont to do. If I quote democratic authority the republicans attack my authority, and sometimes they keep me busy defending the democrats quoted, but when I quote the Bible I leave them to fight it out with my authority. The Bible tells us of dreamers, the most prominent among them being Joseph. His brothers were angered by his dreams, and when his father sent him out into the plains of Dothan, his brothers plotted to kill him. They did sell him to some merchants, who carried him into Egypt, and they reported to his father that he had been killed by a wild beast. Yes, Joseph the dreamer was put out of the way as many dreamers have been since, but after awhile his brothers were glad to go down into Egypt and get corn of him.

The democratic party is something like Joseph in this respect. It has had its dreams; its enemies have plotted against it, and now it is prepared to furnish the corn to those who have fought it and tried to put it out of the way.

The democratic party has contained many dreamers during the last hundred years. In fact, it was founded by a dreamer, Jefferson, and defended by Jackson, who was something of a dreamer. Jefferson's mind was filled with a vision of a self-governing people, and his whole life was devoted to an attempt to make the dream a reality. His dream was reduced to writing in the Declaration of Independence, and it breathes through all of his letters and public documents. He saw in the future a government resting upon the consent of the governed, strong because it was loved and loved because it was good. That dream is being realized in this country, for the tendency is to make our government more Jeffersonian by bringing it more and more completely under the control of the voters. The effort to secure the election of United States senators by the people is an effort toward the realization of Jefferson's dream. The effort to substitute the party primary for the boss-ridden convention is an effort to realize Jefferson's dream.

Not only in this country but in every country in the world the dream of Jefferson is taking form. Everywhere the party of the people is growing, and there is such a party in every civilized or semi-civilized country. The dreamer Jefferson will live when the friends of monarchy, the friends of aristocracy and the friends of plutocracy have all disappeared from the earth.

Nor were democratic dreamers confined to the early days. Fifteen years ago the democratic party had a vision of a United States senate brought into harmony with the people and made the highest legislative body in the world. That dream was crystallized into a resolution submitting the necessary amendment, and that resolution passed a democratic house of representatives by more than a two-thirds vote, and it passed the next house of representatives. So strong a hold did that dream take upon the public that after eight years a republican house of representatives was forced to adopt a similar resolu-

tion, and now two-thirds of the states of the Union have indorsed the democratic dream and two democratic national platforms have demanded its realization.

The democratic party has been dreaming of tariff reform for years and has pointed out the injustice of the high tariff schedules and the inequality which they have caused in the distribution of the wealth created. This dream is taking shape, and every year finds more advocates of tariff reform. A few years ago the republicans said that the tariff must be maintained until the infant industries could get upon their feet, but the infants are not only standing upon their feet but walk over everybody else's feet, so that argument has disappeared. Afterwards we were told that the tariff must be maintained for the benefit of adult industries to enable them to pay good wages, but now we are exporting some five hundred millions of manufactured goods a year and competing in foreign markets with no tariff to protect us, and it cannot be contended that we must keep a fifty per cent. tariff in order to keep outsiders from running our own factories out of the country. The only argument now is that the tariff barons must hang together or hang separately.

The democrats have been dreaming upon the trust question, and their vision of an industrial system resting upon competition and protecting each individual in the enjoyment of his rights and opportunities is about to be realized. At first the republican leaders denied that there were any trusts. Then they insisted that there were good trusts and bad trusts. Now they admit that the trusts are bad but they only promise to regulate and control while the democrats insist on the annihilation of the principle of private monopoly. Every day the absurdity of regulation as a remedy becomes more apparent, and it will not be long before the democratic vision will be the vision of the whole people.

The democratic party has had its dreams on the labor question. Seeing the conflict between employers and employes with the strike as the only remedy of the workingman, it has had a vision of arbitration which will not only secure justice but establish friendship between employer and employe. It is a disgrace to our civilization and a reproach to the party in power that the laboring

man must starve his wife and children by a prolonged strike in order to secure an improvement in wages or conditions of labor. The president has caught something of the democratic dream and settled one coal strike by arbitration, but his party has failed to adopt the principle. Even the president has not yet come up to the democratic vision on the subject of government by injunction. He is still willing that the laboring man should be denied the right of trial by jury—a right so sacred that it cannot be taken from a convicted thief.

For more than a decade the democratic party has had its dream of effective rate legislation, and this dream has been written into three national platforms. We are gratified that we were able to furnish a platform declaration for the president when he found no republican platform which took the people's side on this question. We are glad that the democratic dreamers in the house and the senate supported him when many of the republican leaders were bushwhacking and throwing obstacles in the way. It was a democrat, "Ben" Tillman, who managed the bill in the senate when the republican leaders wanted to defeat it, and democrats supported the nine amendments of that republican dreamer La Follette, of Wisconsin, although republican leaders opposed all these amendments.

Yes, the democratic party has its dreamers, and every day brings those dreams nearer to a realization. Every element of popularity that the president has—and he seems to be the only popular republican leader—is due to his adoption of democratic dreams, although he has only adopted a few of them and these only in part. It is an evidence of democratic sincerity that they have supported a president of the opposite party better than the republicans have supported their own president.

But the republicans have had some dreamers in the party. Hamilton had a vision of an aristocratic government, and that vision was embodied in a form of government which he sought to have adopted. Fortunately it was rejected, and every year carries us farther away from the ideas of Hamilton and nearer to the ideas of Jefferson. Lincoln was a dreamer but he found his inspiration in Jefferson, and Lincoln's arguments no longer have weight with republican leaders.

The republican party has had some recent dreams, but they have proven to be nightmares. It had a dream of empire. It pictured the United States as the possessor of colonies and following at the tail end of the European procession. Every year shows the costliness of the experiment in colonialism; every year brings us nearer to the democratic position, which is the American position, namely—that the right of the Filipinos to self-government must be recognized as the right of the Cubans to self-government has been recognized. Every year makes it more evident that we should have promised independence at the very beginning and that we must ultimately promise it—the sooner, the better.

The democratic party even now has a dream that must sooner or later commend itself to the thinking people of the country. It is a vision of a government brought into harmony with Divine will. God's plan is to suit the reward to the intelligent effort; but the republican party has reversed that law—that those who toiled the longest and the hardest have the least to show for it, while those who through the favoritism of government lay tribute upon the masses are growing rich by leaps and bounds. The president cries out in alarm that the swollen fortunes must not descend to posterity, and he suggests an inheritance tax as a means of making the possessors of these fortunes disgorge. While an inheritance tax will be some improvement, the democratic plan is better still. Instead of being content to secure a part of the plunder when the plunderer dies, the democratic party proposes to withdraw the taxing power from private hands and to destroy monopoly. When equal opportunities are open to all, and when no one can grow rich by cunningly defrauding his neighbor, no man can grow rich enough to make his fortune a menace to the country. When each one is confined to the reward which he can earn by giving society an equivalent service, the menace of predatory wealth will be removed and justice established. This is a democratic dream. This is the democratic dream of a government administered according to the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

Even republicans must see that history is vindicating democratic dreams. Republicans, will you join with us in the effort to realize the greatest of all political dreams

and help to make this government what it should be, a government of the people, by the people and for the people?

EDUCATORS VS. TRUST MAGNATES

To those who teach: Have you ever compared your work with the work done by the trust magnate? You occupy a very important position in society. There can be no civilization, as we use the term, without mental development, and there can be no mental development without teachers. While the parent if educated could supply the place of the teachers to some extent, the parent does not do so. As society is now organized the child from the time it enters the kindergarten until it leaves the university is under the instruction of the school teacher. A great responsibility rests upon the school teacher, for the child's progress depends upon his efficiency and fidelity.

The school teacher, whether man or woman, is an important factor in society and an intellectual stimulus to the community. Almost without exception the teacher is a person of high ideals and exemplary life. Not only in the schoolroom, but outside of the schoolroom as well, the influence of the teacher is of great weight, and that weight is thrown upon the best side of all questions.

The pay of the school teacher is small—woefully small when the value of the work is considered. The stenographer in the average business office receives higher pay than the average school teacher in the country; the head clerks in the business houses draw a larger salary than the superintendents of schools, and the average professional man is better paid than the average college professor. So much for the services, influence and compensation of the school teacher who has devoted years to preparation for work.

What of the trust magnate? His preparation for work is usually not so extensive as that of the teacher; instead of rendering a service to society, his business is a curse; his influence, instead of being thrown upon the right side of public questions, is almost invariably used against society, and yet his wealth mounts up by leaps

and bounds because he is in position to extort what he will. He brings into business no useful idea; he restricts rather than increases the production of wealth, and his example discourages a thousand where it gives inspiration and ambition to one. Why is he tolerated? Why is he permitted to monopolize industry and prey upon society? Why is he allowed to grow fat at the expense of the people while a deserving person like the teacher receives but a scant reward for a large service to society?

It is because society permits it, and society permits it because many do not see the evils involved in private monopoly, and many who do see the evils are silent when they should speak. The teacher owes it to himself to protest against this unequal distribution of the common fund derived from labor, and standing as he does upon an eminence, he owes it to the masses who pay the taxes which support him to sound a note of warning. If all of the teachers in all of the schools and colleges would speak out against the evils of private monopoly and use their influence to exterminate the principle of private monopoly wherever it presents itself, industry would soon be freed from the menace which now confronts it.

Recognizing how important a factor the teacher is in the formation of public opinion, the trust magnates have commenced to subsidize colleges, and they have already closed lips that ought to speak and blunted pens that ought to denounce the aggressions of predatory wealth. Will the teachers study the subject, and studying, will they speak out in the interest of the public?

THE THANKSGIVING SEASON

AS **THE COMMONER** reaches the subscriber this week, his thoughts will be occupied with the Thanksgiving season and much reason have we all to be grateful. No doubt each reader of **THE COMMONER** has had during the past year more or less of joy and sorrow. Good crops have come to most of the toilers upon the farm and reasonable prosperity to those who labor in the factory and the market place. Most of the readers of **THE COMMONER** have had good health, for health is the

rule and sickness the exception. Into some homes sorrow has come; into a few, death has entered. While the grim reaper is never a welcome guest, we are all conscious of the possibility of his summons at any time, and we reconcile ourselves to the loss of loved ones, placing the delights which they have brought to us against the grief caused by their departure from us.

It is not possible for the editor of *THE COMMONER* to know each individual case and to offer congratulations to those who have been especially blessed or to comfort those who mourn, but he takes this opportunity to call attention to the large blessings which all have received and which ought to excite in each a feeling of gratitude appropriate to Thanksgiving day.

When we separate the things which have come to us without effort or even volition upon our part from the things we have done for ourselves, we find little ground for vanity. We are so largely the creatures of environment and so greatly indebted to others for what we have and are that reflection teaches humility.

Were we born in the United States? It was a kind Providence that cast our lot here and gave us a heritage and government formed by the forefathers and handed down to us as a costly and yet priceless treasure.

Were we born in comfortable homes? Let us return thanks for the good fortune that surrounded us in infancy with the things which we needed for sustenance and development.

Have we had the advantages of education? Let us acknowledge our indebtedness to those who established our school systems, public and private; to our parents who, knowing the advantages of intellectual training, sent us to school, and to our teachers, who gave us the benefit of instruction and discipline.

Were we reared in Christian homes or in homes where high ideals were presented to us in youth? If so, let us estimate the influence which birth and early training have had upon our lives and we will recognize how deeply obligated we are to parents and to friends for the conceptions of life which have enabled us to improve our opportunities.

How can we repay the debt? It cannot be repaid as a loan of money can, for those who gave us free govern-

ment are dead. Our teachers are not, as a rule, within our reach. Those who have inspired us by high ideals are in most cases gone to their reward and the parents of the majority of the readers of THE COMMONER have also been called home, but if payment cannot be made to those from whom we have directly received benefits, it can be made to those about us and to society at large. We can help those who have been overcome by misfortune and thus prove our gratitude for the comforts of life. We can labor to protect the government from assaults within as well as from assaults from without. We can strive to keep it a government of the people, by the people and for the people. We can contribute to the maintenance of schools and to the encouragement of teachers, and we can devote ourselves to the wise solution of the problems that confront our generation.

There is no lack of work to be done where there is a will to do it. Every day presents its opportunities, and with its opportunities it presents responsibilities. He whose heart is right will never be idle, for the willing hand can always find employment.

Thanksgiving day will have served its purpose if the retrospect which it presents spurs us on to the more conscientious performance of duty and to increase our contribution to the welfare of the world and the sum of human happiness.

PEACE AND TRUST RESOLUTIONS AT KANSAS CITY

Reporting the proceedings of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress at Kansas City, November 22, the Associated Press says:

Leslie M. Shaw, secretary of the treasury, and William J. Bryan secured the lion's share of attention here today among a long list of speakers at the three sessions of the Trans-Mississippi commercial congress. All spoke on subjects relating more or less directly to the increasing of the commercial business of the country.

Mr. Bryan was appointed to head a committee of ex-presidents of the congress to escort Secretary Shaw to the platform, and when these two distinguished public

men led the way to the rostrum there was great applause.

Secretary Shaw, who spoke particularly for a wider foreign market for American goods, made this declaration:

“If this country ever develops international merchants it will accomplish it by granting them encouragement; not alone by dredging harbors and deepening channels, but by insuring them a merchant marine in which to carry, under the most favorable terms, the products of our farms, our mines, our forests, and our factories. Secretary Root has gone a step further than I propose to go in favor of a merchant marine. He commits himself to the ship subsidy idea. I do not say that I am in favor of a ship subsidy, but I will say that I am in favor of anything that will secure a merchant marine for the United States.”

Mr. Bryan, whose subject principally concerned the commercial interests of the Mississippi Valley region, was the sole speaker at the evening session.

The crowd that greeted Mr. Bryan was the largest of the congress, numbering 6,000 persons. He was introduced by David R. Francis, president of the congress, and was given an unusual ovation. Mr. Bryan said he felt very friendly toward the commercial congress, because it was the only body of which he was ever president. He made a strong plea in opening to have the next annual congress held in his home town, Lincoln, Neb.

Mr. Bryan presented the following resolution, which he asked to be considered by the resolutions committee of the congress at the November 23 session:

“Resolved, That this congress heartily indorses the resolution unanimously adopted by the Inter-parliamentary Union at its London session last July, in favor of the submission of all international questions to an impartial court or commission for investigation before any declaration of war or commencement of hostilities.”

He pleaded earnestly for the adoption of the resolution, hoping, he said, the congress would thus place itself on record as favoring peace.

Mr. Bryan congratulated the commercial congress for having had as their guests two members of the president's cabinet—Secretary Root and Secretary Shaw—“the

two foremost members of the president's official family," he said.

Speaking of the South American trade expansion possibilities as set forth by Secretary Root he said he did not agree with Mr. Root as to the methods suggested. He did not, he said, believe in subsidies.

Mr. Bryan said he had heard Secretary Shaw speak at the afternoon session also on the question of trade expansion. He said that Mr. Shaw had presented the situation in a pleasing manner, but took occasion to assert that many questions which are not logical must be presented in a pleasing manner to cover up their lack of logic.

Mr. Bryan then read a second resolution affecting trusts, which also, he said, he wished might be adopted by the commercial congress at its business session the next day. This resolution, which Mr. Bryan said covered in a general way his hopes regarding trust legislation, follows:

"Resolved, That this congress is unalterably opposed to private monopolies, and, believing them indefensible and intolerable, favors the enforcement of existing laws and the enactment of such new laws as may be necessary to protect industry from the menace offered by the trusts."

Mr. Bryan said he was glad that at last all people finally had come to be opposed to the giving and receiving of rebates. He spoke of the recent conviction of the sugar trust for receiving rebates and attacked the Standard Oil Company, which he declared had built up much of its business by operating in rebates. But legislation was needed, he said, not only to prevent railways from granting rebates, but those other great concerns from watering their stock.

The Associated Press report of the proceedings of the last day of the session at Kansas City follows:

After electing H. D. Loveland, of San Francisco, president for the ensuing year; adopting two resolutions by William J. Bryan after they had been voted down by the committee on resolutions and after adopting a set of resolutions, including an indorsement of the propositions submitted by Secretary of State Elihu Root "for encouraging our merchant marine and for increasing our

intercourse with South America by adequate mail facilities," the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress adjourned late today to meet in 1907, at Muskogee, I. T.

The first of the resolutions favored the indorsement by the congress of the resolutions adopted by the Inter-parliamentary Union at the London session in favor of settling of international questions impartially by a court or commission of investigation before declaration of war or the opening of hostilities by any country.

The second resolution sought to place the congress on record as being opposed to private monopolies and, believing them "indefensible and intolerable favors the enforcement of existing laws and the enactment of such new laws as may be necessary to protect industry from the menace offered by the trusts."

The last session of a memorable gathering proved one of the most stirring of the congress and ended in a victory for Mr. Bryan. Mr. Bryan was not present, having left this morning for Columbia, Mo., to deliver an address.

The introduction of politics into the proceedings of the congress was narrowly averted when the report of the committee on resolutions was submitted for action. John P. Irish, chairman of the committee, had scarcely finished reading the report when L. C. Irvine, of St. Louis, vice-president of the congress, was recognized by the chair. Mr. Irvine made an impassioned address censuring the action of the resolutions committee in omitting from its report the two resolutions introduced to the congress by Mr. Bryan during his speech last night. Mr. Irvine intimated that the omission of these two resolutions savored of political influence and their authorship rather than their subject matter was the reason for the failure of the committee to report them. He said all of the American people were in favor of the Bryan resolutions and that if this convention did not want to lose its power and its influence it had better not commit itself to an action indicating a partisan feeling. He said that the republican leaders who are fighting the trusts and Mr. Bryan were a unit on the trust question. He said that if you took a speech delivered by Mr. Bryan on that subject and another delivered by Mr. Roosevelt or Attorney General Hadley and you were not told the

name of their authors you could not tell which man was the author of either speech.

J. A. Ross of South Dakota seconded the speech of Mr. Irvine and Chairman David R. Francis suggested that consideration of the two Bryan resolutions be postponed **until the report of the committee on resolutions** as reported had been adopted. The suggestion was accepted, the report of the committee was adopted and Mr. Irvine then formally offered the Bryan resolution against private monopoly.

Mr. Irish made a stirring reply to Mr. Irvine. He said that he opposed the Bryan resolutions because of the views Mr. Bryan had expressed in his New York speech. He said that those views were of such a nature that he did not want the congress to go on record as supporting them, directly or indirectly. He said that Mr. Bryan, who was an eminent dialectician and candidate for political honors, had advocated government ownership of all public utilities, and that an indorsement of his trust resolution would be an indirect indorsement of government ownership of such utilities.

Several delegates remonstrated with Mr. Irish that Mr. Bryan had not advocated the public ownership of all public utilities.

Thomas Knight of Kansas City asked Mr. Irish: "Does the authorship of a resolution stamp the resolution?" and Mr. Irish rejoined: "Would you consider any resolution put by Mr. Harriman?"

Mr. Knight answered: "I would if it were a good one."

Without further debate the resolution offered by Mr. Irvine was adopted. Then Mr. Bryan's peace resolution was submitted and adopted without debate.

John P. Irish referred to in the above dispatch was a "democrat" in 1896 and refused to support the democratic nominee for president, giving as his reason his opposition to bimetallism. In that campaign Mr. Irish made speeches for the republican ticket and the greater part of the time since then he has held a federal office at San Francisco.

NO FEDERAL INCORPORATION

Judge Grosscup thinks that our corporations ought to be reorganized. That is all right. Some of them need reorganization and a squeezing out of the water, but the public must beware of a reorganization that permits the incorporation of industrial enterprises by the federal government. It is one thing for the federal government to protect interstate commerce from the trusts; it is quite a different thing to organize interstate corporations that will be superior to state laws and state courts.

COMMENT ON THE MESSAGE

The president's message, just sent to congress, may well be regarded as his most important state paper. It contains much that is democratic and for which the general public may well thank him. It contains some things that ought to arouse severe criticism. The president boldly appropriates some of the doctrines which the democrats have been advocating, and on the other hand he announces some doctrines which are so absurd as to excite amusement if the suggestions came from a less prominent source. In some cases he takes advanced ground; in some cases he retreats from ground already taken.

Take, for instance, his recommendation in regard to campaign funds. He urges the passage of a law which will make it a criminal offense for any corporation to contribute to any campaign fund. In this suggestion he is entirely right. The directors of corporations handle money of stockholders, and as the corporation is not organized for a political purpose, the directors have no legal right to divert funds which they hold in trust to the advancement of their own political views. But the president does not stop there.

As to individual contributions, he virtually recedes from the position taken in a former message. He says: "Let individuals contribute as they desire; but let us prohibit in effective fashion all corporations, etc." He is on record as insisting upon publicity as to individual contributions; why surrender that contention? While it is eminently proper that corporations should be for-

bidden to contribute, it is also important that the contributions made by individuals should be known. After the recent election in New York the published reports of the committees showed that Morgan, Rockefeller, Carnegie and others contributed large amounts to the republican campaign fund. It is important that these contributions should be known, and it is still more important that they should be known before the election. The democrats in congress, while supporting the president's recommendation in favor of the prohibition of corporate contributions, should insist that the committee reports should disclose the contributors of all considerable amounts, and that the disclosures should be made at least ten days before the close of the campaign in order that the public may see on which side large contributions are being made, for the public will then know from which side the trust magnates and high financiers expect to receive favors. It is not necessary that the names of small contributors shall be given, for when a man gives a few dollars to a campaign fund, it may be assumed that he gives it because he shares in a general interest, but when men give large sums, it is quite certain that they expect some definite return in the way of privilege or favoritism.

The president asks for a law conferring upon the government the right of appeal in criminal cases where disputed questions of law are involved. In this the president is right. While such appeal cannot affect that particular case, it can secure a decision which will be a guide in future cases.

The president says: "The government has now definitely begun a policy of resorting to the criminal law in those trust and interstate commerce cases where such a course offers a reasonable chance of success." This is a confession that for many years the government did not resort to the criminal law in trust cases. It is encouraging to know that a reform has been instituted, and the public will watch the effect of the experiment which the president now commends in deterring the trust magnates. This is a democratic position, and the president in taking the step is following democratic advice. If the doctrine of equality before the law is to be the doctrine of

the land, there must be no hesitancy about the enforcement of the criminal law against the big offenders.

What the president says on the subject of government by injunction will not be satisfactory to the laboring men or to those who respect the right of trial by jury, for instead of recommending a law which will assure the right of trial by jury wherever the alleged contempt is committed outside of the court room, he simply warns judges that "it will be well-nigh impossible to prevent its abolition"—abolition of the right of injunction—"if the process is habitually abused." It is to be regretted that the president did not speak out on this subject as he has on several others, and object to the use of the writ as a means of coercing the laboring men into the acceptance of any terms offered by the corporations.

On another question, namely, the right of the people to criticise a judge, the president takes his stand upon democratic ground, or if upon ground not exclusively democratic, upon ground which the democrats occupied in 1896 when their criticisms of the supreme court were challenged. The president points out that a judge, like any other public official, is subject to criticism, and he quotes an English chancellor, Lord Parker, and Judge Taft in support of the right to criticise. There is one part of Judge Taft's opinion which the president quotes with approval which has some bearing upon the question of life tenure. Judge Taft says: "In the case of judges having a life tenure, indeed, their very independence makes the right freely to comment upon their decisions of greater importance, because it is the only practical and available instrument in the hands of a free people to keep such judges alive to the reasonable demands of those they serve." The president seems to indorse this suggestion made by Secretary Taft, which raises the question as to the propriety of appointing judges for life. While Judge Taft does not specifically object to the life tenure, he indirectly calls attention to the very objection which is urged by those who believe in the election of all judges for a limited time. He points out that the right to criticise is even more necessary in regard to life judges than in regard to those appointed or elected for a definite term.

Those who remember the abuse heaped upon the demo-

crats ten years ago for presuming to criticise supreme judges will find great consolation in the position taken by the president and Secretary Taft. It is a pity that the president did not call attention to Judge Taft's decision when he was on the stump in 1896, but probably he had not seen it then, or if he had was not so impressed then as he has become since with the frailty of judges.

The president's position on the child labor question is good, as is also his position on the eight hour day, although he makes a very questionable explanation as to the eight hour day when he speaks of the work at Panama. Many will argue that a limitation upon the hours of labor is as important within the tropics as in the temperate zone. But in speaking of the labor question he cannot forbear to strike a few blows at those whom he describes as agitators, demagogues, etc. He seems very much afraid of "violent class hatred against all men of wealth," "hysterical excitement, inflaming the brutal passions of mankind." He feels called upon to warn the country against the "sinister demagogues and foolish visionaries, purveyors, sensational slanderers, etc." Well, the public will overlook the fact that he employs language quite as abusive and extreme as anyone else if he will only continue to borrow planks from the democratic party and urge them upon the country. But he may find it difficult to persuade his "cool-headed" and sane republican associates to apply the necessary remedies. So far there has been no plunder of the rich in this country, but a great deal of plunder of the poor, and the principal merit that the president possesses is that while he uses a great deal of language to castigate those who point out the encroachments of organized wealth, he is contributing a little toward remedial legislation in spite of the fact that he has to work with the very men he denounces, and has his plans thwarted by the ones for whom he apologizes.

He is right again in what he says about the employer's liability. Why should all the risks of employment be thrown upon the employe when he has no right to select his colaborers?

On the subject of arbitration the president has taken a very commendable position, although it is not a new position. One of the most popular acts of his administration was the settlement of the coal strike, and

everyone who desires peace and good-will between employers and employes must admit that such peace and good-will are only possible under a system of compulsory investigation of differences. The editor of **THE COMMONER** has prominently pointed out that a compulsory investigation at the request of either party by an impartial tribunal would settle almost every dispute. **THE COMMONER** urged the creation of such a board at the time of the anthracite coal strike, and it is a gratification to find a president ready to espouse and carry on this reform. He deserves the support of congress, and if he succeeds in the creation of this board he will be responsible for a great reform to which he can look back with increased gratification as the years go by.

The president recommends the withdrawal of the coal lands from entry and sale. This is a gigantic step toward government ownership, but it is justified not only by the fact that these lands are much more valuable than farming lands, but by the fact that the coal lands are being monopolized and the public held up. The men who have spent so much time denouncing government ownership of railroads will now have a chance to give that subject a little rest and turn their guns upon the proposition that the government should permanently own the coal lands.

The packing houses come in for some attention, and the president renews his recommendation in regard to putting the date on the label and charging cost of inspection to packers. He is right on both of these propositions.

It is interesting to note that the president adopts the argument which democrats use against the abuses that have grown up under individualism. He points out, as democrats have, that socialism has grown because the rights of the individual have been encroached upon. If the friends of individualism are wise they will listen to the warning and proceed to protect individual opportunity by such legislation as will prevent the overthrow of individual effort by corporate combinations. In ordinary industry competition can be restricted. In the matter of railroads there are so many elements of monopoly that mere regulation, however desirable, is not likely to prove sufficient, and the president's recommendation that railroads be allowed to pool is an exceedingly dangerous

one under present conditions. It is conceivable that the regulation of railroads might be made so strict and effective that pooling agreements made with the consent of the interstate commerce commission might be rendered harmless, but the supervision will have to be more strict than it is now before such agreements can be safely permitted.

The president's discussion of the trust question can hardly be satisfactory to those who have carefully studied the subject. He is so anxious not to disturb what he would call good combinations of capital that he shrinks from the legislation necessary to prevent those admitted to be bad, although he comes nearer than in any previous document to admitting that a private monopoly is bad. He incidentally suggests a national license law as a possible method. This national license law is the democratic plan suggested in the Kansas City platform of 1900 and afterwards recommended by Mr. Garfield, the head of the bureau of corporations. He presents a real and effective remedy, but the president only mentions it as one of the things to be considered and does not dwell upon it. He does not deal with the trust question with the earnestness that the conditions require, but he does so much better than most of the republican leaders that the public may well feel grateful for the encouragement which he gives to the anti-trust movement. The president gives a half-hearted indorsement of the asset currency plan, although he does not specifically ask for a law providing for it. He also gives what is equivalent to an indorsement of the ship subsidy program, and suggests that if the public is not ready to enter upon the wholesale subsidy, it ought to give some encouragement to the establishment of fast mail lines to the South American ports. It is evident that he is not hostile to a general subsidy plan, and it is also certain that the South American subsidy is to be only an entering wedge.

He calls attention to the Japanese question raised by the discrimination against Japanese citizens in San Francisco. He pays a deserved tribute to the progress of the Japanese nation and asks for legislation which will enable congress to protect the treaty rights of foreigners. That there should be such legislation cannot be generally disputed, but a great deal depends upon the character of the

legislation. If any bills are presented in response to this suggestion, they must be carefully scrutinized to be sure that they do not deny to the various states the right to protect themselves and their people in matters purely local. It is not fair to throw upon any locality a special burden to be borne for the benefit of the rest of the country. THE COMMONER will discuss these measures when they are presented in congress.

He recommends free trade with the Philippines, which is a just proposition, although it ought to be accompanied by a promise of ultimate independence so that the opponents of colonialism will not be driven from the support of the proposition by the fear that it is intended to link the islands more closely to the United States. His recommendation of citizenship for the Porto Ricans is also on the right line, for we cannot have two kinds of people under the American flag. The constitution should follow the flag, and those who own allegiance to our country should enjoy the blessings of citizenship.

The two most important suggestions in the message concerns the taxation and preparation for war. On the subject of taxation the president comes out in the advocacy of an inheritance tax and an income tax. The inheritance tax is intended to prevent swollen fortunes from descending to future generations, and his recommendation upon this subject is not likely to excite so much opposition as the proposition to establish a graded income tax. He is right in both cases, but in recommending a graded income tax he not only indorses the democratic doctrine of an income tax, but he goes farther than the democratic party went in the law of 1894. The Wilson law contained an income tax, not a graded one, but a flat tax upon all who had incomes above the four thousand dollar exemption. It will be gratifying to democrats to have a republican president indorse the income tax principle which was so violently assailed by the republican party at that time. The Chicago convention of 1896 indorsed the income tax, but the language was distorted by the political opponents into a threat to pack the court in favor of a reversal of the income tax decision. The language could not honestly be so construed, but it served the purpose of political opponents and enabled them to turn the fight away from the principle involved. Since that time the advocates of

an income tax have insisted upon an amendment to the constitution specifically authorizing the tax. The president, while recommending a constitutional amendment as a last resort, expresses the hope that the principles laid down in the income tax decision may be avoided by a new law drawn upon different lines. The democrats—and they constitute a large majority of the party—who believe in an equitable distribution of the burdens of government will appreciate the support which the president has given to the income tax idea; they will encourage him and support him with all their strength. If he does not succeed in bringing his party up to the position which he has taken, he may at least educate a large number of republicans to the point where they will assist the democrats to secure a constitutional amendment authorizing an income tax. Upon no other question have the utterances of the president so clearly indicated that his sympathies are on the side of the masses, for the opposition to the income tax is a purely selfish opposition—not only selfish, but blindly selfish. Every intelligent student of political economy knows that our present federal taxes place the burden upon consumption, and taxes upon consumption are in effect income graded taxes with the heaviest rate upon the smallest incomes. The inheritance tax and the income tax will help to equalize the burdens of government, and they must appeal to those whose sense of justice is not blunted by adverse pecuniary interest. On with the fight for an income tax! Success to the president in his attack against unjust taxation! Democrats would be better pleased if he had linked a recommendation of tariff reform with his income tax proposition, but they can find consolation in the fact that an income tax once established will make tariff reform easier. If the president's message had come out before Thanksgiving day, democrats might have included the income tax recommendation among the things for which they could be thankful.

But while there ought to be general rejoicing at the president's effort to improve our systems of taxation, there will be general disappointment at the warlike tone of his message where he discusses the army and the navy. He speaks of the navy as the surest guarantor of peace which this country possesses. Shame upon the chief

executive that he should place an instrument of brute force above the nation's sense of justice as a guarantor of peace. The best guarantor of peace is our nation's purpose to deal justly with other nations. The second is our isolated position. It will be an unfortunate day when this nation has no better dependence than the navy whether that navy be large or small. In his message two years ago the president announced this astounding doctrine: "If the great civilized nations of the present day should completely disarm, the result would mean an immediate recrudescence of barbarism in one form or another." This passage in his former message can bear no other construction than that the president regards a warlike spirit as necessary to a nation's progress. If he is right, then the whole doctrine of the Christian religion is wrong; if he is right, then the peace movement is a movement toward barbarism and not toward civilization. The president challenges the idea that right is might. There is just now an effort in all the leading nations to increase the navy. Each new ship built by one country is used as a reason why other countries should build new ships, and there is no limit to this rivalry except the power of the people to pay the taxes. From a practical standpoint this rivalry is inexcusable. From a moral standpoint it is astounding. The president was universally applauded when he was instrumental in bringing peace between Russia and Japan, but who has applauded his utterance of two years ago in regard to the evils of a reduction of armaments, and who but a military enthusiast will indorse his proposition that the navy is the best guarantor of peace?

In advising the establishment of shooting galleries and rifle ranges throughout the country, he is only applying to land what he has heretofore applied to water. If he is right in the one case, he is right in the other. If it is right to build up a great navy and to rely upon marksmanship for our nation's safety, then to be consistent we should establish Roosevelt shooting galleries not merely in the schools, but throughout the country, and turn our attention toward preparation for war. What a shocking spectacle this country will present when its youths have no higher ambition than to get ready to kill somebody. By the time we have cultivated enough military spirit to

make shooting galleries popular, we will have some excuse for making use of the marksmanship that we have cultivated. It is lamentable that the president of a nation possessing more altruism than any other nation in the world, and offering higher ideals of citizenship and government than any other nation, should present so un-American and so un-Christian a doctrine. Our nation's prestige should be a moral prestige and not a physical prestige; our influence should rest upon high example, not upon brute force; the aim of our people should be to act righteously rather than to aim rifles accurately; our nation's security should be the spirit of justice that pervades its people, not in its ability to kill those who differ from us in opinion. War ought to be a last resort, not a first consideration. It is bad enough to have a few professional soldiers. It is not necessary that the whole nation shall be keyed up all the time to the fighting point.

CONSTITUTION FOLLOWING THE FLAG

It will be gratifying to democrats to learn from the message of the president just sent to congress relative to Porto Rico that the constitution is at last following the flag. The position taken by the president in favor of conferring full citizenship upon the Porto Ricans will be approved except that it ought not to be described as the conferring of citizenship. The bill ought to simply recognize that the Porto Ricans now possess full citizenship by virtue of the fact that they are a part of the United States. In 1900 the democrats insisted that the constitution keep company with our flag wherever that flag floated over American territory. The democrats insisted then and insist now that we cannot properly have different kinds of citizenship—full citizenship in the United States, semi-citizenship in Porto Rico and vassalage in the Philippines. There is no twilight zone between citizenship and the condition of the subject. Democrats will rejoice in this new recognition of the correctness of the democratic position.

Porto Rico ought to have a territorial government, reserving the right to add to the territory from time to

time as conditions may require. When Porto Rico became a part of the United States she had representation in the Spanish legislature, and while it will be some time before the people of Porto Rico are ready for statehood, they ought to have the territorial form of government and a delegate in congress.

DEMOCRACY MUST MOVE FORWARD

There are increasing evidences that the democrats who call themselves conservative are quietly laying their plans for the capture of the next democratic convention. Attention is called to the matter, not that there is much danger of the plan succeeding, but that the readers of *THE COMMONER* may know what is going on. The argument made two years ago by the friends of Judge Parker was that President Roosevelt was unsatisfactory to the business element and that a conservative democrat like Judge Parker would be able to poll a large republican vote. It ought to have been plain to the party leaders that a candidate conservative enough to draw corporation republicans to his support would not be radical enough to hold the democratic voters, but it was thought that liberal campaign contributions could more than make up for defection among the rank and file. As unreasonable as were the arguments made, they were successful, and the democratic party made an experiment that will not be repeated, at least for some years. After the election the conservative element seemed to be entirely satisfied to allow the organization of the party to pass into the hands of those who believe in positive and aggressive democracy. As the campaign approaches, however, there are indications that some of the conservatives would rather keep the party in a minority than for it to take a position on the side of the people.

The *Brooklyn Citizen* has an editorial based upon the possibility of Mr. Roosevelt being a candidate again, which suggests that the next democratic convention may take the conservative side against the radicalism of the president. The democrats may as well recognize the situation and prepare for it. In the first place, there

is no probability or prospect of the president being a candidate again. He has so announced, and it is only fair to him to take him at his word. Even if he desired to be nominated, he would have difficulty in securing a nomination. There is a division in the republican party, and that division extends from the top of the party to the bottom. Mr. Roosevelt's radicalism has displeased the republican leaders, and his last message has very much aggravated the situation. The republicans who do not favor the president's policies, when supported by the republicans who earnestly oppose a third term, would be strong enough to prevent a renomination, so the thought of his nomination can safely be put aside.

Even if he were nominated, it would not be good policy for the democrats to plan a conservative campaign. If Mr. Roosevelt were a candidate, it would not only be wise but necessary for the democrats to make a radical fight. If the democratic party were to attempt to attack the president for indorsing democratic ideas, it would lose more democrats than it could gain republicans. If, on the other hand, it were to remain steadfast to democratic ideas and use the president's arguments to strengthen the democratic position, it would hold the democratic vote and the conservative republicans would be left to put up a candidate of their own and thus divide the republican strength to the advantage of the democrats.

But let us consider what is probable. There is no radical republican to succeed the president. Senator LaFollette would be his natural successor if Mr. Roosevelt's ideas controlled the republican convention, but the republican party is not yet ready to nominate a man like LaFollette. The republican leaders would not countenance his candidacy in 1908, although the LaFollette element in the republican party is bound to grow. The only question is whether the republicans will nominate some outspoken opponent of Rooseveltism or select a compromise candidate with the idea of keeping both elements together. If an anti-Roosevelt man is nominated, the democrats may expect a large support from the Roosevelt republicans, provided, of course, the party so conducts itself as to deserve the confidence of republican reformers. If the republican convention nominates a

compromise man not entirely satisfactory to either side, his campaign is likely to be as listless a campaign as the democratic campaign of 1904.

From the standpoint, therefore, of expediency as well as from the standpoint of principle the democratic party must make a courageous fight in behalf of necessary reforms and take advantage of the education which has come through the radical utterances of the president. The conservatives went into the last convention promising victory and pointing to two democratic defeats as a reason why they should be intrusted with the party leadership. They cannot make that argument this time, for they led the party to an overwhelming defeat in the east as well as in the west. The conservatives can help win a democratic victory if they are willing to follow and support those who have advocated reforms. They have demonstrated their inability to lead the party to success along conservative lines. Their plans were a failure in 1904, and there has been an immense development of radical sentiment since.

It is folly to talk of putting the democratic party in a position to appeal to the owners of swollen fortunes and the financiers of predatory wealth. It would be folly from the standpoint of expediency; it would be criminal from the standpoint of principle.

DOWN WITH THE SILVER TRUST!

One of THE COMMONER'S exchanges says: "If possible, legal action will be brought against the silver trust which is boomed by Bryan." The editor who wrote the paragraph is guilty of a misrepresentation of Mr. Bryan's position, and it would be a reflection upon the editor's intelligence to say that the misrepresentation was unintentional. Mr. Bryan has never boomed the silver trust, and he is as much interested in the overthrow of the silver trust—if such a trust exists—as he is in favor of the overthrow of any other trust. If there is a silver trust, let the administration begin action against it. If there is any trust which has no friends it is a silver trust, for the advocates of bimetallism oppose a trust on prin-

ciple and oppose a silver trust as much as any other trust, while the advocates of the gold standard ought certainly to be willing to prosecute this particular combination.

And let the criminal clause of the statute be enforced. Let the silver trust magnates be hunted down and put behind the bars. If we cannot imprison the magnates of the steel trust, the sugar trust, the tobacco trust, the whisky trust, the starch trust, the salt trust, the cracker trust, the harvester trust and the other trust magnates, we certainly ought to be able to imprison the silver trust magnates. Hunt them up! On with the fight, and the bimetallicists will be the last to cry, "Hold! Enough!"

THE PRESIDENT SUSTAINED BY THE FACTS

Secretary Taft has made a report of the dismissal of the battalion of colored troops. The order issued by the president has aroused so much criticism among the colored people that Secretary Taft's utterances were awaited with interest. Now that the findings have been presented, the public can form its opinion upon the president's action. Whatever constitutional lawyers may decide concerning the power of the president to discharge or to reinstate, no unbiased person will deny that the offense was grave enough to justify the president in doing whatever he has power to do. It is inconceivable that fair-minded people should criticise the president for attempting to relieve the military service of the menace of a body of troops whose members will shield a group of criminals. The evidence shows that some ten to twenty members of the battalion deliberately went forth upon a murderous expedition and that the remainder of the troops refused to disclose the guilty ones.

The critics of the president say that the innocent should not suffer with the guilty. That is a sound proposition when the innocent can be distinguished from the guilty; but in this case the question is, shall the innocent members of the community suffer from the presence of the troops or shall the innocent members of the battalion suffer for refusing to join the government in the preser-

vation of law and order. There is no principle in law or in morals that requires that greater consideration should be shown to the innocent soldiers who prefer to conceal the guilt of their comrades than to the public in general.

The second ground of criticism urged by those who take issue with the president is that the soldiers ought not to be required to tell on each other, and the case is put upon a level with the case of schoolboys who do not tell on each other when caught in some Hallowe'en prank. The cases are not at all similar. There is a very clear distinction between the sports of the schoolboy and the commission of crimes. If a dozen schoolboys were present when one or two of their number killed a fellow student, no one would justify the silence of the boys who looked on. They would be required to tell what they saw even though it resulted in the punishment of their comrades. And still more is it the duty of soldiers sworn to support the constitution and the laws to assist in bringing to punishment those who are guilty of criminal offenses even though the guilty parties belong to the same company.

The friends of the black man, whether they be themselves white or black, cannot afford to defend crime or the shielding of crime. It may be that the president has gone beyond his authority; if so, the question ought to be discussed as a legal one. Those who assert the moral right of colored soldiers to shield comrades charged with a capital offense will not give any material assistance in the settlement of the race question.

THE MONEY QUESTION

The money question is a very impudent thing. It keeps obtruding itself in the most impolite way. Just as our financiers think they have a satisfactory Philippine currency, silver rises in value and the Philippine dollars go into the melting pot and then something has to be done to reduce their weight and keep them in circulation. And then the bankers who said we had enough money ten years ago are clamoring for more in spite of the fact

that there has been an enormous increase in the volume of gold coin and a large increase in the silver dollars occasioned by coining the seigniorage and a considerable increase in the banknote currency. In spite of these additions to the country's currency, the bankers now demand that they be permitted to issue emergency notes at least, and many of these want a general authority to issue asset currency. Why does not the money question stay settled and behave itself?

Even in England they are having difficulty. A member of parliament rises to ask whether the silver dollar in the Straits Settlements has been recently debased—whether the British government is tampering with the currency.

One might suppose from the financial papers that the advocates of free silver were the only ones guilty of stirring up the money question, but it seems that the self-constituted champions of an honest dollar are the ones who are always wanting something done. They want the silver dollars retired; they want subsidiary coinage supplemented by the melting of silver dollars; they want dollars with nothing back of them but the bank's assets. When will they be satisfied to let the money question rest?

COMMUNISM FAILS IN RUSSIA

News comes from St. Petersburg that the czar has issued a ukase which permits the peasant to renounce his share in the communal ownership of village land and become the individual freeholder. This change has been under discussion for some time, and the reformers of Russia have regarded it as one of the important measures of relief. Experience has shown that the ownership of the land by the communities has discouraged the industrious by making them pay for the idler as well as for themselves. It raises the old question—a very old question—namely: How can you encourage industry without securing to the industrious the reward of his toil? Voluntary co-operation rests upon a sound basis and should be encouraged. Under a voluntary co-operation each partner is stimulated to effort because the partnership

cannot continue unless all parties are satisfied. Under forced co-operation the situation is entirely different. The man who is willing to work is discouraged when he finds that the undeserving profit by his labors and the spur of necessity is withdrawn from the shiftless. The cable dispatch from St. Petersburg says: "Thousands interested in the problems of today will watch the result of the change in Russia because it throws light upon the issue between the individualist and the socialist." While civilized society recognizes that it is right to place upon all the burden of keeping the unfortunate no matter from what cause the misfortune arises, a very different question is presented when it is proposed to compel the energetic, the industrious and the enterprising to share their profits with those who lack energy, industry and enterprise. While there is a wide zone in which religion, fraternity and the spirit of brotherhood may work, we have not found any safer principle yet for the economic world than that which insures to each member of society a reward proportionate to his contribution to society.

GOVERNOR DAVIS' PROGRAM

Governor Jeff. Davis, of Arkansas, who begins his senatorial term next March, has already laid out for himself an important work in his attack upon the bucket shop and the exchange gambler. In a recent interview he says that the senate does not need harmony so much as an old-fashioned row. He complains that "the race of life at this time is not the fair and equal one which was in the minds of the framers of the government; that the combinations of capital, called trusts, have defeated the objects of the constitution and the law."

Governor Davis adds: "But the trusts are not the only evil. There are the bucket shops. The bucket shop has brought more misery, ruined more homes, wrecked more business, made more straight men crooked and destroyed more lives than any other agency." He describes the New York cotton exchange as a bucket shop "where a few gamblers stand around a brass railing and make a plaything of the South's great staple." Good

for Davis! He will find plenty to employ his leisure hours if he will give his attention to the exploiters who grow rich gambling on the price of the farmer's product. It is strange that the people of the city who live upon what the farmer raises should be as indifferent as they are to the farmer's welfare. Senator Davis can render a great service if he can awaken the people of the cities to the importance of protecting the agricultural classes from the speculator and the market manipulator.

A WORD OF ENCOURAGEMENT

Among the many letters received at THE COMMONER office, an occasional one comes from some earnest democrat who, having labored for many years for reforms which to him seem manifestly just, concludes that nothing can be done because progress has not been as rapid as he had hoped.

There is, however, no reason for discouragement. Never has the reformer had more reason to be happy than now, for there is abundant evidence of a public awakening that presages reform.

Let a few instances of progress suffice. Take the election of senators by the people. Sixteen years ago there were advocates of it, but it had never received the attention of congress. About fourteen years ago a resolution proposing the necessary constitutional amendment passed the house; it passed again twelve years ago. These houses were democratic. Two republican congresses followed and nothing was done, but the sentiment continued to grow until even a republican house passed the resolution. Since that time two other republican houses have acted favorably upon the resolution, and the democratic national convention has twice declared for it. Something like two-thirds of the states of the Union have indorsed the proposition, and there is no doubt of its ultimate triumph. It does seem that a reform so obviously necessary should be more easily secured, but it takes time to get matters before the public. The election of senators by direct vote of the people

is coming, and it is coming because those who labor for it have hope, and having hope, continue to work.

Twelve years ago the democratic party included an income tax in its revenue bill. The measure was opposed by an element of the democratic party and was strenuously opposed by the republican party. The supreme court, by a majority of one, declared the law unconstitutional, and the one vote was cast by a judge who changed his mind between the first and the second hearings. The democratic party declared for the principle in 1896, and the democratic candidate advocated it in 1900 and the party was defeated both times. Now a republican president deliberately recommends not merely an income tax but a graded income tax. The world does move and a righteous cause does grow. What greater victory have reformers secured than the conversion of a republican president to a democratic doctrine. The income tax will come. The growth of sentiment is slow, yes, very slow when you consider how plain and unanswerable are the arguments in favor of an income tax, but it takes time for the people to understand it.

Ten years ago the republicans boldly challenged the quantitative theory of money. Now it is universally admitted and we all rejoice over the larger prosperity which a larger volume of currency has brought. Our opponents said in 1896 that we had money enough. Now no public men would advocate a return to the quantity that we had then or to any material reduction of the immense increase that we have enjoyed since. They are even advocating an asset currency or an emergency currency, in order to secure a still larger volume. The new demands ought not to be granted, but the desire for more currency is in itself a vindication of the quantitative theory of money.

How often the democratic party has gone down to defeat on the tariff question, and yet, tariff reform is growing. Every day finds more tariff reformers in the republican party. Each new year strengthens the arguments of the democrats in favor of a reduction of import duties. Reform is slow, to be sure, but it is sure to come even on the tariff question.

In 1898 the republicans thought that colonialism was going to be very profitable to the country, although the

leaders did not dare to mention a word. They thought they saw great possibilities of trade in the Philippines, and in addition to that, they thought Manila would be a stepping stone to the Orient. The delusion has gone. They find that the holding of the Philippines is a weakness instead of a strength to the nation, and that the trade we buy is not worth what it is costing us. No longer seeing a profit in the enterprise, they are not so sure that they saw the hand of God in imperialism. In this case, as in others, the policies for which democracy stands are constantly gaining strength.

On the labor question the democratic party has suffered the usual fate of the pioneer—opposition, abuse, defeat—but the president urges arbitration, which the democrats have demanded in three national platforms. He emphasizes the importance of the eight hour day, which the democrats have been asking, and he even warns the courts against the abuse of the writ of injunction. While he does not go as far as he should on the last proposition, it is encouraging to have him go as far as he does.

On the trust question he is not as explicit and as emphatic as the conditions to be met require, but he is doing something and saying something, and all these things help in the work of education.

Last of all, he is awakening the people to the evils of swollen fortunes gathered by immoral means, which demoralize both their present possessors and the expectant heirs. He proposes an inheritance tax to keep these swollen fortunes from descending to posterity, which is good as far as it goes, but the people will soon learn that it is better to take away the privileges and the governmental favoritism by which swollen fortunes are accumulated than for the government to permit the accumulation and then claim a part of the plunder.

Sentiment is growing in favor of better government and more just conditions, and no reformer has reason to falter in his work. Let him renew his strength by a review of the progress made and then with renewed zeal take up the fight again.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE AND THE MADISON SQUARE SPEECH

Many republicans who bitterly criticised Mr. Bryan's speech at Madison Square Garden are now enthusiastic in their praise for Mr. Roosevelt's message. As they could find no good in the Madison Square speech, so they can find no ill in the message. For the benefit of these THE COMMONER hereinafter reproduces paragraphs from the message and the Madison Square speech. Republicans particularly are invited to compare these paragraphs:

ENFORCING CRIMINAL CLAUSE

(From Mr. Roosevelt's Message.)

The importance of enacting into law the particular bill in question is further increased by the fact that the government has now definitely begun a policy of resorting to the criminal law in those trust and interstate commerce cases where such a course offers reasonable chance of success.

At first, as was proper, every effort was made to enforce these laws by civil proceedings, but it has become increasingly evident that the action of the government in finally deciding, in certain cases, to undertake criminal proceedings was justifiable; and though there have been some conspicuous failures in these cases, we have had many successes, which have undoubtedly had a deterrent effect upon evil doers, whether the penalty inflicted was in the shape of fine or imprisonment—and penalties of both kinds have already been inflicted by the courts. Of course, where the judge can see his way to inflict the penalty of imprisonment the deterrent effect of the punishment on other offenders is increased; but sufficiently heavy fines accomplish much.

(From the Madison Square Speech.)

While men may differ as to the relative importance of issues, and while the next congress will largely shape the lines upon which the next presidential campaign will be fought, I THINK IT IS SAFE TO SAY THAT AT PRESENT THE PARAMOUNT ISSUE IN THE

MINDS OF A LARGE MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE, IS THE TRUST ISSUE.

I congratulate President Roosevelt upon the steps which he has taken to enforce the anti-trust law and my gratification is not lessened by the fact that he has followed the democratic rather than the republican platform in every advance he has made. It has been a great embarrassment to him that the platform upon which he was elected was filled with praises of the republican party's record rather than with promises of reform; even the enthusiastic support given him by the democrats has enabled the champions of the trusts to taunt him with following democratic leadership. He has probably gone as far as he could go without incurring the hostility of the leaders of his own party. The trouble is that the republican party is not in a position to apply effective and thorough-going reforms, because it has built up through special legislation the very abuses which need to be eradicated.

Before any intelligent action can be taken against the trusts we must have a definition of a trust. Because no corporation has an absolute and complete monopoly of any important product, the apologists for the trusts sometimes insist that there are in reality no trusts. Others insist that it is impossible to legislate against such trusts that may exist without doing injury to legitimate business. For the purposes of this discussion it is sufficient to draw the line at the point where competition ceases to be effective and to designate as a trust any corporation which controls so much of the product of any article that it can fix the terms and conditions of sale.

Legislation which prevents monopoly not only does not injure legitimate business, but actually protects legitimate business from injury. We are indebted to the younger Rockefeller for an illustration which makes this distinction clear. In defending the trust system he is quoted as saying that as the American beauty rose cannot be brought to perfection without pinching off ninety-nine buds, so that the one hundredth bud can receive the full strength of the bush, so great industrial organizations are impossible without the elimination of the smaller ones. It is a cruel illustration but it presents a per-

fectly accurate picture of trust methods. The democratic party champions the cause of the ninety-nine enterprises which are menaced; they must not be sacrificed that one great combination may flourish, and when the subject is understood we shall receive the cordial support of hundreds of thousands of business men who have themselves felt the oppression of the trusts or who, having observed the effect of the trusts upon others, realize that their safety lies, not in futile attempts at the restraint of trusts, but in legislation which will make a private monopoly impossible.

There must be no mistaking of the issue and no confusing of the line of battle. The trust, as an institution, will have few open defenders. The policy of the trust defenders will be to insist upon "reasonable regulation" and then they will rely upon their power to corrupt legislatures and to intimidate executives to prevent the application of any remedies which will interfere with the trusts. Our motto must be: "A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable," and our plan of attack must contemplate the total and complete overthrow of the monopoly principle in industry. We need not quarrel over remedies. We must show ourselves willing to support any remedy and every remedy which promises substantial advantage to the people in their warfare against monopoly. Something is to be expected from the enforcement of the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law, but this law must be enforced not against a few trusts, as at present, but against all trusts, and the aim must be to imprison the guilty, not merely to recover a fine. What is a fine of a thousand dollars or even ten thousand dollars to a trust which makes a hundred thousand dollars while the trial is in progress?

If the criminal clause is not going to be enforced it ought to be repealed. If imprisonment is too severe a punishment for the eminently respectable gentlemen who rob eighty millions of people of hundreds of millions of dollars annually, the language of the statutes ought to be changed, for nothing is more calculated to breed anarchy than the failure to enforce the law against rich criminals while it is rigidly enforced against petty offenders. But it is not sufficient to enforce existing laws. If ten corporations conspiring together in restraint of

trade are threatened with punishment, all they have to do now is to dissolve their separate corporations and turn their property over to a new corporation. The new corporation can proceed to do the same thing that the separate corporations attempted, and yet not violate the law. We need, therefore, new legislation and the republican party not only fails to enact such legislation, but fails even to promise it. The democratic party must be prepared to propose legislation which will be sufficient.

GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION

(From Mr. Roosevelt's Message.)

Of course, a judge strong enough to be fit for his office will enjoin any resort to violence or intimidation, especially by conspiracy, no matter what his opinions may be of the rights of the original quarrel. There must be no hesitation in dealing with disorder.

But there must likewise be no such abuse of the injunctive power as is implied in forbidding laboring men to strive for their own betterment in peaceful and lawful ways; nor must the injunction be used merely to aid some big corporation in carrying out schemes for its own aggrandizement.

(From the Madison Square Speech.)

No reference to the labor question is complete that does not include some mention of what is known as government by injunction. As the main purpose of the writ is to evade trial by jury, it is really an attack upon the jury system and ought to arouse a unanimous protest. However, as the writ is usually invoked in case of a strike the importance of the subject would be very much reduced by the adoption of a system of arbitration, because arbitration would very much reduce, even if it did not entirely remove, the probability of a strike.

EIGHT HOUR LAW

(From Mr. Roosevelt's Message.)

I call your attention to the need of passing the bill limiting the number of hours of employment of railroad

employees. The measure is a moderate one and I can conceive of no serious objection to it. Indeed, so far as it is in our power, it should be our aim steadily to reduce the number of hours of labor with as a goal the general introduction of an eight hour day.

(From the Madison Square Speech.)

The struggle to secure an eight hour day is an international struggle and it is sure to be settled in favor of the workingman's contention. The benefits of the labor saving machine have not been distributed with equity. The producer has enormously multiplied his capacity, but so far the owner of the machine has received too much of the increase and the laborer too little. Those who oppose the eight hour day do it, I am convinced, more because of ignorance of conditions than because of lack of sympathy with those who toil. The removal of work from the house to the factory has separated the husband from his wife and the father from his children, while the growth of our cities has put an increasing distance between the home and the workshop. Then, too, more is demanded of the laboring man now than formerly. He is a citizen as well as a laborer, and must have time for the study of public questions if he is to be an intelligent sovereign. To drive him from his bed to his task and from his task to his bed is to deprive the family of his companionship, society of his service and politics of his influence.

ARBITRATION IN LABOR DISPUTES

(From Mr. Roosevelt's Message.)

The commission appointed by the president October 16, 1902, at the request of both the anthracite coal operators and miners, to inquire into, consider, and pass upon the questions in controversy in connection with the strike in the anthracite regions of Pennsylvania and the causes out of which the controversy arose, in their report, findings, and award expressed the belief "that the state and federal governments should provide the machinery for what may be called the compulsory investigation of controversies between employers and employes, when

they arise." This expression of belief is deserving of the favorable consideration of the congress and the enactment of its provisions into law. A bill has already been introduced to this end.

In this age of great corporate and labor combinations, neither employers nor employes should be left completely at the mercy of the stronger party to a dispute, regardless of the righteousness of their respective claims. The proposed measure would be in the line of securing recognition of the fact that in many strikes the public has itself an interest which cannot wisely be disregarded; an interest not merely of general convenience, for the question of a just and proper public policy must also be considered. In all legislation of this kind it is well to advance cautiously, testing each step by the actual results; the step proposed can surely be safely taken, for the decisions of the commission would not bind the parties in legal fashion, and yet would give a chance for public opinion to crystallize and thus to exert its full force for the right.

(From the Madison Square Speech.)

I have referred to the investigation of international controversies under a system which does not bind the parties to accept the findings of the court of inquiry. This plan can be used in disputes between labor and capital; in fact, it was proposed as a means of settling such disputes before it was applied to international controversies. It is as important that we shall have peace at home as that we shall live peaceably with neighboring nations, and peace is only possible when it rests upon justice. In advocating arbitration of differences between large corporate employers and their employes, I believe we are defending the highest interests of the three parties to these disputes, viz: the employers, the employes and the public. The employe cannot be turned over to the employer to be dealt with as the employer may please.

The question sometimes asked, "Can I not conduct my business to suit myself?" is a plausible one, but when a man in conducting his business attempts to arbitrarily fix the conditions under which hundreds of employes are to live and to determine the future of thousands of

human beings, I answer without hesitation that he has no right to conduct his own business in such a way as to deprive his employes of the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To support this position, I need only refer to the laws regulating the safety of mines, the factory laws fixing the age at which children can be employed, and usury laws establishing the rate of interest. The effort of the employer to settle differences without arbitration has done much to embitter him against those who work for him and to estrange them from him—a condition deplorable from every standpoint.

But if it is unwise to make the employer the sole custodian of the rights and interests of the employes, it is equally unwise to give the employes uncontrolled authority over the rights and interests of the employer. The employes are no more to be trusted to act unselfishly and disinterestedly than the employers. In their zeal to secure a present advantage they may not only do injustice but even forfeit a larger future gain.

The strike, the only weapon of the employe at present, is a two-edged sword and may injure the workman as much as the employer, and even when wholly successful, is apt to leave a rankling in the bosom of the wage-earner that ought not to be. Society has, moreover, something at stake as well as the employer and employe, for there can be no considerable strike without considerable loss to the public. Society, therefore, is justified in demanding that the differences between capital and labor shall be settled by peaceful means. If a permanent, impartial board is created, to which either party of an industrial dispute may appeal, or which can of its motion institute an inquiry, public opinion may be relied upon to enforce the finding. If there is compulsory submission to investigation it is not necessary that there shall be compulsory acceptance of the decision, for a full and fair investigation will in almost every case bring about a settlement.

INCOME AND INHERITANCE

(From Mr. Roosevelt's Message.)

The question of taxation is difficult in any country, but it is especially difficult in ours with its federal system of government. Some taxes should on every ground be

levied in a small district for use in that district. Thus the taxation of real estate is peculiarly for the immediate locality in which the real estate is found. Again, there is no more legitimate tax for any state than a tax on the franchises conferred by the state upon street railroads and similar corporations which operate wholly within the state boundaries, sometimes in one and sometimes in several municipalities or other minor divisions of the state. But there are many kinds of taxes which can only be levied by the general government so as to produce the best results, because, among other reasons, the attempt to impose them in one particular state too often results merely in driving the corporation or individual affected to some other locality or other state.

The national government has long derived its chief revenue from a tariff on imports and from an internal excise tax. In addition to these there is every reason why, when next our system of taxation is revised, the national government should impose a graduated inheritance tax and, if possible, a graduated income tax.

The man of great wealth owes a peculiar obligation to the state, because he derives special advantages from the mere existence of the government. Not only should he recognize this obligation in the way he leads his daily life and in the way he earns and spends his money, but it should also be recognized by the way in which he pays for the protection the state gives him. On the one hand, it is desirable that he should assume his full and proper share of the burden of taxation; on the other hand, it is quite as necessary that in this kind of taxation, where the men who vote the tax pay but little of it, there should be clear recognition of the danger of inaugurating any such system save in a spirit of entire justice and moderation.

Whenever we, as a people, undertake to remodel our taxation system along the lines suggested, we must make it clear beyond peradventure that our aim is to distribute the burden of supporting the government more equitably than at present; that we intend to treat rich man and poor man on a basis of absolute equality, and that we regard it as equally fatal to true democracy to do or permit injustice to the one as to do or permit injustice to the other.

I am well aware that such a subject as this needs long and careful study in order that the people may become familiar with what is proposed to be done, may clearly see the necessity of proceeding with wisdom and self-restraint, and may make up their minds just how far they are willing to go in the matter, while only trained legislators can work out the project in necessary detail. But I feel that in the near future our national legislators should enact a law providing for a graduated inheritance tax by which a steadily increasing rate of duty should be put upon all moneys or other valuables coming by gift, bequest, or devise to any individual or corporation. It may be well to make the tax heavy in proportion as the individual benefited is remote of kin. In any event, in my judgment, the pro rata of the tax should increase very heavily with the increase of the amount left to any one individual after a certain point has been reached.

It is most desirable to encourage thrift and ambition, and a potent source of thrift and ambition is the desire on the part of the breadwinner to leave his children well off. This object can be attained by making the tax very small on moderate amounts of property left; because the prime object should be to put a constantly increasing burden on the inheritance of those swollen fortunes which it is certainly of no benefit to this country to perpetuate.

There can be no question of the ethical propriety of the government thus determining the conditions upon which any gift or inheritance should be received. Exactly how far the inheritance tax would, as an incident, have the effect of limiting the transmission by devise or gift of the enormous fortunes in question it is not necessary at present to discuss. It is wise that progress in this direction should be gradual. At first a permanent national inheritance tax, while it might be more substantial than any such tax has hitherto been, need not approximate, either in amount or in the extent of the increase by graduation, to what such a tax should ultimately be.

This species of tax has again and again been imposed, although only temporarily, by the national government. It was first imposed by the act of July 6, 1797, when the makers of the constitution were alive and at the head of affairs. It was a graduated tax; though small in amount, the rate was increased with the amount left to any in-

dividual, exception being made in the case of certain close kin. A similar tax was again imposed by the act of July 1, 1862; a minimum sum of \$1,000 in personal property being excepted from taxation, the tax then becoming progressive according to the remoteness of kin. The war revenue act of June 13, 1898, provided for an inheritance tax on any sum exceeding the value of \$10,000, the rate of the tax increasing both in accordance with the amounts left and in accordance with the legatee's remoteness of kin.

The supreme court has held that the succession tax imposed at the time of the civil war was not a direct tax, but an impost or excise which was both constitutional and valid. More recently the court, in an opinion delivered by Justice White, which contained an exceedingly able and elaborate discussion of the powers of the congress to impose death duties, sustained the constitutionality of the inheritance tax feature of the war revenue act of 1898.

In its incidents, and apart from the main purpose of raising revenue, an income tax stands on an entirely different footing from an inheritance tax; because it involves no question of the perpetuation of fortunes swollen to an unhealthy size. The question is in its essence a question of the proper adjustment of burdens to benefits.

As the law now stands it is undoubtedly difficult to devise a national income tax which shall be constitutional. But whether it is absolutely impossible is another question; and if possible it is most certainly desirable. The first purely income tax law was passed by the congress in 1861, but the most important law dealing with the subject was that of 1894. This the court held to be unconstitutional.

The question is undoubtedly very intricate, delicate and troublesome. The decision of the court was only reached by one majority. It is the law of the land, and of course is accepted as such and loyally obeyed by all good citizens. Nevertheless, the hesitation evidently felt by the court as a whole in coming to a conclusion, when considered together with the previous decisions on the subject, may perhaps indicate the possibility of devising a constitutional income tax law which shall substantially accomplish the results aimed at. The difficulty

of amending the constitution is so great that only real necessity can justify a resort thereto. Every effort should be made in dealing with this subject as with the subject of the proper control by the national government over the use of corporate wealth in interstate business, to devise legislation which without such action shall attain the desired end; but if this fails, there will ultimately be no alternative to a constitutional amendment.

(From the Madison Square Speech.)

The income tax, which some in our country have denounced as a socialistic attack upon wealth, has, I am pleased to report, the indorsement of the most conservative countries in the old world. It is a permanent part of the fiscal system of most of the countries of Europe and in many places it is a graded tax, the rate being highest upon the largest incomes. England has long depended upon the income tax for a considerable part of her revenues and the English commission is now investigating the proposition to change from a uniform to a graded tax.

I have been absent too long to speak with any authority on the public sentiment of this country at this time, but I am so convinced of the justice of the income tax that I feel sure that the people will sooner or later demand an amendment to the constitution which will specifically authorize an income tax and thus make it possible for the burdens of the federal government to be apportioned among the people in proportion to their ability to bear them. It is little short of a disgrace to our country that while it is able to command the lives of its citizens in time of war, it cannot, even in the most extreme emergency, compel wealth to bear its share of the expenses of the government which protects it.

If we can but repeal the laws which enable men to reap where they have not sown—laws which enable them to garner into their overflowing barns the harvests that belong to others—no one will be able to accumulate enough to make his fortune dangerous to the country. Special privilege and the use of the taxing power for private gain—these are the twin pillars upon which plutocracy rests. To take away these supports and to ele-

vate the beneficiaries of special legislation to the plane of honest effort ought to be the purpose of our party.

And who can suffer injury by just taxation, impartial laws and the application of the Jeffersonian doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none? Only those whose accumulations are stained with dishonesty and whose immoral methods have given them a distorted view of business, of society and government. Accumulating by conscious frauds more money than they can use upon themselves, wisely distribute or safely leave to their children, these denounce as public enemies all who question their methods or throw a light upon their crimes.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

(From Mr. Roosevelt's Message.)

I again recommend a law prohibiting all corporations from contributing to the campaign expenses of any party. Such a bill has already passed one house of congress. Let individuals contribute as they desire; but let us prohibit in effective fashion all corporations from making contributions for any political purpose, directly or indirectly.

(From the Madison Square Speech.)

The investigations which have been in progress during the past year have disclosed the business methods of those who a few years ago resented any inspection of their schemes and hid their rascality under high-sounding phrases. These investigations have also disclosed the source of enormous campaign funds which have been used to debauch elections and corrupt the ballot. The people see now what they should have seen before, namely, that no party can exterminate the trusts so long as it owes its political success to campaign contributions secured from the trusts. The great corporations do not contribute their money to any party except for immunity expressly promised or clearly implied. The president has recommended legislation on this subject, but so far his party has failed to respond.

No important advance can be made until this corrupting influence is eliminated, and I hope that the democratic party will not only challenge the republican party

to bring forward effective legislation on this subject, but will set an example by refusing to receive campaign contributions from corporations and by opening the books so that every contributor of any considerable sum may be known to the public before the election. The great majority of corporations are engaged in legitimate business and have nothing to fear from hostile legislation, and they should not be permitted to use the money of the stockholders to advance the political opinions of the officers of the corporations. Contributions should be individual, not corporate, and no party can afford to receive contributions even from individuals when the acceptance of those contributions secretly pledge the party to a course which it cannot openly avow. In other words, politics should be honest, and I mistake political conditions in America if they do not presage improvement in the conduct of campaigns.

COLLECTING DEBTS BY NAVY

(From Mr. Roosevelt's Message.)

In my message to you on the 5th of December, 1905, I called your attention to the embarrassment that might be caused to this government by the assertion by foreign nations of the right to collect by force of arms contract debts due by American republics to citizens of the collecting nation, and to the danger that the process of compulsory collection might result in the occupation of territory tending to become permanent. I then said: "Our own government has always refused to enforce such contractual obligations on behalf of its citizens by an appeal to arms. It is much to be wished that all foreign governments would take the same view."

This subject was one of the topics of consideration at the conference at Rio, and a resolution was adopted by that conference recommending to the respective governments represented "to consider the advisability of asking the second peace conference at The Hague to examine the question of the compulsory collection of public debts, and, in general, means tending to diminish among nations conflicts of purely pecuniary origin." This resolution was supported by the representatives of the United States.

(From the Madison Square Speech.)

I venture to suggest that we may not only promote peace but also advance our commercial interests by announcing as a national policy that our navy will not be used for the collection of private debts. While protecting the lives of our citizens everywhere and guaranteeing personal safety to all who owe allegiance to our flag, we should, in my judgment, announce that persons engaging in business and holding property in other lands for business purposes must be subject to the laws of the countries in which they engage in business enterprises. Many profitable fields of investment are now closed because the people of the smaller nations are afraid that an investment of foreign capital will be made an excuse for a foreign invasion. Several times on this trip this fact has been brought to my attention, and I am convinced that for every dollar we could secure to American investors by an attempt to put the government back of their private claims we would lose many dollars by closing the door to investment. Mark the distinction between the protection of the lives of our citizens and the use of the navy to guarantee a profit on investments. We do not imprison for debt in the United States, neither do we put men to death because of their failure to pay what they owe, and our moral prestige as well as our commercial interests will be conserved by assuring all nations that American investments depend for protection upon the laws of the country to which the investors go.

FEDERAL LICENSE FOR CORPORATIONS

(From Mr. Roosevelt's Message.)

It cannot too often be repeated that experience has conclusively shown the impossibility of securing by the actions of nearly half a hundred different state legislatures anything but ineffective chaos in the way of dealing with the great corporations which do not operate exclusively within the limits of any one state. In some method, whether by a national license law or in other fashion, we must exercise, and that at an early date, a far more complete control than at present over these great corporations—a control that will, among other things,

prevent the evils of excessive over-capitalization, and that will compel the disclosures by each big corporation of its stockholders and of its properties and business, whether owned directly or through subsidiary or affiliated corporations. This will tend to put a stop to securing of inordinate profits by favored individuals at the expense whether of the general public, the stockholders, or the wageworkers. Our effort should be not so much to prevent consolidation as such, but so to supervise and control it as to see that it results in no harm to the people.

(From the Madison Square Speech.)

Recent investigations have brought to light the fact that nearly all the crookedness revealed in the management of our large corporations has been due largely to the duplication of directorates. A group of men organized, or obtained control of, several corporations doing business with each other and then proceeded to swindle the stockholders of the various corporations for which they acted. No man can serve two masters, and the director who attempts to do so will fail, no matter how much money he makes, before his failure is discovered. Many of the trusts control prices by the same methods. The same group of men secure control of several competing corporations and the management is thus consolidated. It is worth while to consider whether a blow may not be struck at the trusts by a law making it illegal for the same person to act as director or officer of two corporations which deal with each other or are engaged in the same general business.

A still more far-reaching remedy was proposed by the democratic platform of 1900, namely, the requiring of corporations to take out a federal license before engaging in interstate commerce. This remedy is simple, easily applied and comprehensive. The requiring of a license would not embarrass legitimate corporations—it would scarcely inconvenience them—while it would confine the predatory corporations to the state of their origin. Just as a federal license to sell liquor leaves the possessor of the license to sell only in accordance with the laws of the state in which he resides, so a corporate license granted

by a federal commission would not interfere with the right of each state to regulate foreign corporations doing business within its borders.

If corporations were required to take out a federal license the federal government could then issue the license upon the terms and conditions which would protect the public. A corporation differs from a human being in that it has no natural rights, and as all of its rights are derived from the statutes it can be limited or restrained according as the public welfare may require. The control which congress has over interstate commerce is complete, and if congress can prevent the transportation of a lottery ticket through the mails, by the express companies or by freight, it can certainly forbid the use of the mails, the railways and the telegraph lines to any corporation which is endeavoring to monopolize an article of commerce, and no party can long be credited with sincerity if it condemns the trusts with words only and then permits the trusts to employ all the instrumentalities of interstate commerce in the carrying out of their nefarious plans. It is far easier to prevent a monopoly than to watch it and punish it, and this prevention can be accomplished in a practical way by refusing a license to any corporation which controls more than a certain proportion of the total product—this proportion to be arbitrarily fixed at a point which will give free operation to competition.

SUGGESTIONS FOR OKLAHOMA'S CONSTITUTION

To the Members of the Constitutional Convention of Oklahoma—Gentlemen:

After expressing my grateful appreciation of the honor you do me in inviting me to address you, and my regret that circumstances prevent my acceptance, I beg to submit some suggestions in writing, in lieu of those which I would take pleasure in submitting orally if I could be present.

The task which the citizens of Oklahoma have, by their generous confidence, imposed upon you is a very honor-

able one as well as a very important one. The organic law of the state is more permanent than the statutes and, therefore, greater care should be exercised in framing it. You have, however, the advantage of the experience of other states, and should profit by the wisdom and the mistakes of those who have prepared former constitutions. It will be your own fault if you do not frame the best constitution ever written. The final draft of the document which you prepare will not be the work of one man or of a few men, but will rather be a composite production and reflect those ideas which you hold in common. Trusting that you will accept my suggestions in the spirit in which they are offered, and adopt only such as commend themselves to your good judgment, I venture to speak to you freely.

Your bill of rights ought to secure to each individual, freedom of conscience, that he may worship God in his own way; freedom of speech and of the press, that he may communicate his thought to others and share in the moulding of public opinion, responsible only to those whom he may injure by the uttering of falsehoods; freedom of assembly and debate, security in his person and property and opportunity to secure redress for injuries by speedy trial. The jury should be permitted in equity cases as well as in cases at law, if either party desires a jury, and the law should not require a unanimous verdict in civil cases. I would prefer a verdict by two-thirds, but argument may be made in favor of a verdict by a majority or by three-fourths. In a civil case the verdict follows the weight of testimony and there is no reason why the case should be continued until one side or the other can convince twelve men. The hung jury, and it is generally hung by one or two, furnishes the most popular argument against the system, and those who believe most strongly in the value of the jury should be the most anxious to free it from every just criticism. When a question is appealed to a court where several judges sit together the decision is rendered by a majority and there is no good reason why two-thirds of a jury should not be permitted to render a verdict in civil suits.

While a jury should be composed of persons entirely disinterested, no one should be excluded from service in a case merely because he has read the details of a crime

as published in the newspapers. The impression made by a newspaper account, while it may be the basis of an off-hand opinion is not the basis of such a conviction as ought to excuse a man from the jury. If a man is himself a witness, or if he knows the parties intimately enough to be biased either way, he is not competent to serve, for absolute impartiality is required; but there is more risk of injustice being done by twelve men who are too ignorant to read the papers than by a jury composed of men who have read newspaper reports, but are free to act upon the evidence as presented.

The selection of the jury should be hedged about by restrictions which will exclude the professional juror and make jury service the duty of all. While there may be special reason for excluding one from service, no man should be excused merely because he can spend his time more profitably in business.

Your judges should be elected by the people rather than appointed, and it would be well for your constitution to provide that the accused in any contempt proceedings shall be allowed to demand a trial by jury when the alleged contempt is committed outside of the court room. This is the real point in issue in the controversy over what is known as "government by injunction." When the contempt is committed in the presence of the court, the judge can be trusted to impose a fine, his action, of course, being subject to review. But when the alleged contempt is committed elsewhere and must be proven, the accused should be given the protection of trial by jury.

The doctrine of local self-government is an essential part of free institutions. Beware of the tendency which manifests itself in so many ways to remove authority from the community and deposit it with some remote official. The appointment of police boards by the governor is an instance of this. On the theory that a city is incompetent to govern itself, some of the states have authorized the governor to appoint police boards. The real reason is usually a partisan one, although the excuse given assails the foundation principle of our government. It is an axiom that people can act best upon subjects which they best understand and it is equally axiomatic that they understand best that which is closest to them.

Let the people of each community attend to all matters purely local. As the states are better custodians than the federal government of interests wholly within the state, so the people of a county are the best custodians of county interests and the people of a precinct the best custodians of precinct interests.

It may be well for you to put a constitutional limit to the length of time for which bonds can be issued. The present generation should not be permitted to burden future generations with a debt incurred for the benefit of those now living.

In fixing the limit of public indebtedness a distinction should be drawn between indebtedness incurred for an improvement that yields no revenue and for that incurred for an improvement that returns an annual income. To illustrate, a pavement is a public improvement which though of benefit does not bring a money return, while a water plant is usually a source of profit to a city. A higher limit of indebtedness may safely be allowed when the money expended is an investment which not only furnishes something which the people need, but which yields an income sufficient to pay interest and retire the bonds.

Elections should be scrupulously guarded and no better security has yet been found than a law giving each party representation on all election boards. The two larger parties ought always to be represented, and if there is a third party of any considerable strength, it should also be represented. It is not wise to allow the dominant party to select representatives from the minority party or parties. Each party should have the right to select its representation; in no other way can fairness be insured. Where the dominant party selects the minority representation, the selection is too often made from those who are only nominally members of the minority party. If the party organizations are allowed to select representatives, the persons selected will not only be bona fide members of their respective parties, but, owing their allegiance to their own organizations, they will be apt to be more trustworthy.

The cost of elections should, as far as possible, be thrown upon the community rather than upon the candidates or the parties. If the candidates have to bear the

expense, the poor will be excluded from office holding, not to speak of the temptation which large campaign expenses present to the officer to reimburse himself at the cost of the public. If the expense of the campaign falls upon the parties, there is danger that corporations or individuals specially interested in legislation will finance the campaign in return for promises of favors. While corporations should be absolutely prohibited from contributing to campaign funds and while the public should be advised before the election of all individual contributions above a small minimum, it would be easier to enforce such a law if candidates and parties were as far as possible relieved from the necessity of making large expenditures. The cost of printing the ballot has already been assumed by the public and it is worth considering whether the bringing of the voter to the polls should not also be provided for by the public or the expenditure of money by the party for that purpose prohibited. It is possible that the end might be reached by the publication of the names of those voters who, without reasonable excuse, absent themselves from the polls on election day.

The direct primary is an improvement over the convention method of nominating, and I suggest that you obtain copies of the primary laws thus far adopted in other states and inquire of the heads of the respective party organizations as to the practical working of the laws. Conventions should be allowed for the framing of platforms and for the performing of any work which cannot be done by primary vote, but the more fully the control of the party can be kept in the hands of the rank and file the better. Authority comes from the people and the more directly and completely the people control the less danger there is of the thwarting of the wishes of the voters.

The initiative and referendum are in harmony with our theory of government and should be applied as far as circumstances will permit. The representative is a necessary evil; he is employed because the people cannot, on account of their numbers, act directly upon public questions. There is more virtue in the people than finds expression through those whom they elect; the faults of our government are not in the degeneracy of the voters, but in the representative who uses a public trust for private gains. Your constitution should provide a way

by which the people of each city and county, and the people of the state, may initiate legislation if their representatives refuse to give expression to their wishes, and sit in judgment upon the acts of their representatives whenever a considerable number of voters desire to test public sentiment by a popular vote. The principle involved in the initiative and referendum is a sound one and experience has shown that it is a popular principle.

I would also recommend the recall—the name is used to describe the system whereby the people of a community may revoke the commission of an official who has betrayed his trust. The right of the people to honest and faithful representatives is superior to the right of an official to hold an office or draw a salary.

You will not have much difficulty in agreeing upon constitutional provisions where there are no special interests to dispute the claims of the general public. You will probably find your greatest difficulty in drawing the provisions relating to corporations, and I am sure you will pardon me if I deal with this subject with some elaboration. For the present purpose, corporations will be divided into three classes, private corporations proper, corporations holding municipal franchises, and transportation corporations, such as railways, interurban electric lines, express companies, sleeping-car companies, telegraph lines and long distance telephone lines.

I ask you to consider the advisability of creating a Board of Corporations composed of a number of state officers, or of men elected specifically for that position. This board should have the right to pass upon all articles of incorporation before they are filed, to insure compliance with prescribed conditions. The watering of stock and the issuing of fictitious capitalization should be forbidden and the issuing of stock for anything excepting actual money should be carefully guarded. No corporation should be allowed to own land except as the ownership of land may be incidental to its legitimate business and then the amount should be carefully limited. A corporation cannot cultivate land and it would only lead to the inauguration of a tenant system if corporations were allowed to own farm land.

Coal, iron and other mineral lands should be leased rather than sold, insofar as the state has control, and the

leases should be limited in duration and in the amount that one person or corporation can control.

Time and experience have brought out two corporate evils which should be corrected. One is the duplication of directorates. No person should be permitted to serve as a director of two or more corporations that either compete with each other or deal with each other. To the extent that two corporations are controlled by the same persons competition is eliminated, and this is one of the methods now employed for monopolizing an industry.

If the same men control two corporations which deal with each other they are constantly subjected to temptation to sacrifice one corporation to the other. The minority stockholders have rights that must be respected and one of their rights is to have directors who have no pecuniary interests adverse to the interests of the stockholders.

No corporation should be permitted to hold stock in another corporation.

Monopoly of the product is the second evil to be prevented. Except where the corporation owns a patent right, no corporation ought to be permitted to control enough of the total product to enable it to fix the market price or the terms of trade. The proportionate limit is fairer than an arbitrary limitation upon the capital stock, because a capitalization sufficient to monopolize one industry might be insufficient to enable the company to control any considerable part of the product of another industry. The object of the law should be to prevent monopoly rather than to prevent association together for production on a large scale. As long as competition operates freely the public will get the benefit of improved methods, but when competition is eliminated the purchaser has no protection.

No corporation should be permitted to discriminate between purchasers for the purpose of driving a rival out of business; it should be compelled to treat all alike. The trusts have very frequently resorted to the practice of reducing prices in a competitor's field while they maintained or raised them in other parts of the country.

These suggestions occur to me, but they do not exhaust the subject. The board of corporations should be given

ample power to require publicity as to the financial condition of the corporation, to supervise its relations with other corporations and to suspend or, subject to appeal, revoke charters for violation of articles of incorporation.

Franchise holding corporations should not be created except under strict regulation. No franchise should be granted except by a majority vote of the people of the city, and then only for a short period, not more than twenty or twenty-five years. The books of the corporation should be open for inspection, its net income over a fixed per cent. should be turned into the city treasury and the city should be permitted to purchase the plant upon a year's notice and on equitable terms. There is no excuse for the squandering of the property of the community as it has been squandered in most of our large cities. In some cities franchises worth many millions have been given away by corrupt councils. It is the rule in the English Parliament now to limit the dividends which a public service corporation can pay and compel the surplus to be turned into the public treasury or used to reduce service charges.

Cities should be empowered to own and operate such municipal plants as the people, by a majority vote, may decide to be desirable, and the city charter should be easily amendable through the initiative and referendum. The tendency is strongly toward the municipal ownership of water plants and lighting plants. The same arguments which have led people to favor municipal water and lighting plants will lead them to favor municipal heating plants, municipal telephone plants and municipal street car systems.

Your constitution should be clear and explicit in regard to railroads. An elective railway commission should be vested with power to protect the public against discrimination, rebates and extortionate rates. There is no danger of giving this commission too much authority, for the courts can correct any of its errors on appeal, but the power granted to the railway commission should not exclude action by the legislature. The commission should have power to ascertain the present value, measured by the cost of reproduction, of all railroads now operating in the state, and the indorsement of the commission should be necessary before any new stock is issued, to

the end that fictitious capitalization may be prevented, as it is by the Texas law.

The capital of a railroad should represent money actually invested and the freight and passenger rates should not be higher than necessary to return a reasonable dividend upon the present value of the road. All rates and classifications should be submitted to the board before they go into effect. In other words, while the rights of the stockholders of the roads should be carefully protected, the quasi-public character of the road should always be borne in mind. It might be well to investigate the operation of the Connecticut law which limits the earning power, or at least the dividend paying power, on the main road of that state.

Elevator sites and private tracks should also be under the supervision of the railroad commission in order that all patrons of the road may have equal treatment. The elevator monopolies, working in league with the railroads, have despoiled the farmers of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Express companies, sleeping-car companies, telegraph companies, interurban electric companies and interurban telephone companies should all be treated like the railroads and put under the control of the railway commission, and the constitution should vest in the legislature or in the commission, or in both concurrently, the authority to exercise any control necessary for the most ample protection of the public.

Labor is deserving of special consideration, for the wage-earners in the city and the farmers in the country produce the wealth of your state and to a large extent will bear its burdens. The legislature should be empowered to fix the length of the working day on state, county, and municipal work and to prescribe the maximum length of the contract day as between private individuals. As the courts have sometimes held unconstitutional laws which, like the eight hour day law, have attempted to limit the length of the working day, I hope that your constitution will specifically confer upon the legislature authority to fix the minimum age at which children may be employed in factories and the maximum hours at which adults may be employed. The same reasoning that justifies a law protecting the borrower from an extortionate interest

contract justifies legislation protecting the employe from excessive hours.

The lobbyist, as he is generally known, should be driven from the capital. No one should be permitted to act as attorney or agent of any corporation or individual interested in legislation until he registers as such, and then his arguments should be submitted to committees rather than to individuals.

The legislature should be given plenary power in matters of taxation. It should be authorized to provide for a land tax "on the improved or unimproved value of the land, as experience may prove best, a tax on personal property, on franchises, on corporations, on occupations, on incomes and on inheritances."

Arbitration of differences between labor and capital ought to be carefully provided for. Where an employer has but a few men under him and comes into daily contact with them, the personal relations which exist between them insure both sides against injustice; but when a corporation employs a large number, neither the stockholders nor the directors, nor yet the superintendent, comes into close acquaintance with the employes and some impartial board is necessary before which disputes may be brought. While the subject has not yet gone beyond the experimental stage, I suggest that your constitution should specifically authorize the legislature to create such a board and bestow upon it such power as may be necessary. A permanent board of three or five, temporarily increased for each dispute by two members, one designated by each side, could, I believe, almost prevent the occurrence of strikes. If the board has power to institute an investigation of its own motion, or at the request of either party, it would not be necessary to make the finding binding upon the parties because public opinion would compel the acceptance in all but the most exceptional cases.

But I shall conclude. I have by no means covered the entire field which you, as members of the convention, will be compelled to traverse, and I fear I have given you little that is new. Where I have used the word "should" you will please understand the qualifying words "in my judgment," for I can do no more than

express an opinion and I ask for that opinion only such consideration as you think it deserves.

With the earnest hope that the constitution which you prepare may be entirely acceptable to your constituents and that each delegate to the convention may look back to his record with increasing pride, I am with great respect,

Very truly yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

CHRISTMAS

The Christmas season is here, and who does not rejoice at its approach? Does it cost something to celebrate Christmas? Yes, but the expense can be proportioned to the ability. The writer remembers when, as a boy, he saved his nickels to buy Christmas presents. Possibly a dollar was all he had to spend, but what an experience to go through the stores and pick out a little present for each member of the family! Father was the hardest to suit, for it was difficult to find a five or ten cent present for a grown man. A cake of soap made into the form of an animal answered the purpose, and it was appreciated by the head of the family even though he did sometimes inquire whether there was any significance in the fact that soap was so often the thing selected; but no, it was all that the money would buy, and it was bestowed and received in the most kindly spirit. Then Christmas is the home-coming day. The children who are away at school return for their vacation, filling the house with noise and gaiety. Well, let them enjoy themselves. They are children but once, and the home would be a lonesome place without them.

The family gathering when the parents and the children and the children's children meet about the family board to review the events of the days during which they have been separated—how these domestic assemblies add to the deep enjoyment of life!

But we must not forget the spirit of Christmas in the keeping of the letter. Our communion with those who are bound to us by the ties of blood must not lead us to forget those with whom we are indissolubly connected even

though the relationship is more remote. The origin of Christmas is not to be overlooked. We commemorate a great gift with the gifts that are bestowed and received. God's gift of his Son is the inspiration that leads us to the observance of Christmas day, and as His gift was for all, our benefactions should extend as far as we are able to extend them. We enjoy Christmas more as we enlarge the circle of those to whose lives we can add some joy on this annual festival.

THE COMMONER wishes its readers a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, a Christmas made more merry to them by their generosity to others, a new year made happy by the bringing of happiness.

THE PEACE PRIZE

Every American citizen must feel proud of the fact that the awarding to the president of the United States, by the Norwegian parliament, of the Nobel peace prize, meets general approbation throughout the civilized world.

By his part in the conclusion of peace between Russia and Japan, Mr. Roosevelt won this high prize and in the winning brought to himself and his country honors that will not only be beneficial to both, but will serve as an inspiration to all men everywhere.

In one of his messages to congress, Mr. Roosevelt said: "If the great civilized nations of the present day should completely disarm, the result would mean an immediate recrudescence of barbarism in one form or another." Between the Theodore Roosevelt announcing this astounding and abominable doctrine and the Theodore Roosevelt winning the prize for the best efforts toward the promotion of the world's peace, it will not be difficult for the American citizen to choose the figure which will best serve as the representative of genuine Americanism.

Congratulations to the Norwegian parliament which conferred the prize, and to the American president who earned it; congratulations to the American people whose most promising line of leadership lies along the paths of peace, and to the world whose progress depends upon the abolition of war!

ROOT ON CENTRALIZATION

THE COMMONER will discuss the subject more at length in future issues, but it enters its protest now to the doctrine of centralization which Secretary of State Root indorses in his latest speech. He asks: "What is to be the future of the states of the Union under our constitutional form of government? The conditions under which the clauses of the constitution distributing powers to the national and state governments are henceforth to be applied are widely different from the conditions which were, or could have been, within the contemplation of the framers of the constitution, and widely different from those which obtained during the earlier years of the republic."

And then he proceeds to point out the causes which have led to new conditions and declares: "It is plainly to be seen that the people of the country are coming to the conclusion that in certain important respects the local laws of the separate states which were adequate for a due and just relation and control of the business which was transacted and the activities which began and ended within the limits of the several states, are inadequate for just and due control of the business and activities which extend through all the states, and more power of regulation and control is gradually passing into the hands of the national government.

He seems to rest his argument upon the old idea of destiny—the refuge of the man who wants to do a thing which he cannot defend. The destiny argument carried us into our expensive experiment in imperialism, and now destiny is relied upon to obliterate the states and centralize all government at Washington. The constitution while made more than a century ago, is adequate for today. The changes that are needed are changes of method, not of principle. The division of the powers of government was founded upon the doctrine of self-government, and the preservation of the nation depends upon the careful observance of the limitations between the things that are local and the things that are national. Those who do not recognize the doctrine of local self-government can make an argument in favor of the transfer of all power to the federal government; but those

who believe in the doctrine of self-government recognize that the people can be trusted best with that with which they are best acquainted and that the people are best acquainted with the things which are near them and immediately concern them.

Secretary Root may have had in mind the Japanese question as it presents itself in California. If so, he will find that the American people, while anxious to protect foreigners in all their rights, will not be willing to turn the school system over to the federal government merely to please any foreign nation, however friendly. It is entirely possible to protect all the interests of the Japanese and scrupulously regard their all rights without changing our form of government or depriving the people of the community of their rights to regulate the schools which their children are to attend.

If Secretary Root has in mind the elimination of the trusts, he will find that it is not necessary to deprive the states of their present powers in order to make congressional action effective.

Democrats may well scrutinize the remedies proposed by those who ignore the arguments upon which local self-government is based. Such remedies are apt to involve changes that are not only not necessary but really dangerous. The democratic party stands for remedies which apply old principles to new conditions. The president intimates in one of the Storer letters that Secretary Root is a valuable man in the cabinet because he can present the president's views. The president will not strengthen his hold upon public confidence by allowing the impression to go out that Secretary Root expresses his views in what he says about the abandonment of the constitutional distinctions between state and nation.

ELKS' MEMORIAL ADDRESS AT LINCOLN

At the Elks' Lodge of Sorrow, Lincoln, Neb., December 2, 1906, Mr. Bryan delivered this address:

On an occasion like this a number of themes suggest themselves. The word "fraternity" comes to us at such a time for we meet under the auspices of one of the

greatest fraternities of this nation, and the hour might well be occupied in speaking of the great work that the fraternity is accomplishing throughout the world. Among the great forces that are at work drawing men closer together, teaching them to recognize the tie that binds each to every other, the fraternity occupies an important place. And the virtues upon which the fraternity rests—any of these would furnish an appropriate theme. The equality that is taught in the lodge room would in itself justify the existence of the fraternity, especially at this time when we need to learn over and over again that the worth of the individual depends not upon what he possesses, or upon distinguished lineage, but upon the manner in which he performs the responsibilities that rest upon him; and our fraternity teaches this idea of equality. Hospitality is one of the virtues of our fraternity, and I think I can say without offending those who belong to other fraternities of which I am a member, that no fraternity in this land is more distinguished for hospitality. At home we can measure a man by what we know of him, and his position can rest upon his merits. But when a stranger comes among us we must assume the existence of virtues before we have an opportunity to test them; and throughout this land the homes that have been established by the Elks have the latch-string ever out. And no order that exists among us extends a more cordial welcome to the visiting brother, or shows to him a more constant courtesy and care.

Charity is a virtue and this fraternity is conspicuous for what it does in the name of sweet charity. And it is a gracious thing in this fraternity that while it gives, gives willingly, and gives freely, it does not record the name of the one to whom it gives that no humiliation shall ever come to one who has been the recipient of this fraternity's bounty. In charity no other order surpasses ours.

Brotherly love is another virtue upon which one might dwell today; for brotherly love lies back of equality and hospitality and charity. It is the idea of brotherly love that the fraternity everywhere is attempting to teach and it is this idea of brotherly love which, growing, as I believe it is growing throughout the world, is cementing mankind more and more closely together. And it is this

brotherly love which in my judgment is going to throw a light upon our pathway, and make it easier for us to distinguish the duties which we owe one to another.

But this afternoon the thought that is uppermost in my mind is the thought that brings us here. While we meet under the auspices of a fraternity and might contemplate the work of the fraternity and the virtues that are brought out in the lodge and among the members, it is death that calls us together; it is the fact that some who have been among us are among us no more; it is the fact that faces that were familiar in the lodge room are no longer seen there. We are here that we may pay a tribute of respect to the brothers who have gone hence, and dwell for a while with them in memory's halls. And assembling under these solemn circumstances we are brought to the contemplation of man's implacable foe. Those whose names have been read were not very long ago among us, as buoyant and as hopeful as we.

They are dead, and we meet year after year to hold brief communion with their spirits, and to utter a prayer for the peace of their souls. And it will not be long before other names will be added, not many years, in fact, until everyone present here today will be recorded as they have been. And so it has ever been. This endless procession has been moving on towards one goal from the time when man was placed upon this footstool to carry out a Divine decree, and there is no turning back from this way. No one is rich enough to purchase immunity, and no one so poor as to escape notice. No one is strong enough to resist the grim reaper, and no one so weak as to excite his pity.

There is a time when death might seem a natural visitor—in extreme old age. When the joints become stiff and the flesh wastes away; when the eyes grow dim and the ears no longer drink in the music of the voice. Then it might seem that death were an appropriate thing. But how few reach advanced age! A large percentage of the human race—a larger per cent. than need be—die young. The summons comes to the very babe before its infinite possibilities begin to unfold; the summons comes when it has no coin with which to make payment for the care it secures, except the smile, and the smile remains when the face is gone. Sometimes the summons comes to the stu-

dent just completing an education, prepared with trained mind and lofty purposes to take up the work of life—but the diploma is no answer to the summons. Again it comes to the mother; the child on her breast pleads for her, and the child at her knee clenches his chubby fist in defiance, but in vain; they must grow up without the knowledge of a mother's love. And now it is the man in the full strength of life, bearing a double burden and dividing his attention between the home and the state; he staggers and falls, and those who convey his remains to the cemetery try to comfort those whom he has left, and endeavor to divide among them the public task which he has left unfinished. Sometimes the cup comes to the lips of one whose whitened locks record the passing of many winters; his ripe experience has made him a treasure house from which wisdom can be drawn, and his spiritual wealth is a benediction to the home, and makes him a tower of strength to the church, but the chair by the fireside is vacated. Why is it that there must be this rude sundering of the ties that bind us to earth, and to each other? Why? A myriad of times this question has risen from broken hearts, and still no answer. I shall not attempt to answer it. But I can say in the language of the poet:

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!

And that hand has inscribed some lessons upon the tomb so clear and plain that all may read them.

Death, by its very uncertainty teaches us to use the present hour. If we were assured of three-score years and ten we might yield to the temptation to postpone everything to the later years. But the fact that we know not the day nor the hour when the call may come to us forces us to use today lest tomorrow may not arrive.

And, then, death reminds us of our weakness. Man was made in the image of his Creator, and given dominion over the earth, the air and sea—made but a little lower than the angels, and behold the work of man's hand! He

has harnessed the forces of nature and compelled them to do his bidding. He has converted the waterfalls into motive power; he has condensed the steam and commanded it to draw the commerce of a nation over the iron highways; his ships plough all the oceans, and they follow their charts unerringly no matter how dark the night. He has imprisoned the lightning in a tiny wire and sent it around the globe as his messenger, and he has even flung his words through space and imprinted them on instruments hundreds of miles away. No wonder man is boastful, and yet just as he imagines himself almost omnipotent, just as he reaches out to seize the crown, death touches him, or one he loves, and then he realizes how helpless he is.

Death turns our thoughts toward immortality. Heaven never seems so real to us as when it becomes the abode of someone whom we have known and loved. When our treasures are there we can easily believe that no heart warmed to a glow by the fire of brotherly love will suffer an eternal chill, that no spiritual flame, that grows brighter with the years, will be extinguished never to shine again.

I have here a little grain of wheat; it grew more than 3,000 years ago on the banks of the Nile. Ten centuries before the Babe of Bethlehem was carried down into Egypt to escape the wrath of Herod, the stalk upon which this little grain matured was swaying in the breezes that fanned the brow of the Sphinx. All these years it has slumbered in an ancient tomb. Had it been planted, and all its progeny after it, the lineal descendants of that one grain would be numerous enough to feed the teeming world today. In every grain of wheat there is a germ of life—a germ of life that has within it the power to discard the body of today and construct from air and earth not a new body alone, but many new bodies—and into each one of the many it can put the power to continue the work of reproduction. If the vital spark in a grain of wheat can pass unchanged through countless deaths and resurrections, surely the spirit of man will be able to defy the grave. All nature proclaims that there is another life, and the belief in that other life lends comfort to us when separated from a friend, we have the assurance that it is but for a time. The belief in immortality relieves the

somber character of an occasion like this, for we are assured that the congenial spirits who meet and mingle here will hold communion in the world beyond. Belief in immortality not only gives consolation, but it gives strength. We can better resist the temptation to do wrong to others when we expect to meet and associate with them in an endless world where our secret thoughts will be made known.

Death also prepares us for the change that is to come. To the young the thought of death affrights; but as we make progress along the path that leads from the cradle to the grave we all become accustomed to the word. Father dies, mother dies, a brother is taken, and then a sister. Children are called away, and friend after friend departs, and the ties that bind us to earth grow less and less in number, and the ties that bind us to the life beyond the grave increase. At last those who are joined together in holy wedlock are separated, and the survivor stands alone. Then death does not mean what it meant to us in youth. We no longer shudder at the thought; we may even come to wait for it with impatience. This is God's way; this is the way in which He weans us from the things that are and brings us into harmony with His plans. The great Irish poet has caught the sentiment, and expressed it in words the beauty of which will never be surpassed, when after scattering the leaves of the last rose of summer over the bed "where its mates of the garden lie scentless and dead," he exclaims:

"So soon may I follow,
 When friendships decay,
 And from Love's shining circle
 The gems drop away.
 When true hearts lie wither'd
 And fond ones are flown,
 Oh! who would inhabit
 This bleak world alone?"

NO PAY FOR POLITICAL SPEECHES

Mr. Bryan's attention has been called to a republican paper of Oklahoma which alleges that he, Mr. Bryan, received "two thousand dollars hard cash" for his

speeches in Oklahoma last fall. The fact that Mr. Bryan does not receive any pay whatever for campaign speeches is known to every republican who has intelligence enough to occupy an editorial position. The editor referred to could ascertain from the democratic committee, if he cared to know the truth, that Mr. Bryan's services were rendered without any compensation.

Mr. Bryan's campaign work is a source of expense to him rather than a source of profit, for his traveling expenses amount to considerable for each campaign, and his income from lectures is cut off while he is at work in the campaign, but he is glad to be able to devote his time to a cause in which he feels deeply interested, and hopes to be able to give more and more time to politics each year.

His income is derived from his lectures and writings, and thanks to a generous public, he is able to make enough from these sources during a part of the year to enable him to devote the rest of his time to gratuitous service. This statement is made in order that the readers of THE COMMONER may be able to answer such malicious misrepresentations as that put forth by the Oklahoma paper.

THE JOB SESSION

The short session of congress which meets after the election is the job session. Whenever the financial interests have any questionable measures to put through they wait until after the election before they spring them. Then they proceed to the manufacture of public opinion in favor of the speedy passage of their bills. The two jobs which the corporate interests have on hand now are the ship subsidy and the asset currency. The present congress has no time to consider tariff reform or an income tax or an inheritance tax, or anything else that would bring relief to the people, but it now looks as if it were going to have plenty of time to rush a ship subsidy bill through and to turn over to the bankers the power to issue an asset currency. The ship subsidy is a job, its object is not to help commerce but to help a few ship companies. It may be that only the thin edge of the

wedge will be presented at this session—the giving of subsidies to South American lines—but it is the beginning of a new raid upon the treasury, and the democrats should fight it with all the weapons at their command.

The asset currency is another scheme, and it is likely that it, too, will be presented in its most attractive form as a remedy for temporary stringency. The emergency note based upon the assets of the bank is the forerunner of the asset currency. Secretary Shaw called attention to this subject several years ago, and the large bankers have been gradually reaching out for the privilege of issuing money upon their assets, although they now draw interest upon those assets. If the asset currency is not guaranteed by the government, it is not secure. If it is guaranteed by the government, the burden is put upon the people and the profit goes to the bankers. This is another measure to which the democrats ought to offer a unanimous opposition. And in this connection it might be well for the democrats to point out the fact that the jobs are always left for the session after the election. At present congress does not convene in regular session until more than a year after its members are elected, and the second session of each congress is held after many of its members have been retired by another election. The constitution ought to be so amended as to convene congress within a few months of the election so as to prohibit the holding of any session after the election. The people ought to be able to sit in judgment upon the action of congress when they elect the next congress.

THE INCOME TAX

The income tax which slept for some ten years after the adverse decision of the supreme court is again a subject for discussion. The president's recognition has brought out the fact that quite a change has gone on in public sentiment favorable to the tax, but it has also brought out the fact equally interesting that the republican leaders are not going to favor the tax. The *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, which can generally be relied upon to take the side of predatory wealth, calls a halt on the in-

come tax. It is afraid that so much money would be raised by the income tax that no import duties would be necessary. This suggestion alone will bring all the beneficiaries of a high tariff into opposition. They have been collecting incomes through the tariff law, and out of pure gratitude ought to be willing to pay an income tax, but gratitude is not a prominent quality among those who enjoy special privileges. They come to regard them as vested rights. If the president undertakes to push the income tax, he will have to rely for his support upon the democrats and upon those republicans who are in a position to give expression to their sense of justice. The *Globe-Democrat* editorial may be accepted as evidence that there will be strong plutocratic opposition to the income tax.

The discussion, however, has brought out the fact that some of the rich men have come over to the side of those who believe in the justness of the income tax. Mr. M. E. Ingalls, former president of the Big Four Railroad and an active opponent of the democratic party in 1896, declares that he is in favor of an income tax, but he does not want a graded one. Mr. Perry Belmont is also in favor of an income tax, but does not want it levied upon punitive principles, but as a matter of revenue. Mr. Carnegie is opposed to the income tax, but is in favor of an inheritance tax. He believes that rich men ought to be compelled to turn over some of their surplus wealth at death. At the Civic Federation meeting in New York the other day he said: "Our country fails in its duty if it does not exact a share, a tremendous share of the estate of the enormously wealthy man upon his death. The money belongs to the community. Do not mistake me. I do not advocate the making of a man a pauper or the pauperizing of his children, but it is not the millionaire who made the wealth. He did not make the ore or the coal or the gold that he dug out of the ground. The Montana copper mine owner did not make his wealth; it belongs in the abstract to the people who use it and who produce the use which makes it valuable. I am with the president, then, to tax heavily by graduated taxation every man who dies leaving behind him his millions, for I think that excessive wealth left to a child is an injury to the child."

Mr. Carnegie might give other reasons in defense of an

inheritance tax. Many of the large fortunes have been acquired by the monopolizing of markets and by the bankruptcy of rivals. The money collected has in many cases been collected by means which are immoral if not illegal, and society could justify a claim to a part as a fine.

But, after all, there is a better remedy than the inheritance tax if the real purpose of the tax is to be levied as a punishment. Instead of allowing the government to grant privileges, to create favors and to sell immunity to great highwaymen, why not restore the government to its legitimate functions and take away the special advantages which have been granted by law? If each individual is put upon his own merits and left to secure only so much as he can earn, the fortunes will not be so fabulous as they are now. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure according to the old proverb, and it is certainly wiser to prevent unjust accumulations than to permit them to extend through life on condition that the government shall at the end of the life receive a share of the plunder.

However, the discussion of the income tax and the inheritance tax will educate the people as to what has been going on in the United States. There has been a good deal of education already, and there will be more when public thought is turned upon the question of taxation.

MORE MONEY

The bankers are still clamoring for more money on deposit, and some of them are willing to pay an interest on it in order to get it. The influence of the banking fraternity is thrown upon the side of high taxes and a large surplus. The depositing of money in favorite banks without interest is a source of corruption, for it lays the foundation for large campaign contributions. Then, too, there is a suspicion that it has been used in the past to make soft places for treasury officials, a number of our secretaries and other prominent officials having gone from official life in Washington into lucrative positions with the favored bankers.

If government money is loaned to the banks it ought

to be loaned according to the plan which now prevails in democratic Missouri. The security is fixed and the money is then loaned to the highest bidder. In this way the government realizes the largest possible amount from the deposit, and the deposit goes where it is most needed. If the federal revenues were loaned out to the highest bidder, there would be larger profit to the government and the banks would not feel under any obligation to contribute to the campaign fund.

MASSACHUSETTS' RAILROAD EXPERIENCE

The *Springfield Republican*, one of the cleanest, best and most advanced of the eastern newspapers, has a very interesting editorial entitled "Bryanism in an Early Massachusetts Report." This editorial will be found on another page and reference is made to it here only to emphasize the importance of the policies which it discusses. The *Republican* says that so far as railroads are concerned the Massachusetts Railway Commission has been a failure, and this failure is explained by a report published nearly forty years ago in which the difficulties involved in regulation were pointed out. Those who have watched the effort of railway boards to meet and counteract the schemes of the railroads will appreciate the foresight of the Massachusetts committee which predicted failure.

What is even more interesting is that a second report suggested a single line of railway across the continent as a regulator of rates. This is not a new suggestion. It has been offered frequently. As prominent a statesman as Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri, proposed a government road from the Mississippi river to the coast. That such a railway would do more to regulate interstate rates than a dozen rate laws goes without saying. It would also demonstrate whether government ownership is practicable. The railroads insist that government ownership is expensive and that the government could not own and operate a railroad as cheaply as private corporations. Figures are presented to show how much lower our freight rates are than European freight rates, although these

arguments have one fatal weakness, namely, that they conceal the fact that government railroads in Europe compete with private railroads there. If the railroads owned by the European nations furnished as good accommodations and as good service at as reasonable rates as the privately owned roads in Europe, there is no force in a comparison between government roads there and privately owned roads here. Such arguments cannot have weight until it is shown that the private roads of Europe are much better than the government roads, for if the governments of Europe offer accommodations as good as the private railroads of Europe offer, could not the government roads of this country do as well as the private roads in this country? Insofar as arguments can be drawn from analogy, it can be shown that the municipal plants of this country furnish service at a lower price than the privately owned plants, and it is also easy to show that there is not as much corruption under municipal ownership and the employes of the city are not as much to be feared in politics as the employes of the franchise-holding corporations.

But the purpose of this editorial is to call attention to the fact that back in Massachusetts there were people who pointed out a generation ago the difficulty of securing effective control through commissions, and even recognized the value of a government line as a regulator of rates. It ought not to be a capital offense to profit by the experience of the past and to recognize the wisdom of those who measure the influence at work and calculate upon the opposition which railroads could bring to bear against the work of a commission.

BANKERS PUSH ASSET CURRENCY

The press dispatches report that the house committee on banking and currency has decided to make a favorable report on a credit currency bill in line with the recommendations of the American Bankers' Association. All the republican members of the committee present joined in the report and all of the democrats present opposed it. Good for the democrats. Our party ought to present

a united front against this new piece of favoritism. One of the first acts of the republican party when it came into power ten years ago was to increase the profits of the national bank. Since that time it has increased the taxes upon the people and now plans a new tax in the form of a subsidy. But it is still endeavoring to accommodate the bankers, and this new proposition seeks to inaugurate a new principle.

When the national bank was empowered to issue notes, the measure was advocated on the ground that it would create a demand for government bonds and thus help the government during the war. That argument has long since ceased to be effective, and there is no excuse now for the bank note except that it puts the volume of money in the hands of the bankers instead of the government. The credit currency has all of the objections of the present bank currency and several other objections which cannot be made against the bank note as it now exists.

It is interesting to note the change of position made by the bankers. In 1896 they said we had plenty of money and did not need any more, and yet, immediately after the election, they asked for and obtained the privilege of issuing more notes on the ground that the country needed more. Since that time we have had an enormous increase in the gold production and gold coinage. We have increased the silver coinage and the bank note issue until the per capita circulation is more than fifty per cent. greater than it was ten years ago, and yet the bankers insist that we must have more money still—provided they are allowed to furnish it. If the government stands back of the new currency, the people will bear the risk and the bankers will make the money; if the government does not stand back of the currency, the bankers will make the money and the people will run the risk, but in either case it means more profit to the banker. If they really desire an elastic currency and not more currency, why do not the bankers propose a reduction of the bank note issue with a provision that an increase can be made? Why do the bankers not apply their tax idea to the present bank notes and provide that the issue of bank notes shall ordinarily be seventy-five per cent. of the par value of the bonds? The government might then permit them to issue an additional twenty-five per cent. upon the pay-

ment of a tax that would retire extra issue when the emergency was over. This would give them an elastic currency, but alas, it has a fatal objection. It would not give them as much profit as their plan, and therefore it is out of the question.

The democratic party is committed to the doctrine that the issue of money is a government function that ought not to be delegated to the banks at all, but in addition to this standing objection it opposes this new form of currency which lessens the security of the depositor, increases the risk of the note-holder and involves our country more deeply in the Wall street control of our finances. The financiers are not willing to allow the money question to remain settled. They vociferously insist that it is dead when any proposition is made that they do not like, and then they as vociferously insist that it shall be kept alive so long as they have any new advantages to gain. If Wall street is to be given any new mortgage upon the treasury, the republicans should be compelled to accept all the responsibility. The small bankers are already beginning to see the danger of an asset currency, and the democratic party will have their co-operation in fighting this new scheme of the large financiers.

SOLICITUDE FOR THE PUBLIC WEAL

Minister Limantour, of the Mexican cabinet, in explaining to congress the government's action in buying the Mexican Central Railroad, pointed out the railroad consolidation that is going on in the United States and justified the action of the government as a step necessary for the protection of the public. He sums up his argument as follows:

“Thus, gentlemen, there are three main arguments for the merger: First, to avoid friction between the different corporations when the two are competing lines, or when one of them fears being antagonized by a concert in which the government holds controlling interest; secondly, to avoid the absorption of properties not controlled by the government by one of the great railway systems of the United States; thirdly, the prospect of realizing economies through consolidation under a single management.”

And this solicitude for the public weal comes from Mexico. We still have some public men in the United States who insist that no matter what the railroads do the government is helpless. These, however, will grow fewer in number and less noisy, for no government can admit that it is impotent to protect the public.

When a public man spends all his time pointing out the dangers of government ownership and none of his time pointing out the evils which have attended the private operation of the railroads, it is well to inquire upon which side of the question his sympathies are.

Public ownership has been referred to as paternalism. Private operation of the railroads has been a sort of infernalism which to many seems more unbearable than any paternalism involved in the protection of the public by government ownership.

ROOT ON FUNDAMENTALS

Secretary of State Root made a speech at Rio de Janeiro, which speech contains many good things. For instance, he says: "Yet no student of our times can fail to see that not America alone, but the whole civilized world is swinging away from its old governmental moorings and intrusting the fate of its civilization to the capacity of the popular mass to govern. By this pathway mankind is to travel, whithersoever it leads. Upon the success of this, our undertaking, the hope of humanity depends."

This is a correct description of present tendencies, and it is creditable to Secretary Root that he sees it and understands it.

In another part of the speech he says, speaking for the United States: "We wish for no victories but those of peace; for no territory except our own; for no sovereignty except the sovereignty over ourselves. We deem the independence and equal rights of the smallest and weakest member of the family of nations entitled to as much respect as those of the greatest empire, and we deem the observance of that respect the chief guaranty of the weak against the oppression of the strong. We

neither claim nor desire any rights or privileges or powers that we do not freely concede to every American republic."

This is also sound doctrine, and it is well that it be kept before the world, although the speedy recognition of Panama may be recalled as inconsistent with it, and our refusal to promise independence to the Filipinos may seem to contradict it, but the doctrine is good even if we have not always lived up to it, and we can rejoice that Secretary Root has taken occasion to give emphasis to the doctrine.

But Secretary Root did not confine himself to statements that are sound. He says: "Capacity for self-government does not come to man by nature. It is an art to be learned, and it is also an expression of character to be developed among all the thousands of men who exercise popular sovereignty." He even declares: "The first fruits of democracy are many of them crude and unlovely; its mistakes are many, its partial failures many, its sins not few."

This is the new doctrine of which we have heard since we entered upon our colonial experiment. The idea that government by others is the natural thing and that self-government is an art that is to be acquired—this is something new in the United States. Clay, once secretary of state, and for years a respected authority in this country on matters of government, made a speech some eighty-eight years ago in defense of the independence of the South American republics. In the course of that speech he said: "Self-government is the natural government of man." He went farther and characterized the opposite doctrine as the excuse of kings, saying: "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 as to particular nations; and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us." And then he used a sentence to which Secretary Root's attention is especially called: "I contend that it is to arraign the dispositions of Providence himself to suppose that He created beings incapable of governing themselves, and to be trampled on by kings."

Which is the correct doctrine, the doctrine of Root that "capacity for self-government does not come to man by nature," or the doctrine of Clay, that "self-government is the natural government of man?" Which is right, that God made people incapable of self-government and left them to develop a capacity, or that God created them capable of self-government but also capable of improvement?

President Lincoln also had something to say on this subject. In 1858 he said: "Those arguments that are made, that the inferior races 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 the enslavement of 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 are better off for being ridden." Which was right, Abraham Lincoln or Secretary Root? Is the republican party willing to substitute the Root doctrine for the Lincoln doctrine?

The issue is a fundamental one. If we once admit that any people are incapable of self-government and that therefore they can justly be governed from without "for their own good," of course we abandon the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence—we abandon the theory of government which we have so carefully developed for a century and a quarter and plant ourselves upon the ground occupied by kings and emperors.

A SAMPLE

J. Pierpont Morgan is quoted in *Town Topics* as saying that cities which try government ownership will have keen and disastrous disappointments. Has he never compared the cost of water in the cities that have municipal plants and those that permit private plants to furnish the water? Lincoln, Neb., and Omaha, are an illustration. In Lincoln the city owns the plant. At Omaha a private corporation supplies the water. Although the water at

Lincoln is drawn from wells and at Omaha it is drawn from the river, water is furnished to the people of Lincoln at less than half the price which the private company charges the people of Omaha.

THE BEVERIDGE BILL

Senator Beveridge's child labor bill is as follows:

A bill to prevent the employment of children in factories and mines.

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, that six months from and after the passage of this act no carrier of interstate commerce shall transport or accept for transportation the products of any factory or mine in which children under fourteen years of age are employed or permitted to work, which products are offered to said interstate carrier by the firm, person, or corporation owning or operating said factory or mine, or any officer or agent or servant thereof, for transportation into any other state or territory than the one in which said factory is located.

Section 2. That no carrier of interstate commerce shall transport or accept for transportation the products of any factory or mine offered it for transportation by any person, firm or corporation which owns or operates such factory or mine, or any officer, agent, or servant of such person, firm or corporation, until the president or secretary or general manager of such corporation or a member of such firm or the person owning or operating such factory or mine shall file with said carrier an affidavit to the effect that children under fourteen years of age are not employed in such factory or mine.

Section 3. That the form of said affidavit shall be prescribed by the secretary of the department of commerce and labor. After the first affidavit is filed a like affidavit shall be filed, on or before July first and on or before December thirty-first of each year, with the interstate carrier to which such factory or mine offers its products for transportation; and after the first affidavit subsequent affidavits shall also state that no children

under fourteen years of age are employed or permitted to work in said factory or mine or have been employed or permitted to work in said factory or mine at any time during the preceding six months.

Section 4. That any officer or agent of a carrier of interstate commerce who is a party to any violation of this act or who knowingly violates any of the provisions of this act shall be punished for each offense by a fine of not more than ten thousand dollars nor less than one thousand dollars, or by imprisonment for not more than six months nor less than one month, or by both said fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court. Any person by this act required to file the affidavit herein provided for who fails or refuses to file such affidavit, or who shall make a false statement in said affidavit, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding twenty thousand dollars nor less than five thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year nor less than three months, or by both said fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

IS THIS PROSPERITY?

R. F. Orr, Buffalo Center, Iowa, writes :

Regarding Lawrence Callahan's barn I wish to say this:

Had Mr. Callahan built his barn in 1885, during a democratic administration, he would have paid for his lumber (supposing he lived in Iowa) as follows: For dimension, \$16 per thousand feet; for best quality of sheathing, \$16; for drop siding, \$18, and for a good quality of shingles, \$2 per thousand. Had he sold hogs to pay for it he would have received for them from \$6.50 to \$7 per hundred, and had he sold corn to pay for it he would have received from 50 to 60 cents per bushel.

Had he built his barn in 1893 (under another democratic administration, but before Grover Cleveland became a republican) he would have paid the same prices, or perhaps a little lower. He would have paid for it in hogs at from \$5 to \$6 per hundred, or corn at 45 to 50 cents per bushel.

Had he built in 1898 just before the g. o. p. got things

reorganized he would have found that he could buy dimension at \$14; the sheathing, \$12 to \$14; the drop siding, \$16 to \$18, and the very best shingles at \$2.75 per thousand. For his hogs he would have received \$5 per hundred and his corn 30 cents per bushel.

But let Mr. Callahan build now, and he will pay \$28 to \$30 for his dimensions, \$26 to \$28 for his sheathing, \$35 for his drop siding and \$4 for his shingles. He will sell his hogs at \$5.25 or \$5.50 per hundred and his corn at 30 cents per bushel.

Now let us drop all fine theories and get to hard facts. Is this prosperity?

THE POSTAL DEFICIT

The eminent gentlemen who have taken it upon themselves to find a way of wiping out the postal deficit seem sadly in need of new spectacles. They are quite sure that the only way to wipe out the deficit is to raise the rates on second-class matter 400 per cent., being utterly unable to see the very plain fact that the postal deficit could not only be wiped out, but a neat surplus secured by simply compelling the railroads to transport the mails for a reasonable compensation. The railroads furnish cars for the express companies and then haul the express for about one-eighth of what they charge for hauling mail in cars rented to the government at an annual rental that pays for the cars every year. Instead of increasing second-class rates 400 per cent. the commission ought to devote some time to getting a fair rate from the railroads.

OLNEY ON LABOR UNIONS

Hon. Richard Olney, Mr. Cleveland's attorney general and afterwards his secretary of state, has contributed to the *Inter-Nation* an interesting article on labor unions and politics. His views will attract the more attention because of the position he took in the Chicago strike. He insists that the labor organizations ought to enter actively into politics. The main reason that he gives is that it is necessary for them to do so in order to protect the

country from the evils that have attended the trustification of industries. He regards the trust as an economic development. He says: "It should be added that the trust has earned the right to be regarded as an economic evolution." As the strongest proof of this he cites the fact that it not only continues to exist but to actually grow and flourish. He even credits it with steadying the wages of the laboring man. While the opponents of the trust will take issue with Mr. Olney on the two propositions that it is an economic evolution, and that the mere fact it still exists is proof of its beneficence, and while they will not agree with him that it is an advantage to the laboring man, they will agree with him in placing emphasis upon the part which the laboring man has of influencing politics and on the responsibility which accompanies the opportunity.

Mr. Olney says: "If it be assumed that the free institutions of this country are on the whole better for mankind in general than any that human wisdom has yet devised, and are to be preserved at all hazards, it necessarily follows that the so-called laboring class has an interest in those institutions surpassing that of all other classes of the community." This is a sound position. The laboring man has an interest in free institutions because they are the only ones in which his voice can be made effective.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Olney mars the force of the preceding paragraph with the following sentence: "How he may so act politically as to promote that interest is a question which the ordinary laboring man is incompetent to decide and feels his incompetence to decide."

It is not true that the laboring man is incompetent to decide the questions that concern him and his country. The great questions of politics involve moral questions, and questions of right and wrong can be decided by a laboring man as well as by anyone else. It is a common error to assume that the average man on the farm and in the workshop is not competent to deal with the problems of government. Jefferson pointed out this error and asserted that the principles of right and wrong were so easily discerned as not to require the aid of many counselors.

Mr. Olney in the course of his articles states with force and clearness certain things which the laboring man should contend for. The catalogue is not complete but it is good as far as it goes and worthy of consideration. He says:

“To understand and appreciate the nature of those services, it is only necessary to bear in mind what the care and promotion of the special interests of labor will imperatively call for. It will require labor to stand for equality of opportunity for all men and against privilege in any form; for taxation measured by the protection given and the ability to bear its burdens and against taxation insidiously devised for the enrichment of particular classes; for economy and thrift in public expenditures and against graft and extravagance, however disguised; for the largest measure of personal liberty consistent with public order, and against all forms of paternalism; for international trade relations conceived in a spirit of equity and fairness, and against the continuance of relations so aggressive in their selfishness and greed as to inevitably arouse national anger and hostility; for peace and pacific methods of settling international controversies, and against war and the huge armaments which find in actual war their sole excuse and justification and inevitably operate as a temptation to war.”

Not only the laboring man but the farmer and the business man may well examine this list, for they are all interested in the reforms which the late secretary of state points out. He closes with a paragraph that contains both a tribute to the laboring men and an appeal, and THE COMMONER is pleased to bring this paragraph before its readers:

“In these circumstances, however indifferent others may be to the fate of our political institutions, the loyalty to them of American workingmen is something that ought not to be susceptible of a doubt. In the ballot they have the precise weapon by which to make that loyalty effective—by which to counteract prevalent reactionary tendencies and to make it plain that whoever will rule in America must be a true American both in sympathy and convictions. That they will use the weapon thus fitted

to their hands, will use it unitedly and therefore efficiently, self-interest as well as patriotism make reasonably certain. Not until it is demonstrated that their use of it will be unwise and injurious both as regards themselves and the public at large will it be time to despair of the republic.”

The ballot is the effective weapon for the redress of every grievance, and the laboring man ought to be quick to avail himself of it. The laboring man ought to be more of a factor in politics than he is, and it is to the credit of Mr. Olney that he so clearly recognizes and so forcibly states this fact.

THE PHILIPPINE ASSEMBLY

A dispatch from Manila announces that an election will soon be called for the selection of members to the first Philippine assembly. The election will be held July 1, 1907, and the assembly will convene within ninety days. Each assembly district will contain about ninety thousand population.

This will be an important assembly, and it is to be hoped that the Filipinos will recognize that the success of the assembly will go a long ways toward advancing the political interests of the people. The one argument that is now made in favor of the holding of the Philippine islands by the United States is that the Filipinos are incapable of self-government. While such an objection is inconsistent with our Declaration of Independence and our ideas of government, it is the only objection that is being seriously urged against Philippine independence, and the Filipinos have it in their power to meet this objection and to establish even in the minds of the most doubtful their claim to self-government.

The insurrection in Cuba has been used by the skeptical as an argument against Philippine independence, but it is absurd for any citizen of the United States to make an insurrection the basis of an argument against self-government. We had in this country the greatest civil war known to history, but yet no one would think of urging that fact as an argument against the capacity of

the people of the North or South for self-government. Both the Cubans and the Filipinos will govern themselves better than we would be able to govern them through carpet-bag officials, just as Mexico has governed herself better than we could have governed her had we held her under our flag as the result of the Mexican war. Besides having governed herself better than we could have governed her, the people of Mexico have had the benefit of development which participation in government brings. Every democrat will wish the Filipinos success in this step toward independence, and an increasing number of republicans will rejoice if their fears are removed by the wisdom and discretion of the Filipinos who are chosen to the new assembly.

“A MORAL ISSUE”

Mr. Stuyvesant Fish, late president of the Illinois Central Railroad, is reported to have said some very good things in a speech recently made at a banquet at Orange, N. J. Mr. Fish said:

“The contest is no longer between those who have and those who have not, but between those on the one hand who have moderately, sufficiently and even abundantly, and on the other those who, through the use of trust funds and the power incident thereto, seek by questionable practices to have excessively. This is the issue which is daily brought into every home in America. Like taxation without representation, it involves moral and ethical questions, and also strikes at the pocket-book, which has been called the sure road to the Anglo-Saxon’s heart. It will not down. Great and repeated efforts have been made to quiet and hush the clamor which is rising on this subject. Such efforts may succeed for a time, but not in the end. It is not for me to say, in the words of Patrick Henry, ‘Gentlemen may cry peace, peace, but there is no peace,’ nor yet, ‘Shall we lie supinely on our backs until the enemy shall have bound us hand and foot?’ No, a thousand times no! I cannot and will not stir your minds up to a sense of wrong. Such is not my purpose, nor is this the forum for an appeal against unjust wealth.

You and I have too large a stake in it to risk adding to the danger into which it has been brought by the malfeasance of some of our agents. What I do want is to bring to your attention the fact that no apparently effective thing has been done to right the wrongs which are known to exist, and that it rests with us, the great middle class, to meet this issue as our fathers met those which confronted them, soberly, advisedly and in fear of God. Let us do and say nothing rash, but, relying upon past experiences, move forward as people who 'know their rights, and knowing dare maintain.' ”

Mr. Fish declares that a moral issue is involved, and he waxes eloquent and quotes from Patrick Henry. It is a noble speech. Mr. Fish is one of the rich men of the country—at least he would have been considered rich a few years ago, although he may not be rich when his wealth is measured against the wealth of some of our trust magnates. He has recently had some experience with the manipulators of the railroads and he was worsted in the contest. His defeat seems to have opened his eyes as to what is going on in this country, and he sounds a note of warning. The fact that he makes this protest is one of the signs of the times. The distinction which he draws is a very proper one. There is no antagonism in this country to honest wealth no matter how much a man makes if he makes it honestly and gives to society an equivalent service. He will be protected in the enjoyment of his wealth. There is a sense of justice among the American people to which the successful man can appeal if his success is merited, but it is time that a distinction was made between money honestly accumulated and money which has been stolen. It is time that the honest men who have made fortunes in legitimate business separate themselves from the predatory classes and join with the masses in putting an end to exploitation. A few years ago many of the small business men felt that they must take the side of the big financiers. They are learning that the big financiers are a class by themselves and that their schemes contemplate the enrichment of the few at the expense of the many.

Mr. Fish probably regards his expulsion from the Illinois Central directorate as a misfortune, but if that misfortune makes him an apostle of reform, the public may

well rejoice over the misfortune. Mr. Fish has been on the inside, and he knows something of the methods of these men who have been syndicating a nation's prosperity and monopolizing the opportunities of the country. May his conscience prompt him to speak and to speak often if he has any more messages like the one recently delivered.

MONEY IN BLOCKS

John Pierpont Morgan is quoted in *Town Topics* as saying: "There is plenty of money, but it is in blocks—not scattered about as it once was." And this seems very satisfactory to the people who own the "blocks." But how about the people among whom it was once scattered? He also says that there is nothing to prevent a continuance of prosperity "unless the agitators are successful in arousing public passion and clamor against our property interests." Is it possible that he wants the money "scattered about as it once was?"

A WORD OF WARNING

THE COMMONER has called attention to the Hamiltonian tendency on the part of some republican leaders to obliterate state lines. This tendency must be guarded against, for the state is the best protector of the rights and the best guardian of the interests of the citizen in local affairs. It is necessary, however, that democrats shall be on their guard against the effort made by the monopolists to use the state as a bulwark when attacked by the federal government. In our zeal for the protection of the rights of the states we must not allow wrongs to go unremedied. We must not allow the federal government to remain inactive where action is necessary. In domestic affairs the state is supreme; in interstate commerce congress is supreme. There is no neutral zone between these two spheres of action. When commerce crosses the line of a state it becomes subject to the control of congress, and congress must act in such matters or the people are without redress.

There ought to be no conflict between the state and the nation in the attack upon predatory wealth. The state should do all within its power to protect the public, and congress should exercise its power to the same end. The remedies should be concurrent. It is more than likely that the advocates of centralization will seek to substitute a national remedy for the remedies which are within the power of the state. The democrats should see to it that the national remedies are simply supplemental and do not disable the state. Congress is entirely within its sphere when it attempts to fix the terms upon which a state corporation can engage in interstate commerce. A state has a right to create corporations, and it has a right to control the corporations which it creates, and it ought to have the right to fix the terms upon which an outside corporation does business within its borders, but no state can object to conditions imposed by the federal government for the protection of interstate commerce.

Let the democrats be on their guard, therefore, first, to see that the powers of the general government are employed to the full in the protection of the public, and second, that the rights of the states in local affairs are not interfered with.

A PRECEDENT FOR DISARMAMENT

Under the title "A Precedent for Disarmament—A Suggestion to the Peace Conference," Ernest Crosby has made some excellent recommendations. Mr. Crosby's article follows:

Hidden away in the archives of the department of state at Washington is a little document which has attracted but small attention; and yet its effect upon the welfare of two nations has been immense, while its purport is altogether unique. It is an "arrangement" between the United States and Great Britain, bearing date April 28, 1817, and signed by Richard Rush, acting as secretary of state on behalf of this country, and Charles Bagot, envoy extraordinary of His Britannic Majesty. The entire contents of this document could easily be copied upon a half-sheet of paper, and it reads in substance as follows:

“The naval force to be maintained upon the American lakes by the government of the United States and His Majesty shall henceforth be confined to the following vessels on each side, that is:

“On Lake Ontario, to one vessel not exceeding one hundred tons burthen, and armed with one eighteen-pound cannon;

“On the upper lakes, to two vessels (of the same burthen and armament);

“On the waters of Lake Champlain to one vessel (of the same burthen and armament);

“All other armed vessels in these lakes shall be forthwith dismantled, and no other vessels of war shall be there built or armed.”

The war of 1812 had made Lake Erie and Lake Champlain the scenes of bloody conflicts. The people living on the shores of those lakes were for the most part connected by blood and traditions, and the war was in character almost a civil war. It was clearly desirable to prevent such conflicts, if possible, in the future; and to some wise and humane statesman the happy idea occurred of removing, or reducing to a minimum, the instruments of strife, recognizing the fact, proclaimed by Victor Hugo, that the chief cause of war is to be found in the armaments of nations.

It can hardly be denied that naval men desire naval war. They would not be worth their salt if they did not. When the lawyer actually wishes for the abolition of litigation, when the physician prays honestly for the disappearance of patients from the surface of the earth, when any man longs for the lack of opportunity to practice his chosen profession or trade, then, perhaps, will the professional fighter yearn for peace. But the soldier, *qua* soldier, ought to wish for war. It is his only *raison d'être*. Apparently appreciating this fact, the men who drafted the agreement of 1817 provided for the removal of that incentive to war which the existence and display of a naval force necessarily involves. Their argument seems to have been that satan will find some mischief still for idle ships to do, and, in consequence, for nearly a century only four toy gunboats have been kept in commission by either country in these waters.

How fully the result has justified their action! We have had plenty of disagreements with Canada. Time and again the disputes between us have reached the point of acerbity and irritation. It is almost certain that, if we had had our weapons handy, one or the other of us would have drawn a bead on the other. But, luckily, our hip pockets were empty and no damage was done. And consider for a moment how different the aspect of the great lakes would be today if this arrangement had not been signed! The mad rivalry of armaments would have been reproduced in miniature in each of them. Manufacturers and contractors would be besieging congress and parliament to authorize the construction, now of a floating battery, and now of a battleship, and each new vessel on either side would be used as a justification for a similar one on the other. To withstand such navies land defenses would be necessary, and garrisons to man them. Every port—Oswego, Buffalo, Cleveland, Duluth, Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston—would require modern forts and ordnance; immense expenditure would be necessary even in times of peace, and the continuance of peace would be rendered precarious. The possibility of such a state of affairs has been removed by the arrangement of 1817, and it is quite likely that the example of peacefulness which it set along the lake frontier has had the effect of making more or less trivial the preparations for war on the rest of the boundary line. Has there been anything enervating or unmanly in all this? Not at all. No one doubts for a moment the courage and ability to fight of the men on both sides, but that courage and ability have been released for service in the conquests of nature and industry. Such have been the far-reaching effects of the arrangement of 1817, which at the time was not thought worthy of the title of "treaty" and is called simply an "arrangement." Mr. Monroe was president then, and his name is associated with another declaration of policy; but I am inclined to think that there are possibilities in the Rush-Bagot arrangement which may well eclipse those of the Monroe doctrine.

It is a pity that all our acts toward Canada have not been as graceful as our assent to this arrangement. Visit the towns on the north bank of the St. Lawrence river, look across that easily beferried stream, and think of the

artificial obstacle which our tariff has erected along its course. We spend millions to bridge chasms, to tunnel mountain ranges, to bring into nearer communication widely separated points, and then, by a stroke of the pen, we conjure up imaginary impediments to intercourse which make the worst obstructions of nature seem like child's play. If we could put the Atlantic ocean next to the St. Lawrence and then on either bank pile up the Alps, the Andes and the Himalayas, it would cost less to bring goods across them from Canada into the United States than it costs today to pass the invisible fiscal line. When an American first walks along the great river on Canadian soil and looks over into his native land, and thinks of the vast arbitrary gulf which has been set between them by his own nation, then at last he sees what a slap in the face to our neighbors our protective tariff is, and how we have, so far as in us lies, shut them out in outer economic darkness. Surely, from the lowest standpoint of policy, this is a mistake. Not long ago an acquaintance of mine, an anti-imperialist and free-trader, was by some peculiar chance invited to address a conservative, imperialist and somewhat jingo society in a Canadian city. He presented himself as an ambassador from a minority, expressed his regret that so much of the policy of his country was unfriendly, hoped for a time when the Canadian, without abating a jot of his patriotism, might feel as much at home under the Stars and Stripes as under the Union Jack, and cited the arrangement of 1817 as a conspicuous instance of neighborliness, and a good example for the rest of the world. His remarks were received with enthusiasm, and he was informed afterwards by a Canadian who was present that a confirmed follower of Mr. Chamberlain, who sat next to him, said as they went out, "If they all talked like that they'd have us in no time!" Friendliness is the best policy.

The second peace conference, called by the czar, is soon to meet, and its members will wish to have something practical to do. Statesmen and lawyers are afraid of untried paths, and they are always searching for precedents. Why cannot our delegation carry with them this precedent of 1817 which our grandfathers have left to us, and which has worked with such entire success? It is

fitting that Mr. Roosevelt, the historian of the naval war of 1812, should have a hand in applying its best lesson. Even a short step in advance along this line would be a notable departure. Some other sea can be selected for the reduction of armaments. The Mediterranean, the Baltic, the Japan sea, could be made the scenes of a similar experiment, which is indeed an experiment no longer. In time, the principle could be extended to the Atlantic or the Pacific, and finally to navies as a whole. Nor is there anything to prevent its application to land forces. It may be easier to enforce such an arrangement in the great lakes than in more open seas, but the principle is always the same. Canada has natural access for war-vessels from the sea into Lake Ontario and by canal into the other lakes, but that has not made the arrangement less fruitful. It is no valid objection to a proposed treaty that it may possibly be broken. If it could not be broken it would not be worth while to make it. In this whole matter of disarmament, too, we are in a far better situation to take the initiative than any other great power, for we have no mighty standing army menacing us at our doors. With the precedent of 1817 in their hands, our delegates can with good grace urge an extension of the principle to other international relations, and thus take a leading part in the conference, and place the world under lasting obligations to them.

ERNEST CROSBY.

STATE AND NATION

The *Portland Oregonian*, discussing the "State and Nation," observes:

"To the petty oligarchies which ruled the original thirteen colonies the principle of state's rights was exceedingly dear because their power depended upon it. The political structure of the country then resembled that vague and fragile union which we see among the parts of a jellyfish. To be sure the parts hang together after a fashion, but their dependence upon one another is of the slightest. They have the semblance of a common nervous system, but the rays of the fish are virtually independent, and if one is cut off from the rest it survives.

Thus it was with the American colonies for some time after the constitution was adopted. Mr. W. M. Ivins, in an able article in the *New York Press*, points out that the true nervous system of the country has developed since that period. By this he means our railroads, telegraphs, telephones, mail facilities and the infinitely complex movements of interstate commerce. Because we now have a true nervous organization we have ceased nationally to resemble the starfish and may be accurately compared to those higher animals whose parts are so intimately united that none can be severed from the rest without perishing.

“The growth of the national idea in America, Mr. Ivins points out, has been unceasing since the union was organized. The force which has fostered it has been the common economic welfare of the people; the force which has continually opposed it has been the interest of special privilege. Throughout our history, exactly as today, special privilege has looked to the doctrine of state’s rights for its protection. ‘We have,’ says Mr. Ivins, ‘forty-six sovereignties, to each of which the seekers of privilege may appeal, and every one of which sovereignties may permit the existence of conditions which make against the national welfare.’ Naturally, the endowed classes and holders of special privilege are deeply concerned in preserving those rights of the states which are to them such a boon.”

The *Oregonian* is in error. The monopolists who are bleeding the country are the very ones who are constantly defying the state and belittling their rights. Of course they object to national legislation, and in making their objection they naturally present arguments in favor of the state, but these arguments ought not to fool anybody. Whenever the state attempts to do anything these same monopolists rush to the cover offered by the federal courts. The railroads have done more to build up the power of the federal courts than any other one influence, and there is scarcely a state legislature which the railroads have not defied. If the trust magnates and the railroad presidents had their way about it, state lines would be entirely obliterated and corporations would be chartered by the federal government. That they do not have their way about it is due to the fact that

the people recognized the necessity for local self-government. It is true that the states have been brought nearer together and their relations made more intimate since the adoption of the federal constitution, but the need for the state is stronger today than it was a century ago. The wide extent of our country, the increase in our population, the greater complexity of our business relations and industries, all these increase the importance of the state. The federal government could not look after the multiplied interests of the people. The founders of the constitution built more wisely than they knew when they reserved to the states the powers not delegated to the federal government. Congress has all the power that it needs. In the realm of interstate commerce it is supreme. The state can charter corporations, and so long as those corporations confine their business to the state the federal government cannot interfere, but the moment those corporations step across the state line they come under the supervision of the federal government and congress has power to fix the terms upon which they shall do business. This is a very much better arrangement than to have national corporations superior to and independent of the states. We have trouble enough with overgrown state corporations. We would have still more trouble if we permitted the creation of overgrown national corporations.

The state and the nation—both are necessary—and the doctrine of Jefferson and Jackson is the doctrine that must prevail today. We need no new principles; we only need the courageous application of old-time principles to the new conditions. We need remedies, state and national, but it is not necessary that the nation should encroach upon the rights of the state or the state upon the rights of the nation in order to secure such remedial legislation as is demanded.

CHINA AWAKENING

A dispatch from Peking announces that an imperial edict was published during the holidays raising Confucius to the same rank as heaven and earth. This edict was issued in order to give the emperor a monopoly of the

worship of Confucius. The emperor, acting as the representative of his people, offers sacrifice to heaven and to earth, and the dispatch says that the action of the emperor in issuing this edict is due to the fact that the Christian students in the government colleges object to kow-towing to the tablet of Confucius. Henceforth the emperor will do all the kow-towing and the students will be relieved. When Mr. Bryan was at Shanghai he visited the state school there, and seeing the chapel prepared for the kow-towing which was to take place the next morning, he arose early and went out to witness the ceremony. He was disappointed to find that for some reason not given the ceremony did not take place. It was rumored then that it was losing its hold upon the students, and this rumor seems to be substantiated by the edict of the emperor. This edict is an indication of the progress which China is making in the adoption of western ideas. The Christian religion is making headway against the doctrine of Confucius, and in proportion as religion takes the place of Confucianism, China may be expected to rise in civilization. It is the boast of the Chinaman that the Chinese people live up to the ideals of Confucius. That in itself is a sufficient condemnation of those ideals, for an ideal which is fully embodied in the life is not as high as it ought to be. It is the glory of the Christian ideal that, struggle as we may, we can only approximate to it, not reach it, for while it is within sight of the lowliest and the humblest, it is so high as to keep the noblest and the best with their faces turned ever upward.

THE SHIP SUBSIDY

The advocates of a ship subsidy, like the advocates of the asset currency, hope to rush their measure through before public opinion has a chance to act upon it. When Secretary Root went to South America it was generally supposed that the object of his visit was to cultivate more intimate relations between this country and the southern republics. It now seems that the real purpose of his trip was to fortify his arguments in favor of a ship subsidy. Whether the advocates of a subsidy will

be content to begin with subsidizing the lines to South America or will insist upon a complete system of subsidies remains to be seen. The democrats will naturally and logically oppose the subsidy scheme whether it is presented by piecemeal or as a whole. There are two kinds of aid which the democrats could consistently favor. There is the aid which could be given through discriminating duties. A reduction of duty on articles brought into the country in American bottoms would give to the shipowners an advantage without an additional tax upon the people, but those who oppose tariff reduction would, of course, oppose this breach in the tariff wall.

The other plan is to put into transports a part of the money that is now put into warships and let the transports be run to southern ports by the government or leased on terms which are equitable for us in building up a mail and trade line. A few ships will be sufficient to establish regular communication between North and South America. The service on such lines could be made a training school for seamen and public interests could be properly protected in the contracts.

There are two kinds of government aid to an industry. One kind is illustrated in the agricultural experiment stations. The government at its own expense experiments on matters connected with agriculture, horticulture and stockraising and gives to the public the benefit of its experiments. The results of its work are open to all and are an instruction to all. This is a legitimate use of government money. The government is under no obligation to continue an experiment when it proves unsuccessful, and no one can monopolize the benefits which flow from a successful experiment. The establishment of a government line of boats either directly or through lessees would be in line with the experiment station. The government's success or failure would be instructive and no one would be able to monopolize the benefits. The second way of giving the government aid is to subsidize. This taxes the public for the benefit of a few and the few who receive not only monopolize the benefits but insist upon the continuation of the system. The protected industries are now demanding higher duties than were demanded in the beginning of the century. Instead of being strengthened they have been enervated, and the

country has to go through a life and death struggle to get the public teats out of the mouth of one of its pampered infants. So it will be if we enter on the subsidy scheme. A little subsidy now will mean a bigger subsidy in a few years, and the steamship lines built up by subsidy will threaten to die if they are left unsupported. A protective tariff and a steamship subsidy are one in principle. Those who believe in taxing the many for the benefit of the few are likely to favor both. Those who believe in the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none will favor neither. The argument that subsidy is only temporary ought not to deceive anyone. The time will never come when a subsidy once granted can be withdrawn without a struggle, and the more successful the subsidy has been in building up the favored industry, the more difficult will it be to repeal the law.

CIVIL PENSIONS

The National Civil Service Reform League has recently made public the result of its study of the subject of civil pensions. There are now several bills before congress providing for pensions or superannuated government clerks, and the various state governments are continually importuned to provide for pensions for state and municipal employes. The Civil Service Reform League finds that it would cost about twenty-five millions a year to provide pensions for all the employes in the government service, whereas the government's loss from the inefficiency of its employes who are above sixty-five amounts to but one million two hundred thousand a year. The investigation which has been made and the facts brought out will be useful when these bills are considered in the state and nation.

SAGACITY

The editor of our esteemed contemporary, the *Washington Post*, was guilty of a mental lapse the other day when he wrote the editorial on "Statesmanship and Sagacity." He said: "Here is Mr. Bryan indorsing the Beveridge child labor bill. He thinks he sees in child

labor an evil. Well, given an evil, and Mr. Bryan would abate it by act of congress, however unconstitutional. If congress can curtail interstate commerce by enacting the Beveridge bill, it can eradicate interstate commerce by some other bill. It is madness, from the standpoint of the old-fashioned democrat, to suppose that the constitution clothes congress with such autocratic power. Child labor is an evil, we make no doubt, but not an unmixed evil. A boy ten years old, helping to plant corn and dropping pumpkin seed is to be envied rather than commiserated. It would be as stupid as it would be despotic to forbid a railroad to carry a bushel of corn from state to state because the seed of which it was the yield had been 'dropped' by a boy of twelve. Had that been the law, Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, Andrew Johnson, and many other of our greatest and best public men would not have received that discipline in childhood that made them pillars of the state in manhood. Mr. Bryan is a brilliant man, and by many looked upon as a matchless statesman and peerless orator. He is the best advertised private citizen in the world, and Mr. Bryan would be a pretty considerable man if nature had not denied him the quality of sagacity. And sagacity is pretty nearly indispensable to a leader of a political party in a country that adheres to universal manhood suffrage."

If the editor of the *Post* will take time to read the Beveridge bill, he will find that the child labor at which the bill aims is labor in mines and factories. It does not cover labor upon the farm, and there is a reason for the distinction which is thus drawn between labor in mine and factory on the one side and labor on the farm. In the first place, labor upon the farm is not confining like labor in the factory and in the mine; and second, labor on the farm is generally in the summer time when school is not in session. Third, the child is at home and under the care and oversight of parents who have the highest possible interest in his welfare. The work that the child does upon the farm during vacations and before and after school hours is a work that develops; the work that a child does in mines and factories stunts the growth and dwarfs the intellect. It does not require much sagacity to see the difference between the two, and it only requires

ordinary care to read and understand the Beveridge bill. Neither need one be a latitudinarian to favor the exercise of the federal congress in the control of interstate commerce. Instead of having a "supreme contempt for the old democratic gospel that the government at Washington is one of delegated and restricted powers" Mr. Bryan believes thoroughly in that doctrine, but he will not be deceived by those who spend their time looking for reasons to support inaction when a great evil is to be dealt with. Child labor is a great evil, and while each state has a right to deal with the subject as it will, the federal government has a concurrent remedy which it can employ. Senator Beveridge has embodied this remedy in a bill which does not in any way trespass upon the rights of the states. The people of a state can permit the employment of child labor if they will, but congress has a right to say that they shall not use that child labor to make the child labor laws of other states ineffective. The principle embodied in the Beveridge bill is exactly the principle indorsed in the anti-trust plank of the democratic platform of 1900. Every democrat in the senate and house ought to support the Beveridge bill, and then the principle of the Beveridge bill ought to be applied to the trust question. The editor of the *Post* is respectfully invited to examine the bill and the constitution and then take his position among the supporters of this important and necessary measure.

DID NOT SAY IT

The *Sioux City Journal* has an editorial based upon the claim that Mr. Bryan said: "Such a high honor as the presidential nomination is something that no American citizen should decline." The *Journal's* editorial is all very interesting to be sure; but the sentence quoted by the *Journal* was not employed by Mr. Bryan. He simply stated in Topeka what he stated elsewhere, that he was not ready to make an announcement on the nomination. Whether a nomination should be declined or accepted depends on conditions under which the offer is made. The platform is a matter to be considered; the character of the organization is also important, and the general

line to be pursued in the campaign cannot be ignored. The platform ought to fit the issues; the candidate ought to fit the platform, and the party organization should be in harmony with the party's purpose.

JAMES BRYCE, AMBASSADOR

Great Britain has paid the United States a compliment in the appointment of James Bryce as ambassador from that country to ours. In the first place, Mr. Bryce—not Lord Bryce, or Sir James, but plain Mr. Bryce—is a student of our form of government. He has written a very valuable and widely read treatise on the American commonwealth. Our country would naturally welcome so intelligent a student of American affairs. In the second place, his wife is the granddaughter of an American, and it will be pleasant for Americans to meet her. In the third place, both Mr. and Mrs. Bryce represent the intellectual life of Great Britain rather than its ranks and titles, and this fact makes the appointment of Mr. Bryce especially gratifying. We do not recognize hereditary titles or even titles conferred by merit. The old world has been sending us its nobility; that is, a nobility which has nothing in achievement or special fitness to commend it. In sending us a man of brains whose rise is due to his own ability, Great Britain sends us a congenial spirit. Mr. Bryce should be received in this country with such cordiality and open-heartedness as to impress upon the government of Europe the wisdom of recognizing our standards in matters of diplomatic appointment. Welcome, Mr. Bryce, and welcome, Mrs. Bryce! May your stay be long and your days in America happy ones.

In the purchase of permanent residences for our ambassadors abroad, our government has taken a step in the direction of raising the quality of our representatives. We have had to rely heretofore upon men of wealth, and those eligible to appointment have been few in number. It will strengthen the bonds between nations if they will send us strong, self-made men like Mr. Bryce, and we in return send the flower of our statesmanship to represent us at the capitals of the old world.

REFORM IN AUSTRIA

An important governmental reform has just been secured in Austria. Heretofore the parliament has been chosen in such a way as to give the minority absolute control of the legislative body, but public demonstrations have coerced the government into a change by which the deputies will be in the future allotted in proportion to the population, and these will be selected by universal manhood suffrage. As the Austrian parliament is composed of representatives from different races, the members will be assigned to the different races according to population. This will give to each race its proportionate strength and at the same time save the clash between candidates representing different languages and race sentiments. The world moves, and Austria is keeping step.

MR. BRYAN ON ISSUES OF THE DAY

The following address was delivered by Mr. Bryan at Joplin, Mo., and reported in full by the *Joplin Daily Globe*:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I first came to Joplin something like eleven years ago and it has been a pleasure to return from time to time and note the progress that your city has made.

Each time I see new evidences of growth and extension of trade. You have passed from the age of frame houses to the brick and stone and this time when I came I found the steel beams rising for one of the modern structures such as ornament the greater cities of the country.

Your people have faith in the destiny of the future of Joplin, for when men build substantially and invest great sums in permanent structures it shows that they have faith in the city's future and after all we must have faith if we would accomplish anything.

I have sometimes thought of preparing a speech on faith as a subject, for the older I grow the more I appreciate the influence of faith on one's conduct. Not only in the church is faith essential, but faith is necessary everywhere.

I travel at night, speeding over the country, and I sleep as well upon the train as I sleep in my Nebraska home. Why? Because I have faith in the integrity and in the watchfulness of the men who are on the engine and who guide the train.

In business faith is necessary; it is necessary to the farmer. He would not put in his crop in the spring if he had no faith in the autumn harvests. And so in politics faith is necessary. A man wouldn't labor if he had no faith in the triumph of his cause.

I have had faith in democratic ideas from the time I was a young man. My father left me a lesson before he was taken from us. He left me a lesson, although he died before I had reached manhood's estate, and that lesson has been worth infinitely more to me than the small fortune that he left to each child. Yes, worth far more than about \$3,000 that I received, and the lesson was this:

That I could afford to be in the minority, but that I could not afford to be in the wrong, for he said if I was in the minority and right I was apt some day to be in the majority, while if I was in the majority and wrong I would some day find myself in the minority.

It has been worth a great deal to me. I have had faith in the omnipotence of truth and today I believe more firmly than ever in the final triumph of every righteous cause.

It doesn't discourage me if defeat comes, for I know it takes time to bring success to anything that is good. The mushroom grows in the night and dies in the day, but the oak grows for years and decades and even centuries and its decay is as slow as its growth.

When I left this country twelve months ago in order to visit foreign lands I went with faith in democracy. I knew that I belonged to a party that was one hundred years old and I come back to tell you that I belong to a party not only one hundred years old, but twenty-five thousand miles wide; for the democratic party girdles the globe.

There is not a nation through which we passed, and we went through every important nation on earth, where I didn't find a democratic party.

Jefferson said a century ago that there were naturally

two parties in every country, and that wherever speech was free these parties would manifest themselves. He said the two parties naturally necessary to be found in every country were a democratic party and an aristocratic party.

I took it on faith then because I have faith in Jefferson, but now I can testify, for my eyes have seen it and it is true. In every country you find two parties; one democratic in its tendencies, the other aristocratic, and everywhere the democratic party is trying to bring the government nearer to the people, and everywhere the aristocratic party is trying to obstruct every step toward popular government. And everywhere the same arguments are used. The democrats say, "Let the people have what they want," and the aristocrat says, "Don't let the people hurt themselves; we will look after the people and do better for them than they can do for themselves."

I see before me a great many young men. Some of them will cast their votes for the first time this year. Some of them have been reared in democratic families and lean toward the democratic party. Others have been reared in republican families and lean toward the republican party. We are largely creatures of environment and it is natural that we should lean toward the party with which our parents were brought up, and toward the party with which they were connected, and yet, my friends, we should respect the opinions of those near to us upon whose wisdom we have relied.

It is also necessary that each person shall be prepared to give a reason for his own faith and defend his own position, and parties sometimes change. Aye, the republican party has changed immensely in the last forty years.

When the republican party came into existence its speakers took the name of Jefferson and appealed to those who believed in his principles, and today you don't hear the name of Jefferson invoked in behalf of republican ideas.

It is necessary that each young man should have a reason for his position, and I have never asked a young man to vote the democratic ticket unless he was convinced that in doing so he could better serve his country than in voting any other ticket. And so when I speak to a young republican I ask him to vote our ticket only when

he is convinced that our party offers him the best means there are to protect his rights and his interest, and advance the welfare of the country, and I want to remind these young men that there is an irresistible tendency in this world toward democracy, and after I have shown him this tendency in other countries I want to call his attention to the same tendency in this country.

Go into Japan, that nation which has astonished the world with its progress, and what do you find? A half-century ago they had an unlimited monarchy and today they have a constitution and a parliament, and this advance toward democratic ideas has been followed by universal education until today 90 per cent. of their people can read and write.

Go, if you will, into Korea, and I found a Y. M. C. A. in the capital of Korea, and they tell me that of the five thousand members of that Y. M. C. A., only one hundred Koreans were members of the church and four hundred had joined the Y. M. C. A. that they might learn more of American institutions.

I went into China and I found reformers there and within a year the dowager empress has sent commissioners to the various nations of the world that they might bring back information in regard to constitutions, for she contemplates giving her people a constitution before she dies.

Go into India, and you will find there a native congress that has for years demanded a voice in the government of the people. Go into Egypt, and you will find that even those Arabs and Egyptians are now talking of a constitution.

Going into Turkey you find the reformer there speaking of the benefits of a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. Go into Russia, and there you find a despotism that is being rapidly converted into a constitutional monarchy. Within a year they have established a *duma*, and if you want to know how democracy is growing in Russia, where, until recently, a man could be sent into exile without complaint or warrant or trial; if you want to know how democracy is growing there let me remind you when the election took place in the city of St. Petersburg, notwithstanding the influences of the capital of the country, only 2,000 votes

were cast for the czar's ticket and 58,000 votes for the democratic ticket.

When the czar sent 300 men from the palace to the polls in court carriages eighty of them voted for the czar and 220 voted the democratic ticket. Do you see how democracy is growing there?

Let me remind you in every country in Europe democracy is also growing. It is growing in Italy, in the south and growing up in the north, and it is growing in the center and England. Great Britain gave us the latest democratic victory when a government came into power by a majority of something like 200, and to show you the difference between democracy and aristocracy in England now, the democrats have 200 majority in the popular branch while the aristocrats have 12 to 1 in the house of lords.

Do you see the growth of democracy? Well, after seeing its growth and rejoicing in it as we follow the sun in its course around the globe, you may imagine my delight when on my return to America I heard of the rapid growth of the democratic idea in the United States.

But, my friends, I got an intimation of it even before I crossed the Atlantic, for when I reached Europe I met from America some democrats, some republicans, but all of them, without exception, told me of the growth of democratic ideas. Is there not reason to be encouraged? If I had faith before I have confidence now in the triumph of these ideas for which we have contended.

Now a word to the young men who may not have a chance to inform themselves on the early history of our country. It has pained me when I have gone from city to city and spoken before high schools to find how many young men have dropped out of school, even before they finished the high school course, and it has led me to believe that we ought to bring into these schools at an earlier period the study of a science of government and of history as it relates to our own governmental development, but for fear some of these young men left school before they acquainted themselves with the early history of this country, I want to show them that there are two parties in this country and that one of them is nearer to the people than the other party.

What Jefferson said was true in all countries, and also

true in this. We have a democratic party and I am a member of it because it is nearer to the people than any other party in this country; because it believes more firmly in the people than any other party; and of all the parties the republican party is the closest to the aristocratic idea in this country. Now, some of you doubt it, but I will not leave you in doubt long, for I started out to convince you and they are going to give me time enough to make a thorough job of it. Now, if you ask a man whether he sympathizes with the people or his sympathies are against the people he will always tell you that he sympathizes with the people.

I have met a great many men and I have yet to meet the first man in this country, or in any other country, who ever acknowledged that he didn't sympathize with the people, and if you ask the men now in this country whether they have faith in the people they will nearly all tell you that they have.

Now, how are you going to find out who has faith and who has not? Well, I will give you two tests. If you go to a republican banquet you will find that there is one name mentioned above other names. It is the name of Alexander Hamilton. Go to a democratic banquet and you find one name mentioned above all other names, and it is Thomas Jefferson.

Now, if you want to find out what a man really thinks, find out who he admires and then find out what the man admired thinks, and you can get some idea of what his admirer thinks. So, now, I am prepared to convict the republican with testimony that is sufficient. I take your republican leaders who admired Hamilton and I take your democratic leaders who admired Jefferson, and then I can tell you what kind of men these are and what they think by showing you the difference between Hamilton and Jefferson.

What did Jefferson believe? He believed that the people not only had a right to self-government, but were capable of self-government. He said, "Let the people have their way."

What did Hamilton think? Well, he didn't have faith in the people. He did not trust the people, but thought that people were divided into two classes, the well born

and the not so well born, and that the well born were born to rule and the not so well born were born to be ruled.

Now I would like to ask you republicans which class do you belong to, the well born or the not so well born?

I am afraid of this Hamiltonian doctrine, for if we ever had it in this country I am not sure that I could get into the well born class. They might be too strict for me. Down in New York if you want to get into the four hundred class you have to show three generations between you and any honest work.

Now, I don't know just what the limits would be if you had that Hamiltonian doctrine. My father had to make his own way. He was left without father and mother in his boyhood; he had to work his way through school; he worked on a farm; then he taught school and after awhile he was able to graduate at the age of twenty-seven and then he studied law, and then he was on the bench, but I don't know whether he did enough to get him out of the not-so-well-born class.

I don't want to risk it. I tell you I don't want my right to participate in government to depend on a pedigree that I have to carry around with me to show who I am.

So I think you republicans had better take chances with us democrats on this subject. What other difference? Why, Jefferson said, "Let's have elections and let the people elect their representatives," and then knowing human nature as few public men have, he said: "Let's make the elections frequent, so the fellow in office won't forget who put him there."

Pretty good point. The trouble with our government is not in the people, but in those elected by the people betraying their trusts and misrepresenting the people, and Jefferson said, "Make the elections frequent so the voter can keep his hands on the man who acts for him and withdraw his authority if he disobeys or misrepresents or betrays his trust."

What did Hamilton say? Well, his was quite different and we are fortunate we have it in writing. I am afraid if it wasn't in writing republicans out here would deny Hamilton ever believed in it, but Hamilton prepared a form of government and it is on record and he tried to get it adopted; and what did it provide for? For the election of presidents for life; the election of senators

for life, and for the appointment of governors by the president for life. That was the Hamiltonian doctrine. How would you like to have presidents for life? Well, I wouldn't like it.

Why, President Roosevelt is only two years older than I and he is in good health. What chance would I have if he was elected for life?

But now I don't want the republicans to be too good about it. I don't want them to think that it would be a good thing to have the Hamiltonian doctrine so they could keep President Roosevelt until I died and shut me out, because if we had the ideas of Hamilton we wouldn't have had a President Roosevelt, for Grover Cleveland is still alive.

Now, republicans, don't you think it is good to have elections every once in a while? Don't you like that plan better than the Hamiltonian plan? Well, what about senators for life? Don't you think it is better to have a chance at them occasionally? Don't you think we can keep them under better control?

Why, my objection to the present election, or method of electing senators, is it smacks too much of Hamilton anyhow, and I have been trying for sixteen years to make Jeffersonians so the people can elect their senators by direct vote of the people.

What do you think of governors appointed by the president for life? If any of you think it is a good thing I can tell you how you can cure yourself. Go down into the territory where they have a taste of the Hamiltonian doctrine, where the president does appoint the governor, not for life, but a few years, and you find in every territory the people are so tired of this doctrine that they are rushing into statehood in order that they can have Jeffersonian doctrine and elect their own people in their own way.

Now, if republicans constantly praise Hamilton when his ideas were as they were, and democrats praise Jefferson when his ideas were as they were, is it not safe to assume that democrats are more in favor of letting the people run their own affairs than republicans are?

Now, remember, I am not saying that you republicans would like Hamiltonian doctrine, because nine-tenths of you people who call yourselves republicans are not repub-

licans at all and your name is misfit and you ought to take it off and put on a name that fits.

Now, I tell you, I will give you a second evidence of the fact that the democrats are nearer to the people than the republicans and have more confidence in them. Take the election of senators by the people. Nine-tenths of the republicans, yes, ninety-nine out of one hundred republicans, believe in direct elections. Now I want to ask the republicans, is there any significance in the fact that a democratic house was the first house to pass a resolution in favor of electing senators by direct vote? It was the fifty-second congress, it happened to be the first one in which I served—the congress before it was republican—but it didn't pass the resolution, yet the fifty-second congress, democratic, did, and the fifty-third, also democratic, did, and then we had two republican congresses and they adjourned without acting on this subject.

Republicans, why did the democratic house act favorably and then two republican houses ignore the subject? Was it not because the democrats had more faith in the people than the republicans? And yet I know some of you, if you have been reading or thinking, will say that after while even republican congresses acted favorably on the resolution.

Yes, that is true, but it was six years after the democrats had set the example, and yet I want to give the republicans credit for getting even within six years of the democrats on any good proposition.

More than that, we put it in our national platform twice, once at Kansas City and once at St. Louis, and the republican national convention has never acted favorably on it at all. Why is it that it is in no republican national platform, although fourteen years ago a democratic house adopted it by a two-thirds vote? I will tell you. It is because the great corporations exert such influence over republican leaders that they dare not make that promise of men running for office—they dare not offend these great corporations; and if you have any doubt who opposes the election of senators by the people let me remind you when the question was up in the senate the last time Chauncey M. Depew, a republican from New York, led the opposition; Chauncey Depew, the most popular banquet speaker in the republican party, and the man elected

to the senate by the New York Central Railroad to guard the interests of the trusts and corporations in the United States senate.

The senate has become the bulwark of wealth and the men who have filled the senate with their representatives of trusts and corporations have so strong an influence over the republican leaders that they don't put this plank in their platform. Now, republicans, is this any evidence the democratic party has more faith in the people than the republican leaders? But, my friends, I want to go farther than that. I want to show these young republicans that this difference of opinion about the government, this difference in faith in the people, manifests itself in other ways and even in the opinion that people have of the formation of society. (Interrupted by noise in the audience.)

They act as if there were pickpockets over there. The pickpocket always attempts to start the people to moving in order that they may pick their pockets while they try to keep their balance. Let me ask, are there seats there where those people are standing?

Now, my friends, I want to call your attention to the difference. If two or three of you tall men would step over into that crowd and stand awhile—no, you needn't take any club, all they need to know is that they are disturbing others and they will either stop or go away where their conversation will not disturb.

It is very easy, I think, to reach the people if they understand they are doing wrong. The great trouble with republicans is that they are innocently doing a great deal of wrong and we can't make them understand it. Now, there is this difference in the ideas in regard to the construction of society.

The democrat says that society is built from the bottom and the republican thinks that society is suspended from the top. The democrat says, make the masses prosperous and then all who rest upon them will share in the prosperity, but the republicans say, make the well to do prosperous and their prosperity will leak through on those below.

If I could bring a republican and put him on the stand here beside a democrat, not one of you republicans, because you are not republicans at all, but I mean a sure

enough one—one who really is in sympathy with the dominant policy of his party—if I could bring such a republican here and put him beside a democrat and question the two, I could find out which was a democrat and which was a republican by just telling a Bible story and asking them what they thought about it.

I would tell the story of Dives and Lazarus, when Lazarus had to eat the crumbs that fell from Dive's table, and the democrat would speak up and say it was too bad that Dives had to live on crumbs and he would try to find some way to so change conditions that everyone could have a table of his own and no one have to hang upon the charity of another.

But what would the republican say? He would say it was a lucky thing for Lazarus that there was a Dives near so he could get some crumbs.

If you doubt it let me give you a familiar argument that will show you the truth of what I say. Go and hear the speech of some great republican and you will come away with the idea that the important men are the men who give employment to laborers. That the laborer ought to be constantly grateful that he has a job. This man insists that the laboring man wouldn't have any work if there wasn't somebody who employed him and, therefore, the employer is the important man and not the laborer; and yet you go into a factory and you will find that no manufacturer employs men to work for him unless that man can not only produce enough to pay his own wages, but a surplus over as a profit to the employer besides, and the great trusts will give you their reports showing they pay in dividends sometimes as much as they pay in wages and that means that the employes not only earn what they receive, but 100 per cent. profit for their employer.

Now, my friends, have you not heard men talk as though all you had to do was to make the employer prosperous and all the rest of the people would be prosperous. The democrats insist that the man who works for wages is as much entitled to consideration as the man who pays his wages.

The democrats insist that the man who toils on the farm and in the factory and in the mine and produces wealth is as important a factor in society as is the man

for whom he works. This is democratic doctrine and you will find this difference runs all through the legislation of this country, and republicans will do things in national politics that no republican would think of doing in his own home affairs. For a quarter of a century we have been running this government—I don't say we in a partisan sense—I mean those who run it have been running it on the theory if they just give enough money to the employers that the employer would take care of the laborers. No republican would follow that principle in his own family. Go into your courts and look at the wills made by republicans and you will find that they know too much about human nature to act in their own affairs like they permit their leaders to act. What republican, who is about to die and has an estate to leave, would leave it all to one child and just say in his will, I have confidence that this child will deal justly with all the rest of the children.

Now, why wouldn't you do it?

You would not dare to trust your own child to deal justly with those who are of his own flesh and blood, and therefore when you make your will you give each child what you think that child ought to have and do not leave your fortune to the mercy of even a brother of the blood! And yet for a quarter of a century we have been voting \$10,000,000, \$50,000,000, \$100,000,000 to the employers of this country and leaving it to them to be just and generous to their employes. These employers will trust men whom they never saw, when they won't trust their own children to be just with their brothers and sisters. And what is the result? We have been building up fortunes in the hands of the few while the wealth has been drained from the pockets of the many.

Now, my friends, I want to show you that our doctrines have received vindication from several directions. When I was a candidate I had a majority in this county. I think I had a better majority than usual, if I am not mistaken. (To Mr. Hackney) Didn't we do pretty well here in '96?

Mr. Hackney: Over 2,000.

Mr. Bryan, continuing: My friends, our opinions and our positions at that time have been vindicated. We said the people needed more money. We said more money would make better times. We said if the farmers could

sell their product for more money they would have more to spend at the stores, and when the stores had customers they could buy of the factories better; but our opponents said we had plenty of money and didn't need any more, and yet, when they refused to give us the money the country needed, God took pity on us and opened the gold mines and from them there poured forth a yellow stream. It went into the channels of trade and we have 50 per cent. more money in circulation than we had ten years ago.

What is the result? The country is what we said it would be—higher prices and better times—and our contention in regard to the quantitative theory of money has been vindicated by events.

And now I want to show you that even the republicans have been bearing testimony to the correctness of democratic principles.

Ten years ago the republicans came into power and for ten years they have had the president, the senate and the house, not to speak of the United States supreme court. They have had everything their own way. They could pass all the laws they wanted. They could repeal any laws they didn't like.

Not only have they had their own way, but they have been blessed by a prosperity that has come in spite of them—not because of them. They have been benefited by the prosperity that has come from a larger volume of money. Not only that, but they have had good crops and they have claimed the credit for the good crops and suggested that they were in silent partnership with the Almighty and that God was smiling on the country because the people voted the republican ticket. They have had ten years of power and yet, notwithstanding the advantages that have come for which they are not responsible, they have not satisfied the country.

The people today are not satisfied. The republican party today is not as popular as it was. I might give you many evidences of it. I might point to the fact that up in Maine they had an election. Republican speakers were there and yet there was a falling off in every republican district in Maine, and if the falling off continues throughout the country only equal to what it was in

Maine we will have a democratic majority in the next congress.

Arkansas gave a larger democratic majority than before in a quarter of a century.

Vermont cut the republican majority half in two. But I will not depend on election figures. I will give you something more substantial. I will tell you the republican party has fallen in popularity to such an extent that whereas two years ago they had any number of available men for the presidency, now they have only one man who has popularity enough to be elected, according to republican ideas and opinions, and that man is the president himself.

The republican leaders go down on their knees to the president and they say:

“Oh, Mr. President, you did say the night of the election that you would regard this as your second term and would not run again, but, Mr. President,” they say, “you didn’t know what a desperate condition the republican party was going to be in.” They say: “Mr. President, can’t you take it back? Can’t you forget that you have said it? Can’t you forget that Washington refused a third term? Can’t you forget that Jefferson refused a third term? Can’t you forget EVERYTHING, Mr. President, and make your mind a blank, just to help the republican party out this once from its desperate condition?”

Now, that is the situation. Where are these other popular men? Where are these other intelligent republicans? For they have men of great intelligence—plenty of them. They have claimed for years that they had all the intelligence in the country.

They have twitted us with our ignorance. They have said democrats could not read or write. I have heard them say they could tell a democrat—just to have him write his name and if he lolled out his tongue when he wrote he was a democrat.

Yes, they have made fun of us. But where are these intelligent republicans? Why aren’t they popular? Aren’t they well known? Yes—too well known.

And why is the president popular? Now, republicans, I want to ask you a question. I want you to answer it

in your own mind before I do. Then see if your answer is the same as mine.

Why is President Roosevelt popular today?

I will give you my reason: Because he is the only prominent republican who has had the courage to desert the republican platform and adopt planks from the democratic platform.

Now, republicans, how does that agree with your reason? Have you any other reason?

I say to you that President Roosevelt has a good element of popularity that is borrowed from democratic doctrines—from his supposed advocacy of something that democrats have advocated before.

This is not the first time I have said it. I said it a year ago. I was about to leave home and I told the democrats that the president was taking our platform, taking it plank by plank—deliberately. I told them I was almost afraid to be gone a year for fear he would take the rest of it while I was gone.

That was not the first time, either. A year ago last January I attended a banquet in Washington. It was given by the Gridiron Club. The president himself was the guest of honor. From the beginning of the banquet to the end they were joking him about what he was taking from the democratic platform. When it came my time to speak I said I hadn't felt so good in Washington for years as I did then to see the things I had advocated and been called an anarchist for advocating, being made respectable by being advocated in high places. Then I enumerated some of the things he had taken.

I said I felt like the old colored woman who was sick and sent for a colored physician and when she got worse she sent for a white physician and the white physician examined her pulse and then said to her:

“Did the other doctor take your temperature?”

She said: “I don't know. I ain't missed nothing but my watch yet.”

I told them I hadn't had time to take an inventory to see how much I had lost. I told them I didn't object to it. I told them we felt complimented to have them think so highly of our ideas as to take them without asking for them. I told them it made me feel so good to see the republicans getting up on our platform that if I couldn't

take back what I said about them I at least didn't feel like saying it again.

I told them I felt a good deal like the young fellow I heard of—a very bashful young fellow—who courted his girl for a year before he had the courage to propose to her, and one evening he made bold enough to tell her that he loved her and asked her to marry him. She was a frank sort of a girl, and she said:

“Why, Jim, I have been loving you these many months and I had just been waiting for you to tell me so I could tell you.”

Jim was overcome with delight and when he went out he looked up at the stars and said: “Why, I ain't got nothin' agin nobody.”

That is the way I feel about it. I am just getting so I “ain't got nothin' agin nobody.”

Oh, how pleasant it is to welcome to almost full fellowship these “reform republicans.” I am willing to take them in on the Methodist plan of six months' probation. Yes, it makes us feel good to see the democrats and the populists and the republicans all moving along in the same direction, all harmonious—with the democrats a little bit ahead.

Why, they used to say that the democrats camped each night where the republicans camped the night before. They don't say that now.

We have got it turned around now. The republicans are following. When a republican reformer wants to make some progress he is a little timid about it and gets down on his hands and knees and crawls around looking for tracks, and when he sees where the democratic army has gone he gets up and says: “Come on, boys! They have been here! This is safe!”

Oh, it is so nice. Yes, the president hasn't an element of popularity that he has not got by being a little democratic. And, my friends, if a republican president can become the only popular man in his party by being sporadically and spasmodically a little democratic what would be the popularity of a democratic administration that was consistently and persistently and everlastingly democratic?

Well, what has the president done to earn popularity? You tell me that he brought about peace between Japan

and Russia. I glory in it. Wherever I have been they have mentioned the name of the president as a peace-maker and it has made me proud of my nation.

In Japan I went out to visit a man—he couldn't speak our language—and he met us at the bottom of a hill in front of his house. Leading us up the hill he asked us to be seated and before we had a chance to say a word he asked the interpreter to interpret for him and thanked me, as an American, for what our president had done in bringing about peace between his country and Russia. Yes, it has been a glory to him, but, my friends, was he elected as a peace-maker?

On the contrary, the man who put him in nomination at Chicago two years ago nominated him with an eulogy of war. I have read speeches from my boyhood. My library is filled with books with speeches in them and I never read a speech before that gave an eulogy of war. Yet this man, ex-Governor Black of New York, in his nominating speech, delivered an eulogy of war. He said men might preach and women pray, but at last these questions must be settled on the battlefield and that there must forever be the silent upturned face.

He gave the lie to Christian history. He denied the Christian's hope, if I know what Christianity means. In every Christian heart there must be the hope and the faith that the time will come when we will not kill because we differ in opinion, but will settle questions by the arbitrament of reason. And yet, this man, after delivering an eulogy of war, presented the president as a man of blood and iron—a modern Mars to fit his eulogy.

How strange that this modern Mars should, within a year, find his greatest fame in adopting the democratic idea that the nation's prestige must rest upon a moral basis and not upon a great army and a great navy!

What else made him popular? Why, he settled the coal strike. I am glad of it. I praised him at the time. I am glad to praise him yet. We had lost, according to the report of his arbitration board, \$99,000,000. But he settled it at last.

But where did he get his inspiration?

From a republican platform?

No. From a democratic platform. We had an arbitration plank in the platform adopted at Chicago. It

was again in the Kansas City platform. It was again in the St. Louis platform. Three democratic national platforms have demanded arbitration. Not a republican national platform has demanded it.

I am so glad we had an arbitration plank to loan to the president when he needed something.

But, my friends, the republican leaders didn't seem to enjoy it. After the president settled one strike the republican leaders were not willing to establish a board of arbitration to make other strikes unnecessary. The laboring man has no remedy but a strike if he cannot agree with his employer.

I say to you that it is a disgrace to our civilization, a disgrace to our generation and a reproach to the republican administration that it has not given the laboring man a better remedy—that it has left the laboring man to fight out his differences and starve his wife and children during prolonged idleness in order to get justice in his demands.

Why haven't the republicans taken our plank and used it? They have stolen our thunder—why don't they steal our lightning, and not be satisfied with mere noise?

What else made the president popular? Why, he has done something on the trust question. I am glad he has. But, my friends, every step he has taken has been a step instigated by the democratic platform, and encouraged by democratic counsel, and he cannot find authority in his republican platforms for anything he has done on the trust question.

I am so glad that we have a plank on this subject to let him have when he needs something on the trust question.

Oh, my friends, he has not gone far enough! He has not gone fast enough! They don't intend to do enough. Read the *Globe-Democrat*—if any of you are so foolish as to read the *Globe-Democrat*—and what do you find?

On the front page a report of a speech by Speaker Cannon. Who is Speaker Cannon? The speaker of the house of representatives—the one man power that dominates congress. In the headlines you will see it says that Cannon says you must not destroy the trusts—just regulate them. Yes, my friends, they are very careful not to destroy the trusts. Why don't they regulate the

trusts? Because the trusts regulate them. That is the reason.

They talk about reforms. What reforms of any magnitude have come that republicans can trust republican platforms, promises or speeches? When they talk about their reforms, and what they have done and what they are going to do, I am reminded of the old colored man who married a second time and got an extravagant wife. He was telling one of his friends how extravagant she was.

“Why,” he said, “today she wants a dollar and tomorrow 50 cents, and the next day a quarter, and then the next day she wants a dollar again and then 50 cents, and then the next day a quarter, and then a dollar and then 50 cents and then a quarter, and it is just dollar and 50 cents and a quarter over and over and over again.”

“But,” his friend says, “what does she do with so much money?”

He says: “I don’t know. I ain’t give her none yet.”

The line on this trust question is drawn. The democrats have a doctrine and the republicans have a doctrine.

The democrats say a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. The democrats say that God never made a man good enough to stand at the head of a private monopoly. The democrats say that the law should make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States. That is our doctrine.

What is the republican doctrine? Why, that they must be regulated and restrained and restricted, and we have had ten years now of regulation, restriction and restraint and we have as many trusts as we had when they commenced.

How long will it take to settle the trust question at the rate we are now going? Well, I have made a nice calculation. I have figured that if we proceed at exactly the same rate we have been going for ten years—no faster, no slower—that in about one thousand years the republican party will reach a point where it will be willing to ask a little more time.

Why, I read a speech made by a republican in which he said that in the long run—in the long run—the trusts would die themselves. In the long run!

But what if a fellow is short winded and can't stand a long run?

Will a trust rob you all its life and then will you sit and wait for it to die? Suppose you see a burglar getting into your house; what would you do? But the republicans would say, "Don't bother him. Don't bother him. There is a chance he might die of heart failure just as he goes to steal."

Why don't they destroy the trusts? Because the trusts buy immunity by their campaign contributions. They bought it last time and when the democrats tried to get a bill through to investigate campaign contributions the republicans didn't dare to pass the bill. When they had an investigation outside of congress they brought out the facts that enormous sums were contributed—taken from the widow and orphan for whom a life insurance policy was written in order to carry the republican campaigns.

I think I understand now why they called me a dangerous man in '96. They said I wouldn't enforce the law. The trouble was they were afraid I would enforce the law and they were not prepared to have the law enforced. These men have been purchasing immunity, and if you want to know how difficult it is to regulate the trusts when you permit them to live, let me tell you that in the campaign of '96, when I received six million and a half votes and when people showed more interest in the election than they had shown in a quarter of a century, we were only able to collect for our national committee a sum less than one-half million dollars to carry on the campaign, while Rockefeller alone can give ten times that sum from the profits of his trust that are secured to him by the election of republicans to office.

How are you going to regulate trusts when a few trusts can give a hundred times as much to a campaign fund as you can collect from all the people who believe in the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none?

The only thing to do is to exterminate the private monopoly, root and branch, and not permit one to live anywhere in the United States.

That is the only protection the people have. My friends, if you don't know what "the trusts" means now I hardly

see how it is possible to inform you. If you read the papers you have had the chance to see what the trust magnates themselves have said. The best illustration of trust methods we have ever had is the illustration given us by young Rockefeller. A beautiful illustration. He says that as you can only bring the American Beauty rose to perfection by pinching off ninety-nine buds that the strength of the bush may flow into the one hundredth one, so you can only bring a great industrial enterprise to perfection by pinching off the smaller and weaker ones.

How simple the process! Just pinch them off—so easy. You have seen it done. I am just old-fashioned enough to think it is better to have one hundred roses, giving perfume to one hundred homes, than to have just one rose—a great big one—in one splendid home and the rest of the people without flowers. What do you think, friends? I am just old-fashioned enough to think it is better to have tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of independent industries, giving hope and ambition to thousands who work with them, than to have a few gigantic industries exploiting the country and reaching them by the taxing power as the owners transmit independent wealth from generation to generation. Here is the line drawn. On which side are you? The democrats believe in exterminating the trusts; the republicans believe in regulating, restraining and restricting them.

Well, we are told that the president gained a good deal of popularity by getting a rate bill through. Yes, I am glad he did. I am willing to praise him, but where did he get his inspiration? From a democratic platform, where all good things come from nowadays.

Let me give you a bit of history. Six years ago last July a man came up to the door of my house in a carriage. He introduced himself and said he was a clerk in the office of the interstate commerce commission. He drew out a little slip of paper on which was a plank that he wanted inserted in our platform. It was in favor of enlarging the scope of the interstate commerce commission. He said that he had been to Chicago, that he had tried to get it into the republican platform and had failed, and that he came to Nebraska to see if I could help him to get it into the democratic platform at Kansas City. I showed him a draft of the platform that was under

consideration and showed him a plank on that subject. He read it and said that was all right, put his own plank in his pocket and went away. He had tried to get that plank in the republican platform and had failed. We had it before he asked for it, and when the president wanted to do something he found the inspiration in the democratic platform.

Well, what about the bill in the senate? They wanted somebody to manage it. Why didn't they get a republican? Because the republican leaders didn't want it passed. They were against it. They put it in the hands of a democrat in order to make it odious to republicans and make it appear as a democratic measure. And to what democrat did they give it? They gave it to the one democrat who was not invited to the White House—to the one man who was not on good terms with the president. Yes, republicans, your republican leaders tried to humiliate a republican president by putting his pet measure into the hands of the one man in the senate who was not invited to the White House and would not go there. When did you ever have such an experience as that before? And yet they say we must stand by the president because of what he did on the rate bill.

Why, my friends, in the senate that bill was improved by amendments proposed by democrats. Senator Stone, of your state, proposed one of the most important amendments. It restored the criminal clause of the interstate commerce law. And why was it necessary to restore it? Because a republican senate, house and president had stricken it out of that interstate commerce law four years before. Senator Stone proposed an amendment reinstating it. After a while a republican did the same thing and when they went to vote on the amendments, Senator Stone's amendment was so much better than the republican amendment that it was accepted.

Senator Culberson, of Texas, proposed an amendment prohibiting passes, an important amendment, and it was carried. Two democratic amendments made important provisions in the bill. Senator LaFollette, a reform republican, proposed nine amendments; seven of them had been indorsed by the interstate commerce commission, but they were voted down by the republicans, although the democrats voted with LaFollette. The bill was im-

proved by democrats. It would have been better if all the democratic amendments had been carried and all of those, also, offered by LaFollette and for which democrats voted. And then they say, "You must stand by Roosevelt and elect republicans to office."

If you want to stand by the president, I will tell you the best way to stand by the president. It is to elect democrats to office to back him up and not republicans. Why, the president has done pretty well considering his environment, remarkably well for a republican; but he would have done better if you hadn't hung so many republican mill-stones around his neck and had so many republican bushwhackers at work all the time.

If you want to stand by him, give him democrats in the senate and house and they will say to him, "Mr. President, you can go ahead with confidence now. We will be behind you. You go as far as you will—go as fast as you can—and we will be with you." They will say, "Mr. President, if at any time you get weak-kneed or faint-hearted and start to back, back, we are right behind you and we won't let you back." It is better to encourage him and push him forward than to send republicans down there to harass and annoy him.

Now, my friends, I want to speak for a moment on another question. We tried six years ago to get the country to take an American position on the question of imperialism. We pointed out the evils of a colonial policy and we warned you that your republican leaders intended colonialism.

They wouldn't tell what they intended. They said they couldn't talk to people who had guns in their hands. They said let the Filipinos lay down their arms and we will talk to them, and the Filipinos laid down their arms and then what did these republicans say? They said there was nothing to talk about!

They wouldn't talk to them when in rebellion and when they ceased to rebel, they said everything was settled and there was nothing to discuss! They criticised us for discussing imperialism when war was in progress. Two years ago, when there was profound peace, Governor Wright—then acting governor over there—wrote a letter to President Roosevelt and the president circulated it as a campaign document, and Governor Wright said that

the discussion of the rights of the Filipinos in this country was making their task harder over there. We couldn't discuss the question when they had war for fear that it would continue the war and we couldn't discuss it when they had no war for fear they would start a war! We haven't found a time when the republicans were willing to discuss imperialism.

Well, my friends, since I last visited you I have had a chance to see the Filipinos. Now I defend from observation all that I defended from theory. I said then they had the right to govern themselves—to shape their own destiny. I now tell you that they are able to govern themselves and shape their own destiny. If you tell me that less than 10 per cent. of them are educated, I reply that less than 10 per cent. of the Japanese are permitted to vote under their suffrage laws, and yet a government resting upon a vote of less than one-tenth of the male population of Japan has astonished the world! And every year finds more educated people in the Philippine islands.

In Manila there were one thousand students above the bachelor's degree studying law, medicine and engineering, and they prepared a memorial and presented it to me while I was there. They had more than fifty printed pages and every page a protest against American rule and not an argument printed on any page that would not have been accepted by any republican in this country a year before we began our experiment in imperialism.

Every year more are educated. One teacher told me that in his district they had 150 per cent. of the people of school age in school. One hundred and fifty per cent! Why, we do well if we get 95 per cent. of the people of school age in school. Over there so many of the parents went with their children that they had more than 50 per cent. more than the school age.

I was told by another teacher of an incident. He told me a Filipino boy was working for an English lady and she liked him so much that when he stopped to go to school she tried to persuade him to stay at work. She was paying him 20 pesos per month and she offered to double it to 40 pesos per month—a tempting offer. But the boy told her he loved knowledge more than money and would go to school.

Yet they tell you they must send a carpet-bag govern-

ment over there and hold it in place by a standing army because they are not capable of governing themselves! They used to think there was going to be money in this experiment, and when they thought there was money in it they thought the hand of God was in it. But my observation is that these people see the hand of God in a thing only when they see a dollar in the hand. When they found there was no money in it they probably found God didn't mean it, after all. Nine-tenths of the republicans will tell you today that after while the Philippines, of course, will have independence. I heard speeches there by American officials and every speech contained language that could not be honestly construed except as a promise of independence, and yet this experiment in colonialism has cost us something like \$500,000,000!

Why with that sum we could build the Panama canal and not tax the American people another dollar! With that sum we could reclaim the arid lands of the west on which homes could be built for more American citizens than will go to the Philippine islands to live in a thousand years! \$500,000,000! We could build a railroad from New York to San Francisco that would do more to regulate railroad rates than all the railroad rate bills you can pass in a hundred years! \$500,000,000! You could build good roads, improve water-ways, and deepen harbors—how much you could do with \$500,000,000!

But we have wasted it trying to follow at the tail end of the European processions. India is held up for us as a model in the Philippines. Yes, and the memory of those half-starved people walking like shadows through their native land still remains with me. England's policy in India a model? England taxes the Indian people about \$100,000,000 a year to support an army that India does not want! Why is the army there? Some say to keep the Indians in subjection; some say to keep Russia from stealing India. Upon those people of India, whose average income is \$10 per year, is this burden placed, and the government that does it spends \$8,000,000 a year on education! One hundred and fifty years of English rule and less than ten million spent in giving them something in return.

Our contention is that if you will take away from the trust magnates the means by which the world has been

taxed for their benefit—if you withdraw the special privileges and favors that republicans have given to them and make them act and live upon their merits, no man will accumulate enough money in a lifetime by honest effort to make his fortune a menace to society.

But, my friends, if you are not going to stop the stealing you will have to accept the president's plan to get some of it back at the end of life.

My friends, there is progress in human affairs, and there has been progress in this country. There is an awakening in this country, and you know what it means when we come to another election. You know that the people are beginning to be afraid that if reforms don't come now they will be more radical in the future than they would have to be now.

Stand by the side of a stream and you can watch the current glide past—you can even listen to the singing of the waters and you suffer no harm. But put a dam across the stream and conditions change. The water begins to boil up back of the dam. Then you raise the dam higher and the water raises still. And after while the water back of that dam has such tremendous energy that no man-made dam can hold it back, and when the dam washes away some houses in the valley below may go with the tide.

Who is to blame? The man who dams the stream. He is the man to blame. And there is a stream of human thought—a current of public opinion. Let it have its way and it harms no one; but if you dare to obstruct it the water will rise behind the dam and after while no dam will hold the power accumulated there. In monarchies they build that dam so high that people in desperation rise and blow it out with shot and shell, but in our country the ballot is in the hands of the people and they can remove that dam whenever they get ready.

We asked you ten years ago to help us remove these obstructions and let the will of the people flow and be free. You refused then. We ask you now. You have a chance in this state to elect congressmen who will either be on the side of the people or against them; you have a chance to elect a legislature that will be either for the people or against them; you have a chance to elect your state ticket, and, my friends, beside the merit of these

men, such as Woodson and Oglesby and others on the state ticket—besides their merits—I am interested that Missouri shall take her place in the democratic column and let the world know that in this contest between man and mammon Missouri is on the side of man and not on the side of mammon.

I beg you to study these questions and then be prepared to vote. Two years ago you didn't go to the polls. I can see a difference between the meetings this year and two years ago. Why, I was in a county yesterday where they had a ratification meeting two years ago and one of the men at the meeting told me of their experience.

He said after they got through their speaking the chairman proposed three cheers for the ticket. He said the chairman gave two cheers and he gave one and that made three. And then they adjourned.

Fifty-five thousand democrats stayed at home in this state last year. Don't do it this year. Come to the polls early and avoid the rush, and if you live any distance from the polls come the night before and camp there.

Now is your chance to indicate the trend of public opinion and I mistake my judgment of what is going on if this year Missouri doesn't take her place in the democratic column and then the Mysterious Stranger will wander no longer in republican ranks.

MRS. JEFFERSON DAVIS

The death of Mrs. Davis, the widow of the president of the confederacy, has cast a gloom over the Southland and the North joins in sympathy. Her husband was one of the most conspicuous men on the political stage during the civil war and his widow has borne herself so graciously that she has not only grown in the affections of those who followed the fortunes of her husband, but in the esteem of those who opposed his views on the subjects of slavery and secession. In war woman has to endure more sacrifices than man and she has no stirring music to inspire her while she in her loneliness guards the home. The death of Mrs. Davis recalls the sad days of 1861-65. How fortunate that she has lived to see the passions of

war subside and to know by personal experience that the once estranged sections are now reunited by bonds of love each year strengthened.

THE PRACTICAL VS. THE IDEAL

Secretary Root, Secretary Shaw and Mr. Bryan spoke at the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress which recently met at Kansas City. The *Kansas City Journal*, one of the strongest republican papers of the West, makes the following editorial comment upon their speeches:

“One of the most conspicuous features of the address at the sessions of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress is the clear line of cleavage between the methods and policies of the two big political parties in dealing with the great economic questions which press for settlement at the hands of the American people. The speeches of the republican spokesmen, Secretaries Root and Shaw, are meaty with practical plans based on the experience of the great nations in dealing with the same questions, while the speech of Mr. Bryan, the leading democratic statesman now living, is full of untried theories and moral sentiments, fine in their way but utterly inapplicable to the cold and inexorable laws of economics. The one side illustrates practical statesmanship which deals with things as they are and will always be as long as human nature remains as it is; the other illustrates the visionary philosophy which mistakes ideals for facts and proceeds on the theory that things are so because they ought to be so, according to the golden rule or the abstract principles of moral philosophy. Root and Shaw advocate ship subsidies, not on theoretical grounds, but because all the nations which are competing with us for the world's trade are using them successfully to build up their merchant marine and get their share of trade. Bryan, the dreamer, opposes the tremendous impetus which ship subsidies would give the whole country because a few men will get some direct benefit from them, and as a substitute remedy he offers the plan of building fewer battleships and of ‘expending our money for a merchant marine that could be used in times of war.’”

The *Journal* editor, recognizing the impossibility of defending a ship subsidy upon theory promptly rejects theories and clamors for something practical. That has been the policy of the republican speakers whenever they are cornered. When asked to defend the principle involved in a protective tariff they answer: "This is not a theoretical question; it is a practical one." And then they proceed to attribute to protection all of the advantages that have come from a fruitful soil and generous climate and a free government. When asked to defend the principle that underlies the trust, they answer: "We are not dealing with ideals; we are practical statesmen and the trusts have helped to develop the country." And then they put to the credit of the trusts every reduction in price which has come from improved machinery or from any other source. And now they are defending the ship subsidy with the same set of arguments. Finding that other nations give subsidies, they rush to the conclusion that ship subsidies and ship subsidies alone will rebuild the merchant marine, and they propose to enter into competition with other nations in the giving of subsidies.

Secretary Root estimates the subsidies given by other nations at twenty-eight millions, and yet, according to the figures which he gives, our nation will have to pay more than that to put our vessel owners upon an equal footing with other nations. Secretary Root gives two reasons why our ships cannot compete with foreign ships—first, that the tariff has increased the cost of living in our country, and second, that the wages paid upon American ships are higher than the wages paid on foreign ships. If, therefore, we must not only pay a subsidy equal to the subsidy paid by foreign ships but enough more to overcome the increased cost of living and the increased wages, the ship subsidy means a very large annual drain. And that is not all. If foreign nations have been willing to pay twenty-eight millions to secure trade when we paid no subsidies, they were unable to compete with subsidized American ships. Might we not expect an increase in foreign subsidies, and would this not have to be counteracted by an increase in our subsidies? What limit except the willingness of the people to tax themselves would there be to the subsidy policy? No wonder the *Journal* does not attempt to defend a subsidy upon theory. But

as a practical proposition can it commend itself to the American people? Is our trade to be a one-sided trade? Are we to carry American goods away only and not bring foreign goods back? Or if we are to bring goods to the United States as well as carry them away, what folly to subsidize ships to bring merchandise to our ports and then raise the tariff to keep it out!

If we desire to encourage shipping, why not discriminate in favor of goods brought into the United States in American ships? This would give to the ship owners a part of the advantage which the tariff-protected manufacturers now enjoy. But this would not be acceptable to the republican leaders. They have insisted upon taxing the whole country to build up our manufactures, and now they want to place an additional tax upon the country to build up American lines for the purpose of carrying our manufactures to other countries. According to the republican leaders the practical policy must have two characteristics; first, it must lay the tax on all the people; and second, it must confine the benefits to a few of the people. If one advocates any other policy, he subjects himself to the charge of being visionary and idealistic. Within the last eight years the appropriations for two departments of government—war and navy—have increased over one hundred millions of dollars. The people are required to bear this additional annual burden as a preparation for war that ought never to come. The benefits of this policy are enjoyed by the shipbuilders or contractors for supplies, and a comparatively few secure a life position. There is no suggestion of a reduction in unnecessary expenses—only a clamor for more appropriations and bigger profits for the few who will be favored.

The democratic party can afford to stand for ideals rather than for such practical statesmanship. It can afford to protect the rights of the many. If public necessity requires the establishment of steamship lines, let the government build and own the ships and establish the lines on conditions which will bring the benefit to the entire country and not to a few favorites. Whatever is important enough for the government to spend money on is important enough for the government to control. It is a favorite device of the practical politicians who control the republican party to plead a public necessity in

order to get a public appropriation and then insist upon the appropriation being spent for private interests. The ship subsidy means an indefinite increase in the taxes; it means great rich picking for a few financiers and a large fund to draw on for campaign expenses.

FEDERAL AND STATE AUTHORITY

John F. Dryden who receives \$5,000 as a United States senator from New Jersey, and \$65,000 as president of an insurance company, is the author of a measure which, according to Mr. Dryden, is designed to protect the public interests by placing the insurance business under federal control. This is no time for mincing words, and it may as well be said that any plan devised by Senator-President Dryden will not give relief to the public or interfere with the odious methods of the insurance magnates.

The disclosures before the insurance committee has led to the discussion of remedies, and the advocates of centralization in general and the insurance magnates in particular have seized upon this agitation as an excuse for legislation which will take the business of life insurance out of the hands of the authorities of the various states.

Democrats draw a distinct line between federal legislation which is supplemental to state legislation, and that form of federal legislation which would substitute a national for a state remedy. No national charter should be granted to an insurance company, and no federal supervision should interfere with the exercise of the power now vested in the states to supervise companies doing business in such states.

The democrat would not take from the federal government any power necessary to the performance of its legitimate duties, but he recognizes that the consolidation of all government at Washington would be a menace to the safety of the nation and would endanger the perpetuity of the republic. He believes in the preservation of the power of both state and federal governments, recognizing in the constitutional division of those powers the strength of free government. The advocate of centralization is

always optimistic when the dangers of centralization are pointed out. He is not afraid that any harm can come to the American people, and yet no enthusiastic advocate of centralization can talk long without betraying his distrust of the people. Instead of accepting the theory that the people should think for themselves and then select representatives to carry out those thoughts, he believes that representatives are selected to think for the people and he does not hesitate to build barriers between the government and the voters. While the advocate of centralization is urging legislation which obliterates state lines and removes the government from the control of the voters, the monopolist may, on the other hand, hide behind the democratic theory of self-government and use this theory to prevent national legislation which may be necessary. The democrat who believes in democratic principles and who wants to preserve the dual character of our government must be on his guard against both.

There are certain things which the locality can do for itself, and there are certain things which only the federal government can do—neither the federal government nor the local government should be sacrificed to the other.

So in devising a remedy for the trusts, the democratic party should resolutely oppose any and every attempt to authorize a national incorporation or chartering trading or manufacturing enterprises. Congress has control over interstate commerce and it is the only body that can deal effectively and efficiently with interstate commerce, but to control interstate commerce it is not necessary that it should create corporations or over-ride state laws. The democratic national platform of 1900 proposed a national remedy for the trusts entirely consistent with the preservation of state remedies. It suggested a license system—the license to permit a corporation to do business outside of the state of its origin upon compliance with the conditions of the license, but the license would not permit it to do business in any other state except upon compliance with the conditions provided by the state. In other words, it would be such a license as is now granted for the sale of liquor. When a federal license is issued for the sale of liquor it does not carry with it any immunity from the laws of the state in which the licensee lives. The same reasoning should be applied to the insur-

ance question and to all other questions which involve remedial legislation.

No advocate of centralization should be permitted to impair the power of the various states over business done within their borders under the pretense that it is necessary to transfer the power to the national capitol, and no democrat should oppose necessary federal legislation when the powers of the several states are properly safeguarded. It is possible to preserve in full force the power of both the federal government and the state government. It is only necessary that the legitimate functions of the two governments shall be clearly recognized and their spheres duly respected.

A PHILIPPINE ESTIMATE

The *Manila Times* quotes from *Libertas* as follows:

We read in *Libertas*: "A friend of ours, a native of the province of Catalonia, and already advanced in years, was determined to acquire the English language, if not with the elegance and correct pronunciation of a native of London, at least with the comparative fluency which a foreigner of his educational qualifications may well attain. He has studied for many years, used all his spare moments reading English, but in spite of his ardent enthusiasm he despaired at times before the magnitude of the undertaking, and reviewing his little success, exclaimed: 'A person of my age can never become thoroughly familiar with this language.'

"This remark of our anglophile friend was recalled to our mind when we read the speech of Mr. Bryan at Malolos, and we may well say that it seems impossible to attain the command of language and the oratory of this clever politician. It is impossible to catch this bird by any scheme of waylaying at crossroads; the skillful pilot always manages to extricate himself from the tortuous labyrinth. By a lucid phrase he surmounts the greatest difficulties, leaving everyone content and not compromising himself in any way whatsoever. He proved this ability by his Malolos toast. He is received with vociferous acclamations at all the stations along the road, and hailed

as the saviour and defender of the liberties of the Filipino people; he is greeted by the strains of the American national anthem as though he were the chief executive of his nation; a single word of his, satisfactory to the crowd which surrounded and entertained him, would have sufficed to cause delirium and the rabble would have proclaimed itself king. But in the midst of all this tumult and maddening atmosphere, which would have proved too much for minds of less gravity than his, and less accustomed to these popular demonstrations, he remained calm. And in spite of the many efforts of Sandiko, not a single compromising word nor a single phrase of comfort to the element of the agitators, escaped his lips. It might be said that he maintained even greater reserve than his political friend Bourke Cockran, and his attitude was that of statesman more than of a politician, of an American rather than of a democrat. He courteously thanked the Filipinos for their appreciation of his political campaigns in America, but all the rest of his speech was governmental. Mr. Wright would see his way clear to subscribe to the sentiments expressed in this speech. The prudent counsels with which the speech is embellished are in perfect accord with the moderation prevalent in our government circles.

“The speech made a good impression upon the advanced Filipinos who accompanied the leader of democracy, and we have no doubt but that it favorably impressed the government and the entire American element. The speech evinces the ability of a great orator as well as reveals the resources of the consummate politician. Mr. Taft has repeatedly attained similar triumphs. The toast at Malolos will not be the only one which Mr. Bryan will have to offer during his stay in the Philippines. There are elements interested in wresting from him political declarations with reference to this country; but we are confident that whatever the circumstances or surroundings may be, Mr. Bryan will avoid compromising himself and only saying what subserves the interests of his party, subordinating them, as is natural, to the supreme interests of his country. In America there are republicans and democrats, bimetalists and monometalists, but in the Philippines there are only Americans. To hope that a democrat of prestige will publicly inveigh against the

policy of the republican party in the colonies, and against the resolutions of congress, would be to expect the impossible. A Mr. Prautsch and others of his calibre would be capable of going to this extreme, but a Bryan, never."

CRITICISM OF THE COURTS

Arthur McEwen writing for Hearst's *New York American*, makes a forceful reply to those who contend that the judges are above criticism. Mr. McEwen says that respect for courts "is a praiseworthy, dutiful sentiment—provided the courts deserve it"—but he adds "the judge is entitled to only the degree of reverence that his qualities as a man and his abilities as a lawyer earn for him. Reverence which goes beyond that is dangerous and un-American." Mr. McEwen cites a number of instances in which courts have been criticised by men who hold high rank in the public estimation. On one occasion Charles Sumner said:

"I hold judges, and especially the supreme court of the country, in much respect, but I am too familiar with the history of judicial proceedings to regard them with any superstitious reverence. Judges are but men, and in all ages have shown a fair share of frailty. Alas! alas! the worst crimes of history have been perpetrated under their sanction. The blood of martyrs and of patriots, crying from the ground, summons them to judgment."

Chief Justice Clark of the supreme court of North Carolina advocated the election by the people of federal judges of all courts. In taking this position, Justice Clark said:

"In this country alone, the people, speaking through their congress and with the approval of the executive, cannot put in force a single measure of any nature whatever with assurance that it shall meet with the approval of the court; and its failure to receive such approval is fatal, for, unlike the veto of the executive, the unanimous vote of congress cannot avail against it. Such vast power cannot safely be deposited in the hands of any body of men without supervision or control by any other authority whatever. If the president errs, his mandate expires in

four years, and his party, as well as himself, is accountable to the people at the ballot box for his stewardship. If members of congress err, they too must account to their constituents. But the judiciary hold for life, and, though popular sentiment should change the entire personnel of the other two great departments of government, a whole generation must pass away before the people can get control of the judiciary, which possesses an irresponsible and unrestricted veto upon the action of the other departments—irresponsible because impeachment has become impossible, and if it were possible it could not be invoked as to erroneous decisions unless corruption were shown.”

Roscoe Conkling is quoted as saying:

“Why, sir, the infallibility ascribed to the supreme court makes the constitution, the institutions of the country, nothing but wax in the hands of the judges.”

Professor Russell, of the New York University Law school, used these words:

“The judiciary holds a higher rank in America than it does in England or anywhere else in the world. It also has a wider range of power. The deliberate setting aside of a statute by judicial authority for unconstitutionality is a practice wholly foreign to European ideas, and is recognized only in the United States.”

Asserting that criticism of the supreme court is an “American privilege,” Mr. McEwen points out that none have been freer with these criticisms than minority judges of the court itself. For example, Justice Harlan expresses this frank opinion of the supreme court in the income tax judgment.

“The practical effect of the decision today is to give to certain kinds of property a position of favoritism and advantage inconsistent with the fundamental principles of our social organization, and to invest them with power and influence that may be perilous to that portion of the American people upon whom rests the larger part of the burdens of government, and who ought not to be subjected to the dominion of aggregated wealth any more than the property of the country should be at the mercy of the lawless.”

And Justice Brown was even more candid:

“The decision involves nothing less than a surrender to the moneyed class. * * * I hope it may not prove the

first step toward the submergence of the liberties of the people in a sordid despotism of wealth. As I cannot escape the conviction that the decision of the court in this great case is fraught with immeasurable danger to the future of the country, and that it approaches the proportions of a national calamity, I feel it my duty to enter my protest against it."

Mr. McEwen indulges in a little criticism on his own account, saying: "But be it said in all reverence, the supreme court is not infallible. It has repeatedly reversed itself, and then again reversed its reversals. It derives its members, not by celestial selection, but by appointment of presidents, who are not conspicuously exempt from political motives. One of the present nine before he received the robe was chiefly notable for his servility to a railroad corporation which holds despotic sway in his section of the country, and many members of the bar protested formally against his elevation on the ground that he had neither the brains nor acquirements requisite for the post.

"The court has been packed by a president on occasion when its decisions were not satisfactory to the party in power—for example, the Greenback cases. In 1869 the Greenback act was declared unconstitutional so far as it made the greenbacks legal tender for debts contracted prior to its passage. In 1870 Strong and Bradley were added to the court, and the decision was reversed.

"There are only two ways of changing the law when it has been laid down by the omnipotent nine—by making new judges, as the British premier makes new peers, and by amendment of the constitution. The eleventh amendment was adopted to overturn the decision that a sovereign state could be sued in a federal court by any citizen.

"It does not deepen veneration for the supreme court to recall its performances in connection with the income tax. Unanimously that tax was upheld in 1868, and again unanimously in 1880. But in 1895, by a vote of five to four, the tax was pronounced unconstitutional. And Justice Shiras changed his mind within a few days. Had he not changed his mind the income tax would now be in operation here, as in England, where one-third of the revenue is derived from it." "The same system," re-

marks Chief Justice Clark, of North Carolina, "is in force in all other civilized countries. In not one of them would the hereditary monarch venture to veto or declare null and void such a tax."

THE "REAL POLITICIANS"

Matthew Arnold says: "Because those things—right and wrong—are really what do govern politics and save or destroy states, therefore the few philosophers who alone keep insisting on the good of righteousness and the unprofitableness of iniquity are the only real politicians."

The sentiment so well expressed in the lines just quoted is commended to men of all parties. It is a common belief that the politician is a shifty sort of an individual who is successful in laying cunningly contrived plans to catch the unwary voter. He is called a practical politician because he is working for immediate advantage and because he prides himself on not being bothered by theories. He is usually represented as having no compunctions of conscience to interfere with his plans for success. The late Speaker Reed defined a statesman as "a successful politician who is dead." There is more wit than truth in the definition. While it is true that death often compels a recognition that opponents deny in life, yet it is not safe to form an opinion of men from post-mortem eulogies, for they often magnify virtues and throw the mantle of charity over shortcomings. The statesman is to be judged by his work and his work is not always appreciated during his life or immediately after his death. Neither can we estimate the influence that a statesman exerts by examining contemporaneous criticism or praise. The fame of really great men grows with the years and the influence of their lives increases in ever widening circles. No house can stand long unless the foundation is good, and so no lasting reputation can be built except upon the solid rock of principle. Those who "keep insisting on the good of righteousness and the unprofitableness of iniquity" are the only "real politicians," because they build upon a sure foundation and their work endures.

The principle applies to parties as well as to men. The

party that keeps insisting upon "the good of righteousness and the unprofitableness of iniquity" is building for the future; to insure success it has only to keep along with the procession of events and apply its moral precepts to each new question as it arises. The party that lightly prizes "the good of righteousness" or is tempted from the right course by the seeming profitableness of iniquity meets at last the fate that overtakes the criminal.

DEMOCRATIC GAINS IN INDIANA

As the complete returns come in, the democrats find increasing reason for rejoicing. Take the state of Indiana, for instance: In 1904 the republicans carried eleven of the thirteen congressional districts, and in those districts the republican candidates had an aggregate majority of 78,905. The democrats carried two districts, and their candidates had an aggregate majority of 5,514. Subtracting the democratic majority in two districts from the republican majority in eleven districts leaves a net republican majority of 73,391 to the credit of the republican party in its congressional fight. This year the republicans carried nine of the congressional districts, but by majorities so reduced that the aggregate majority in the nine districts was only 16,366. The democrats carried four districts with an aggregate majority of 9,719. When the democratic majority in the four districts is subtracted from the republican majority in the nine districts, it leaves a net republican majority of 6,647 in the state, if the victory is to be measured on the congressional contest. In three of the republican districts the successful candidate had less than 400 majority, and in another district the republican majority was less than 1,000, and in two others less than 1,600. If the trend toward the democratic party continues for the next two years Indiana is a democratic state, and we can confidently expect to win in from eight to ten of the congressional districts.

Take the legislative contest in Indiana and the result is almost equally encouraging. While the representation in the state senate has fallen off one, it being fourteen to thirty-six in 1904 and thirteen to thirty-seven this year,

the democratic representation in the house has increased from twenty-one democrats and seventy-nine republicans in 1904 to forty-seven democrats and fifty-three republicans in 1906. As a result of the present election the democrats are within four of having a majority of the lower house.

Let us examine still another evidence of democratic growth. President Roosevelt carried Indiana by 93,944 while the republican state ticket was elected this year by less than 31,000, a gain of 63,000.

When it is remembered that this is the state of Vice-President Fairbanks, and that he, as an active candidate for the presidency, stumped the state of Indiana in the recent campaign, it must be apparent to anyone that the democrats have really gained a great victory. With the sentiment growing as it is in favor of democratic ideas, our party can confidently count on Indiana in 1908 if an honest, straightforward fight is made for democratic principles.

AN UNUSUAL REPORT

The Knights of Columbus, one of the leading Catholic organizations of the country, have a local organization at San Francisco, and this organization in behalf of its San Francisco membership appealed to the country for relief funds at the time of the San Francisco earthquake. It was estimated by the local organization that \$100,000 would be needed to provide for the suffering members. Something over \$60,000 was subscribed by the members of the order all over the country—a very creditable sum indeed. But the strange part of the story is yet to be told. The local organization took charge of the funds, investigated the applications for relief, and after distributing to the deserving, found itself in the possession of a surplus of nearly \$45,000. To be accurate, the total sum received was \$60,671.13, and the amount distributed \$15,861.85. The Knights of Columbus of San Francisco have announced that the balance—almost three-fourths of the entire sum received—will be returned to the givers.

This is an unusual report and worthy of notice. That the money was subscribed is proof of the fraternity and

generosity of the Knights of Columbus; that it was wisely and carefully distributed is conclusive proof of the conscientiousness of those who had the fund in charge. Often the local distributors of such a fund are so generous as to distribute all the money received even though many of the claimants be lacking in merit, for there are always some in every community who are selfish enough to appeal for relief when relief is not really deserved. If all distributors of relief funds discharged their duty with the fidelity shown by the Knights of Columbus of San Francisco, it would be easier to raise money for such emergencies as that through which our western seaport has passed.

AN OBJECT LESSON

The democratic vote in Illinois in 1900 was 503,061. That was when the party stood for a positive and progressive democracy. In 1902 Mr. Hopkins was chairman of the state committee and conducted the campaign. The democratic vote that year was only 360,925. In 1904 Mr. Sullivan became a member of the national committee, and he and Mr. Hopkins controlled the state organization. That year the democratic vote fell to 327,606 notwithstanding the fact that it was a presidential campaign. In 1906 Hopkins-Sullivan influence still controlled, and the democratic vote fell to 271,984. Here was a falling off of 231,077 in six years—a loss of almost fifty per cent. Query: How long will it take that sort of party management to build up a democratic party in the state of Illinois? Is it not about time for the rank and file of the party to bring the Illinois organization into harmony with the democratic voters?

DANIEL B. SHIPMAN

Daniel B. Shipman, paint manufacturer and director of one of the banks of Chicago, died recently leaving an estate of something over a million. Practically all of it is given to some charities in which he was interested, Glenwood School for Boys, Chicago Home for Incurables,

Chicago Old People's Home, Hahnemann Hospital and St. Luke's Free Hospital receiving an endowment of \$240,000 each. Mr. Shipman did not leave as much money as Mr. Field did, but he left it in such a way as to do a great deal of good. It will not be difficult for the average Chicagoan to decide which was the more successful business man. Mr. Field amassed more money but he allowed it to so dwarf his moral perceptions that he died alone, while Mr. Shipman grew in his sympathies as he grew in wealth, and at death linked himself with institutions through which he will confer blessings on generations yet unborn.

ROOT EXPLAINS

Secretary Root has given out an interview explaining his New York speech. He denies that he had any intention of overriding the constitution or proposing any change in it. He insists that he merely intended to point out the failure of some of the states to perform their duty and to suggest that their failure, if prolonged, would lead the country to look around for some federal means of protecting themselves.

It is well that Secretary Root has made this explanation, for, being the spokesman of the president, his speech was regarded as a notice of some important move on the part of the administration. It has served a useful purpose, however, in that it has shown how quickly the people resent any attempt to interfere with the reserved rights of the states. Even republicans were not slow to dissent from Mr. Root's speech when it was construed as an attack upon the constitution.

It is a healthy sign when the people are so zealous in guarding a sacred—and the doctrine of local self-government is sacred—doctrine. The division of powers between the state governments and the federal government, instead of being a source of weakness, is a source of strength. The nation is stronger because each community is a law unto itself in its local affairs. The nearer the government is to the people the more closely they watch it, and the more effectively they control it. Centralization is hateful to the people because it saps the strength of the republic

and leads directly to the inauguration of evils which in their very nature menace the existence of a republic.

When the president suggested legislation for the protection of the Japanese, some of his supporters rushed to the conclusion that a treaty could override the constitution and that the federal government was in duty bound to disregard the constitution if by so doing they could carry out the provisions of the treaty. It ought to be unnecessary to suggest that a treaty made by the president and the senate cannot nullify a constitution made by the people. If a treaty attempts to nullify the constitution, so much the worse for the treaty, but it does not destroy the vital force of our organic law.

The Japanese are not only a progressive people but they are an intelligent people. They know what constitutional government is, and they understand the binding force of a constitution. Whatever congress may see fit to do to show consideration for those who enter into treaty obligations with us, it will not attempt to interfere with the right of the people of the states to control their educational systems. Neither will congress attempt to take out of the hands of the states the power to regulate domestic commerce and to deal with foreign corporations doing business in the state. The remedies which the federal government sees fit to apply will be added remedies. It is not necessary to take away from the states the power that they now have in order that the federal government may exercise such power as it has. There is no conflict between the sphere of the state and the sphere of the nation. Congress can control interstate commerce without interfering with the rights of the state. Secretary Root has served a good purpose in bringing acutely before the country the question of the state's position, and the good which the discussion has done will not be undone by his explanation.

A CHILD LABOR BILL

The plan of Senator Beveridge's bill for the prevention of the employment of children in factories and mines is very simple. It provides that corporations employing children under the age of fourteen in factories and mines

shall not be permitted to ship their products over the railroads from one state to the other. Congress has tried to control interstate commerce, and this bill invokes the power of congress over commerce for the protection of children. It is a perfectly legitimate use of congressional authority, and the bill ought to have the support of all, whether democrats or republicans, who are anxious to protect the children of the country from the physical, mental and moral impairment that comes from employment at too early an age in factories and mines.

Democrats will be especially glad to support the bill because it recognizes a principle which the democratic platform of 1900 sought to apply to the trusts. In that platform a license system was recommended under which a corporation would be compelled to take out a license before engaging in interstate commerce. Where a license is required, it can be granted upon conditions which prevent a corporation from attempting a monopoly of an industry.

Let the Beveridge bill be passed, and then let the same principle be applied to the trusts, for congress has the same power to protect the people from the extortion of the trusts that it has to protect the children. A law denying interstate commerce to any corporation controlling as much as fifty per cent. of any article of merchandise would be a death-blow to the trusts. If the principle is once established in regard to child labor or in dealing with child labor, it ought to be easy to apply it afterwards to the trusts. By arbitrarily fixing the proportion of the total product that one corporation would be permitted to control, private monopoly could be prevented.

POPULAR ELECTION OF SENATORS

The Des Moines conference, called by Governor Cummins, and participated in by a number of men from various states, adopted resolutions which favor the amending of the constitution through a convention called by agreement among two-thirds or more of the states. The constitution provides this method of submitting an amendment, and those who were present at the Des Moines conference

believe that the time has come to apply this method to the popularizing of the election of United States senators.

The house of representatives has five times passed by a two-thirds vote a resolution proposing the necessary amendment, but the senate has each time stood in the way. If it were certain that the senate would continue to block this reform there would be but little objection to the convention method of submitting an amendment, for there is no doubt that the people are determined to secure the election of United States senators by direct vote.

THE COMMONER cordially approves of the work of the Des Moines conference, but it hopes that pressure will be brought upon the senate to pass the necessary resolution and thus make a convention unnecessary. Surely the states that joined in the call for a convention ought to be able to coerce their senators to vote for a resolution submitting the necessary amendment. It is hardly conceivable that the senators representing the state would attempt to thwart the will of the people of the state when expressed in a resolution in favor of a convention, and it is even less conceivable that people who are in favor of electing senators by direct vote would elect senators without first pledging them to this reform. A number of senators will be elected in January, and every one of them should be pledged in advance to vote for a resolution submitting an amendment providing for the popular election of senators. The resolutions adopted at Des Moines are all right, but it is to be hoped that the senators may be coerced into respecting the wishes of the public before a separate convention can be convened.

CHARLES FREMONT COCHRAN

Ex-Representative Charles Fremont Cochran of St. Joseph, Mo., died at his home in that city on Wednesday, December 19. Mr. Cochran represented the Fourth Missouri district in congress for several years, and while serving in that body assumed a leading position by reason of his ability and his industry. He was a staunch democrat who was ever ready to defend the principles of democracy, and his defense was always able. A forceful

public speaker and a man of genial presence and personality, he was a great favorite wherever men met to discuss principles and policies. Mr. Cochran was an enterprising citizen who gave largely of his time to further the public interests. For several years he engaged in the newspaper business and his newspaper was an able and fearless exponent of democratic principles. In his death Missouri has lost a leading citizen and the democracy of the nation has lost a tireless champion.

JOHN W. KERN ON GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

John W. Kern, the well known democrat of Indianapolis and well known to democrats throughout the country, has written for the *Indianapolis Star* the following statement:

“Bryan seems to be the most puzzling problem ever tackled by the newspaper men of the country. Ever since 1896—a period of ten years—the republican and so-called independent journalists of America have been busily engaged in ‘writing him down’ and putting him out of business. The cartoonists have pictured him in every ridiculous attitude imaginable. The jokesmiths have worn themselves to a ‘frazzle’ making jokes at his expense; the big guns of the editorial rooms have written thousands of columns of the choicest English, holding him up to public execration as a colossal fraud and a political charlatan of the worst kind. Yet at the end of this ten years of unceasing fusillade all were compelled to admit that W. J. Bryan is one of the foremost men in all the world and one of America’s greatest citizens. But they justified their years of villification by saying the Bryan of today was not the Bryan of 1896—that he had improved vastly with age and experience and had grown so conservative as to be no longer offensive to the great business interests, etc.

“Bryan returned to America and, by his New York speech and his vigorous pronouncement that men financially interested in privilege-seeking corporations ought to have no part in democratic party management, convinced everybody concerned that he was the same old

Bryan—improved by age and travel, but not improved in the way the corporation agents had fondly hoped, but that, on the contrary, age and travel had made him a more formidable champion of popular rights and a more powerful adversary of special privilege and monopoly than ever before. And so the mighty journalists had all their work to do over again in ‘writing him down.’

“There was great sorrow manifested in the camps of corporations—not anger, but genuine sorrow. It was such a pity that Bryan, who was just within reach of the presidency, had in a single speech made a ‘break’ which had absolutely destroyed all chance of preferment.

“In great headlines it was announced that the democrats of the South were so incensed at his declarations on the subject of government ownership of railroads that they were anxiously awaiting the opportunity to repudiate him. And so, when the democratic state convention of Georgia met a few days after the New York speech, Bryan was repudiated by a resolution, adopted unanimously, declaring for Bryan for president.

“But the independent journalist was by no means discouraged. Crowding the telegraph report of the Georgia convention down into an obscure corner of his newspaper, or crowding it out altogether, he proceeded, with much fine writing, to prove that Bryan was no longer an appreciable quantity in American politics and that the southern democracy was especially bitter toward him. One morning about a week after the Georgia convention, I read several articles of this kind and then, turning to another part of the same paper—in an out-of-the-way place—I found an abbreviated account of the Alabama state convention held on the previous day. I there learned that early in the proceedings Congressman Clayton had introduced a resolution condemning government ownership of railroads, which resolution was summarily voted down by a vote of three or four to one, after which the convention proceeded to repudiate Bryan by the enthusiastic adoption of a resolution by a unanimous vote, declaring that Bryan was the first and only choice of the Alabama democracy for president.

“And then came the California state convention, and then Bryan’s triumphal tour of the South—the work of repudiation proceeding right along in such way as to

make it reasonably plain that the only name before the next national convention for the presidency will be that of the great Nebraskan.

“So it seems quite apparent that while cautious politicians were startled and alarmed the masses of the people were neither stampeded nor in the slightest degree frightened at Mr. Bryan’s declarations on the subject of government ownership of railroads. And why should they be? His declaration was to the effect that up to this time the railroad corporations had been powerful enough to resist successfully all efforts on the part of the government to regulate and control them in their dealings with the public—that with that power in their hands it was doubtful if they could be regulated and controlled by legislation and that, if it so turned out, there was only one effective remedy for the people and that is government ownership.

“To put it in another form: If it became a question as to whether the great trunk lines, built as competing lines, should be owned by the Standard Oil crowd or that group of financial pirates known as ‘The System,’ or whether the government should own those lines, the latter alternative would be preferable.

“Or, to put it in another form: As between railroad ownership of the government and government ownership of the railroad, public interests would demand government ownership.

“Look at a few facts and you will readily see why the people are not frightened by a discussion of the government ownership question. Within the last month the Pennsylvania Railroad Company gave out an authoritative statement that it had, the day before, sold its controlling interests in the Chesapeake & Ohio and the Norfolk & Western Railroads to Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of New York—a firm of bankers—for \$54,000,000. Here was a confession by this great corporation that for several years it had owned, in defiance of law, a majority of the stock in these two great lines of railway, which were not only competitors of the Pennsylvania, but were built to compete with each other, and that it had sold both of these lines to a firm of New York bankers. Of course that firm purchased these lines for ‘The System.’

“Harriman now turns up as the owner of the Baltimore

& Ohio. Kuhn, Loeb & Co. ostensibly own the two roads just named. The Pennsylvania Company and the Vanderbilt people own the remaining east and west trunk lines, a 'gentleman's agreement' binding them together, and the Standard Oil crowd—'The System' dominating the whole bunch.

"The great transportation lines of this country are absolutely dominated and controlled by not more than twelve men:

"'Twelve souls with but a single thought,
Twelve hearts that beat as one.'

"That these twelve men pull together in elections and in all matters of legislation goes without saying. That the shipping interests of the country are at their mercy is known of all men. That they have defied all laws and resisted all efforts to control them in the past is history. That they absolutely dominate the United States senate has been proved a thousand times and demonstrated during the last session when they compelled a compromise on their own terms, on both the rate bill and the pure food bill.

"In Indiana the railroad commission bill, enacted by the last legislature, had no chance for enactment until it had been trimmed and emasculated so that it received the approval of the railroad officials. A compromise bill.

"With whom were the people compromising? A dozen men comprising 'The System.' And why were the people obliged to compromise with these men? Because these twelve men had such influence with the people's representatives in the United States senate that 80,000,000 of people could not control these representatives and get what they wanted. Because these railroad companies had such influence in the Indiana legislature that the people of this great state were compelled to compromise, not being able to get what they wanted.

"The people have been watching all these performances and they are getting tired of compromising with this handful of financiers. These are some of the reasons why the people are not frightened at a proposed discussion of remedies and why they do not shy away from Bryan.

“They want a man who will execute the people’s will as expressed at the polls—not by compromising with a handful of public enemies, but by teaching such men that in this government of the people and by the people the popular will, when once expressed, is the supreme law, and that there are none so powerful as to stand up against it.”

THAT LITTLE BROWN BABY

Secretary Shaw is still illustrating the Philippine question as he views it by the story of the little brown baby. He pictures himself going across the street to settle a row in a neighboring family, and when he returns he is carrying a little brown baby. His daughter wants to adopt it. His son wants to put it out in the street, but his wife advises him to keep in until it has grown and then decide what to do with it, and he follows his wife’s advice. Beautiful picture, but incomplete and not to the point. What about the other little brown baby? We found Cuba as well as the Philippines. Both were fighting for liberty. We let Cuba set up for herself “because we promised to,” and kept the Philippines because we did not promise and because we thought that we could use them in our business. The little brown baby in the Orient was to help us extend our trade among the Chinese. It was not philanthropy, but cold, “practical business” that led to the adoption of a different course in regard to the two. Secretary Shaw would have it appear a philanthropic undertaking, but that would not account for the difference in treatment. More than that, he regards the Filipinos as children when they are not children. No one who has intelligence enough to be secretary of the treasury ought to be so ignorant of the human race as to compare grown-up people with children. You cannot deal with the adult as with a child no matter how inferior. Fact as well as theory contradicts Secretary Shaw’s picture. The Filipino would not be able to conduct as good a government in the Philippines as we conduct in the United States, but what of it? We do not conduct as good a government for them as we conduct for ourselves. We refuse them the constitutional guarantees which we regard as essential

to us, and we sacrifice them to the interests of Americans. A republican congress refused amendment after amendment offered for the protection of the Filipinos when the Philippine bill was under consideration. A republican congress refused to give to the resident Filipino the first chance to buy public land, and it sanctioned a perpetual franchise which would not be tolerated in this country.

Secretary Shaw does not know what to do with the Philippines. If he would study the principles of government laid down by the fathers, he would not find it difficult to make up his mind on the subject. He would recognize that people who are not desired as citizens should not be held as subjects.

BRITISH RULE IN INDIA

“What is truth?” asked Pilate, and when he had asked the question he went out without waiting for an answer. The question has been asked many times and answered in many different ways. I was reminded of a similar question when I read over the door of a court house in Aligarh, India, the motto: “Justice is the strength of the British Empire.” No empire, no government, no society can have any other source of permanent strength. Lord Salisbury is quoted by Indian leaders as saying: “Injustice will bring down the mightiest to ruin,” and we all believe it. Wendell Phillips expressed it as strongly and even more beautifully when he said (I quote from memory): “You may build your capitals until they reach the skies, but if they rest upon injustice, the pulse of a woman will beat them down.”

But what is justice? How varied are the answers given! The subject, in the name of justice, presents his appeal to his king, and the sovereign, if he be a despot, may send him to exile or the prison or the block and do it in the name of justice. What is justice? This question has been ringing in my ears during our journey through India.

When I was a law student I read the speech of Sheridan at the trial of Warren Hastings, and that masterpiece of invective was recalled sixteen years later, when a colonial policy began to be suggested in the United

States after the taking of Manila, and I tried to inform myself in regard to British rule in India. The more I read about it, the more unjust it seemed. So many Americans have, however, during the last few years spoken admiringly of England's colonial system that I have looked forward to the visit to India with increasing interest because of the opportunity it would give me to study at close range a question of vital importance to our own country. I have met some of the leading English officials as well as a number in subordinate positions; have talked with educated Indians—Hindus, Mohammedans and Parsees; have seen the people, rich and poor, in the cities and in the country, and have examined statistics and read speeches, reports, petitions and other literature that does not find its way to the United States; and British rule in India is far worse, far more burdensome to the people, and far more unjust—if I understand the meaning of the word—than I had supposed.

When I say this I do not mean to bring an indictment against the English people or to assert that they are guilty of intentional wrongdoing. Neither do I mean to question the motives of those who are in authority. It has been my good fortune to become personally acquainted with Lord Minto, the present viceroy; with Lieutenant Governor Frazier, the chief executive of the province of Bengal; with Lieutenant-Governor La Touche, chief executive of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, and with Governor Lamington, chief executive of the Bombay presidency, three of the largest Indian states. These men, I am sure, represent the highest type of their countrymen. Lord Minto is fresh from Canada, where he was governor general; Governor Lamington was the head of the Australian government before coming to India, and both Governors Frazier and La Touche have long official experience to their credit. That they will be just, as they understand justice, and do right as they see the right, I am satisfied. But what is justice?

The trouble is that England acquired India for England's advantage, not for India's, and that she holds India for England's benefit, not for India's. She administers India with an eye single to England's interests, not India's, and she passes upon every question as a judge would were he permitted to decide his own case. The

officials in India owe their appointment directly or indirectly to the home government, and the home government holds authority at the sufferance of the people of England, not of the people of India. The officials who go out from England to serve a certain time and then return, whose interests are in England rather than in India and whose sympathies are naturally with the British rather than with the natives, cannot be expected to view questions from the same standpoint as the Indians. Neither can these officials be expected to know the needs of the people as well as those who share their daily life and aspirations.

It is not necessary to review the earlier rule under the East India Company; that is sufficiently condemned by public record. That company was chartered for commercial purposes, and its rule had no other than a pecuniary aim. It secured control of state after state by helping one native prince against another where it did not actually instigate war between princes. The English government finally took the colony over, confessedly because of the outrageous conduct of the company's officials. No one now defends the rule of the East India Company, although Warren Hastings was finally acquitted by the House of Lords in spite of his crimes, out of consideration for his public service in extending English authority.

Is English rule in India just, as we find it today? Fortunately England permits free speech in England, although she has sometimes restricted it in her colonies, and there has not been a public question under consideration in England for a century which has not brought out independent opinion. It is the glory of England that she was an early champion of freedom of speech, and it is the glory of Englishmen that they criticise their own government when they think it wrong. During the American revolution Burke thundered his defense of the rights of the colonists, and Walpole warned his countrymen that they could not destroy American liberty without asserting principles which, if carried out, would destroy English liberty as well. During the recent war in South Africa Great Britain had no more severe critics than were to be found among her own people and in her own parliament. And so today British rule in India is as forcibly arraigned by Englishmen as by the Indians themselves.

While Mr. Naoroji, an Indian, goes to England and secures from a meeting of a radical club the adoption of a resolution reciting that as "Britain has appropriated thousands of millions of India's wealth for building up and maintaining her British Indian empire and for drawing directly vast wealth to herself;" that as "she is continuing to drain about thirty million pounds sterling of India's wealth every year unceasingly in a variety of ways," and that as "she has thereby reduced the bulk of the Indian population to extreme poverty, destitution and degradation, it is therefore her bounden duty, in common justice and humanity, to pay from her own exchequer the costs of all famines and diseases caused by such impoverishment." And further, "that it is most humiliating and discreditable to the British name that other countries should be appealed to or should have to come to Britain's help for relief of Britain's own subjects, and after and by her un-British rule of about one hundred and fifty years."

While, I repeat, Mr. Naoroji was securing the unanimous adoption of the above resolution in England, Sir Henry Cotton, now a member of parliament, but for thirty-five years a member of the Indian civil service, was preparing his book, "New India," in which he courageously points out the injustice from which India now suffers. Neither he nor Mr. Naoroji suggests Indian independence. Both believe that English sovereignty should continue, but Mr. Cotton shows the wrongs now inflicted upon India and the necessity for reform. Not only does he charge that the promises of the queen have been ignored and Indians excluded from service for which they were fitted, but he charges that the antagonism between the officials and the people is growing, and that there is among civilian magistrates "an undoubted tendency to inflict severe sentences when natives of India are concerned, and to impose light and sometimes inadequate punishment upon offenders of their own race," and that in trials "in which Englishmen are tried by English juries" the result is sometimes "a failure of justice not falling short of judicial scandal." If justice cannot be found in the court, where shall she be sought?

After the Indian mutiny the queen, in a proclamation, promised that natives should be freely and impartially

admitted to offices, "the duties of which they might be qualified by their education, ability and integrity to discharge." Lord Lytton, a viceroy of India, in a confidential document which got into print, speaking of the pledges of the sovereign and the parliament of England, said: "We all know that these claims and expectations never can or will be fulfilled. We have had to choose between prohibiting them (the natives of India) and cheating them, and we have chosen the least straightforward course," and again: "Since I am writing confidentially, I do not hesitate to say that both the governments of England and of India appear to me, up to the present moment, unable to answer satisfactorily the charge of having taken every means in their power of breaking to the heart the words of promise they had uttered to the ear."

The government of India is as arbitrary and despotic as the government of Russia ever was and in two respects it is worse. First, it is administered by an alien people, whereas the officials of Russia are Russians. Second, it drains a large part of the taxes out of the country, whereas the Russian government spends at home the money which it collects from the people. A third disadvantage might be named since the czar has already created a legislative body, whereas England continues to deny to the Indians any form of representative or constitutional government.

The people of India are taxed, but they have no voice in the amount to be collected or in the use to be made of the revenue. They pay into the government nearly two hundred and twenty-five millions of dollars a year and of this nearly one hundred millions is expended upon an army in which Indians cannot be officers. It is not necessary to keep such an army merely to hold the people in subjection if the Indians are really satisfied with English rule; and if the army is intended to keep Russia from taking India, as is sometimes claimed, why should not the British government bear a part of the burden? Would it not be wiser to so attach the Indian people to the British government that they would themselves resist annexation to Russia?

The home charges, as they are called, absorb practically one-third of the entire revenues. About one hundred million dollars go out of India to England every year, and

over fifteen millions are paid to European officials in the civil employ. What nation could stand such a drain without impoverishment?

Taxation is nearly twice as heavy in India as in England in proportion to the income of the people. Compared with the people of other countries, the Indian's income is, on an average, one-twentieth of the average English income, one-seventh of the average Spaniard's income, one-sixth of the average Italian's income, one-fifth of the (European) Russian's income and one-half of the income of the Turk. Sir Henry Cotton shows that the average per capita deposit in banks in England is one hundred dollars while the average per capita deposit in India is fifty cents; but how can the Indian be expected to have a large bank account when the average yearly income is only ten dollars? I have, in another article, referred to the jewelry worn by Indian women. The bracelets and anklets are silver except among the poorest, and this was formerly a form of hoarding, but the suspension of the coinage of silver deprived the people of the privilege of converting this hoarded silver into rupees. It will be remembered that the late Senator Wolcott, a member of the monetary commission appointed by President McKinley in 1897, on his return from Europe, declared that the suspension of the coinage of silver in India had reduced the value of the savings of the people to the amount of five hundred millions of dollars. The suspension was carried out for the benefit of European interests regardless of the welfare of the masses.

So great has been the drain, the injustice to the people and the tax upon the resources of the country, that famines have increased in frequency and severity. Mr. Gokhale, one of the ablest of India's public men, presided over the meeting of the last Indian national congress (held in December) and declared in his opening speech that the death rate had steadily risen from twenty-four to the thousand in 1882-84, to thirty in 1892-94, and to thirty-four at the present time. I have more than once within the last month heard the plague referred to as a providential remedy for over-population! Think of it, British rule justified because "it keeps the people from killing each other" and the plague praised because it removes those whom the government has saved from slaughter!

The railroads with all their advantages have been charged with adding to the weight of famine by carrying away the surplus grain in good years, leaving no residue for the years of drouth. While grain can now be carried back more easily in time of scarcity, the people are too poor to buy it with two freights added. The storage of grain by the government at central points until the new crop is safe would bring some relief, but it has not been attempted.

If it is argued that the railroads have raised the price of grain in the interior by furnishing a cheaper outlet to the sea, it must be remembered that the benefit has accrued not to the people, nearly all of whom are tenants, but to the landlords, the government being the largest holder.

Not only are the people being impoverished, but the land is being worn out. Manure, which ought to be used to renew the fields, is consumed as fuel, and no sight is more common in India than that of women and children gathering manure from the roads with their hands. This, when mixed with straw and sun-dried, is used in place of wood, and from the amount of it carried in baskets, it must be one of the chief articles of merchandise. There are now large tracts of useless land that might be brought under cultivation if the irrigation system were extended. Proof of this is to be found in the fact that the government of India has already approved of extensions which, when made, will protect seven million acres and irrigate three million acres. The estimated cost of these extensions is about forty-five million dollars, and the plans are to be carried out "as funds can be provided." Ten per cent. of the army expenditure, applied to irrigation, would complete the system within five years, but instead of military expenses being reduced, the army appropriation was increased more than ten million dollars between 1904 and 1905.

Of the total amount raised from taxation each year about forty per cent. is raised from land, and the rate is so heavy that the people cannot save enough when the crops are good to feed themselves when the crops are bad. More than ten per cent. of the total tax is collected on salt, which now pays about five-eighths of a cent per pound. This is not only a heavy rate when compared with the

original cost of the salt, but it is especially burdensome to the poor. The salt tax has been as high as one cent a pound, and when at that rate materially reduced the amount of salt consumed by the people.

The poverty of the people of India is distressing in the extreme; millions live on the verge of starvation all the time, and one would think that their very appearance would plead successfully in their behalf.

The economic wrong done to the people of India explains the political wrong done to them. For more than twenty years an Indian national congress has been pleading for a modified form of representative government—not for a severing of the tie that binds India to Great Britain, but for an increasing voice in their local affairs. But this request cannot be granted. Why? Because a local government composed of natives selected by the people would protest against so large an army, reduce the taxes and put Indians at lower salaries into places now held by Europeans. It is the fear of what an Indian local government would do that prevents the experiment, although two other reasons, both insufficient, are given. One of these is that the Indian people are not intelligent enough and that they must be protected from themselves by denying them a voice in their own affairs. The other is that the Indians are so divided into tribes and religious sects that they cannot act harmoniously together. The first argument will not impress any unprejudiced traveler who has come into contact with the educated classes. There are enough well informed, college trained men in India, not to speak of those who, like our own ancestors a few centuries ago, have practical sense and good judgment without book learning, to guide public opinion. While the percentage of literacy is deplorably small, the total number of educated men is really considerable, and there are at this time seventeen thousand students above the secondary schools and studying for the B. A. degree. There is not a district of any considerable size that has not some intelligent men in it, and these could be relied upon to direct the government until a larger number are qualified to assist. It is true that native princes have often seemed indifferent to the welfare of their subjects—princes who have lived in great luxury while the people have been neglected, but today some of the native states vie with

those controlled by European officials in education and material advancement. And is not the very fact that the people are left under the government of native princes in the native states conclusive proof that in all the states the government could be administered without the aid of so large a number of Europeans?

The second argument is equally unsound. To say that the Indians would necessarily fight among themselves is to ignore the progress of the world. There was a time when Europe was the scene of bloody religious wars, and our own country is indebted to the persecution of the pilgrims in England for some of its best pioneers. There has been a growth in religious tolerance during the last century, and this is as noticeable in India as elsewhere. Already the intellectual leaders of all the sects and elements of the Indian population are mingling in congresses, conferences and public meetings. Already a national spirit is growing which, like the national spirit in England and America, disregards religious lines and emphasizes more and more the broad social needs which are common to all; and with the increase of general education there will be still more of unity and national sentiment. Those who make this argument also forget that as long as England maintains sovereignty it will be impossible for religious differences to lead to war and that differences in council and in congress would strengthen rather than weaken her position.

But why is there a lack of intelligence among the Indians? Have they not had the blessings of British rule for several generations? Why have they not been fitted for self-government? Gladstone, whose greatness of head and heart shed a lustre upon all Europe, said: "It is liberty alone which fits men for liberty. This proposition, like every other in politics, has its bounds; but it is far safer than the counter doctrine, 'wait till they are fit.'"

How long will it take to fit the Indians for self-government when they are denied the benefits of experience? They are excluded from the higher civil service (ostensibly open to them) by a cunningly devised system of examinations which make it impossible for them to enter. Not only are the people thus robbed of opportunities which rightfully belong to them, but the country is deprived of the accumulated wisdom that would come with service,

for the alien officials return to Europe at the end of their service, carrying back their wisdom and earnings, not to speak of the pensions which they then begin to draw.

The illiteracy of the Indian people is a disgrace to the proud nation which has for a century and a half controlled their destiny. The editor of the *Indian World* a Calcutta magazine, says in last February's number:

“If India has not yet been fit for free institutions, it is certainly not her fault. If after one and a half centuries of British rule India remains where she was in the Middle Ages, what a sad commentary must it be upon the civilizing influences of that rule! When the English came to India this country was the leader of Asiatic civilization and the undisputed center of light in the Asiatic world; Japan was then nowhere. Now, in fifty years, Japan has revolutionized her history with the aid of modern arts of progress, and India, with a hundred and fifty years of English rule, is still condemned to tutelage.”

Who will answer the argument presented by this Indian editor? And he might have made it stronger. Japan, the arbiter of her own destiny and the guardian of her own people, has in half a century bounded from illiteracy to a position where ninety per cent. of her people can read and write and is now thought worthy to enter into an Anglo-Japanese alliance, while India, condemned to political servitude and sacrificed for the commercial advantage of another nation, still sits in darkness, less than one per cent. of her women able to read and write and less than ten per cent. of her total population sufficiently advanced to communicate with each other by letter or to gather knowledge from the printed page. In the speech above referred to, Mr. Gokhale estimates that four villages out of every five are without a schoolhouse, and this, too, in a country where the people stagger under an enormous burden of taxation. The published statement for 1904-5 shows that the general government appropriated but six and a half million dollars for education while more than ninety millions were appropriated for “army service,” and the revised estimate for the next year shows an increase of a little more than half a million for education while the army received an increase of more than twelve millions.

The government has, it is true, built a number of colleges (with money raised by taxation), and it is gradually extending the system of primary and secondary schools (also with taxes); but the progress is exceedingly slow and the number of schools grossly inadequate. Benevolent Englishmen have also aided the cause of education by establishing private schools and colleges under church and other control, but the amount returned to India in this way is insignificant when compared with the amount annually drawn by England from India.

It is not scarcity of money that delays the spread of education in India, but the deliberate misappropriation of taxes collected, and the system which permits this disregard of the welfare of the subjects and the subordination of their industries to the supposed advancement of another nation's trade is as indefensible upon political and economic grounds as upon moral grounds. If more attention were given to the intellectual progress of the people and more regard shown for their wishes, it would not require many soldiers to compel loyalty to England, neither would it require a large army to preserve peace and order. If agriculture were protected and encouraged and native industries built up and diversified, England's commerce with India would be greater, for prosperous people would buy more than can be sold to India today when so many of her sons and daughters are like walking shadows.

Lord Curzon, the most brilliant of India's viceroys of recent years, inaugurated a policy of reaction. He not only divided Bengal with a view of lessening the political influence of the great province, but he adopted an educational system which the Indians believe was intended to discourage higher education among the native population. The result, however, was exactly the opposite of that which was intended. It aroused the Indians and made them conscious of the possession of powers which they had not before employed. As the cold autumn wind scatters winged seeds far and wide, so Lord Curzon's administration spread the seeds of a national sentiment, and there is more life in India today, and therefore more hope, than there has ever been before. So high has feeling run against the government that there has been an attempted boycott of English made goods, and there

is now a well organized movement to encourage the use of goods made in India.

Let no one cite India as an argument in defense of colonialism. On the Ganges and the Indus the Briton, in spite of his many noble qualities and his large contributions to the world's advancement, has demonstrated, as many have before, man's inability to exercise, with wisdom and justice, irresponsible power over helpless people. He has conferred some benefits upon India, but he has extorted a tremendous price for them. While he has boasted of bringing peace to the living, he has led millions to the peace of the grave; while he has dwelt upon order established between warring tribes, he has impoverished the country by legalized pillage. Pillage is a strong word, but no refinement of language can purge the present system of its iniquity. How long will it be before the quickened conscience of England's Christian people will heed the petition that swells up from fettered India and apply to Britain's greatest colony the doctrines of human brotherhood that have given to the Anglo-Saxon race the prestige it now enjoys?

INCOME TAX IN 1900

The *New York World* says: "To mollify the eastern democrats Mr. Bryan consented to have the income tax plank dropped from the national platform of 1900."

It is true the income tax was not explicitly referred to in the 1900 platform, although it was not the intention of the committee to omit it. The income tax was, however, explicitly referred to in the 1896 platform and the Kansas City convention adhered to the plan when it said: "We reaffirm and endorse the principles of the national democratic platform adopted at Chicago in 1896."

In order to show the absurdity of the *World's* charge that "to mollify the eastern democrats Mr. Bryan consented to have the income tax dropped from the national platform of 1900," it is only necessary to refer to Mr. Bryan's letter accepting the democratic nomination in 1900. In that letter Mr. Bryan said: "By inadvertence the income tax plank agreed upon by the resolutions com-

mittee was omitted from the platform as read and adopted. The subject, however, is covered by the reaffirmation of the Chicago platform, and I take this occasion to reassert my belief in the principle which underlies the income tax. Congress should have authority to levy and collect an income tax whenever necessary, and an amendment to the federal constitution specifically conferring such authority ought to be supported by even those who may think the tax unnecessary at this time. In the hour of danger the government can draft the citizen; it ought to be able to draft the pocketbook as well. Unless money is more precious than blood, we cannot afford to give greater protection to the incomes of the rich than to the lives of the poor."

WORK OF THE FIFTY-NINTH CONGRESS

The Washington correspondent for the *New York Tribune* presents the following summary of the things accomplished by the Fifty-ninth congress:

"Railway rates to be fixed by enlarged interstate commerce commission; rebates and other discriminations penalized.

"Panama canal to have 85-foot level, with locks; Panama canal bonds to enjoy same privileges as all other United States bonds; Panama canal supplies to be domestic products.

"Pure food: Label must tell the truth, especially on popular remedies.

"Meat inspection, 'from hoof to can,' at government expense.

"Free alcohol, denatured, for use in the arts.

"Oklahoma (including Indian Territory) admitted to the Union, and Arizona (with New Mexico) if they agree to union.

"Consular service reorganized on merit basis.

"Quarantine against yellow fever nationalized.

"Alaska allowed a delegate in the house. Alaska liquor revenue devoted to schools and road building. Prohibition of aliens fishing in Alaskan waters.

"Naturalization safeguarded and made more difficult.

“Steamboat inspection made more rigid, due to General Slocum loss. Motor boats operated for profit required to have federal licenses.

“The Philippines: Application of coastwise law postponed until April 11, 1909. Minor tariff modifications made, and ratio of gold and silver in insular coinage changed. Batan coal mines to belong to government. Tariff duties collected before 1902 legalized. Naval vessel for Philippine naval militia.

“Gold bullion reserve in excess of \$50,000,000 to be coined. National bank liabilities limited to 30 per cent. of capital.

“Employers’ liability statute: Negligent common carriers within United States jurisdiction liable for damages to employes.

“Federal donations to state agricultural experiment stations increased, so that within ten years they shall each receive \$30,000 annually.

“President’s traveling expenses defrayed to the extent of \$25,000 annually.

“American representative at Constantinople made ambassador, and \$150,000 appropriated to purchase legation property.

“Niagara Falls to be preserved.

“Production of pure domestic sweet wines encouraged by reduced taxation.

“Immunity of witnesses in criminal cases limited (anti-‘immunity bath’).

“United States district judge and court officers for China, and additional judge for New York, southern district provided.

“Destruction of antiquities on United States lands forbidden and the president authorized to acquire lands which have historic value. Mariposa big tree grove accepted from California. National park established in Oklahoma and named Orville Hitchcock Platt. Battle mountain sanatorium reserve in South Dakota established for disabled soldiers.

“Trademark law amended.

“Militia efficiency to be promoted by aid of \$2,000,000.

“Final disposition of affairs of the five civilized tribes of Indians.

“Secretary of interior authorized to establish town sites of not more than 160 acres each in irrigated areas.

“Unlawful wearing of insignia of G. A. R. and other soldier organizations forbidden.

“Secretary of the navy given greater discretion in suppressing hazing at Annapolis.

“Falsely marked articles of gold or silver, or their alloys, not to be imported, exported or carried.

“Sponge growing in American waters protected.

“San Francisco sufferers aided; \$2,500,000 appropriated.

“Extending period for continuous shipment of cattle to thirty-six hours.

“To destroy derelicts, \$250,000 steam vessel authorized.

“Numerous lighthouses and beacons authorized.

“Census office directed to collect and publish vital, social and other statistics.

“For District of Columbia: A juvenile court, compulsory education, sale of poisons restricted.

“Grave of Andrew Jackson, with fifteen acres of land, made a national cemetery. Marking graves of confederate soldiers ordered.

“Jamestown exposition, 1907, given aid.

“Monuments authorized: King’s Mountain battleground, South Carolina, \$30,000; landing of the Pilgrims, at Provincetown, Mass., \$40,000; Princeton battleground, New Jersey, \$30,000; John Paul Jones, in Washington, \$50,000; Commodore John Barry, in Washington, \$50,000; H. W. Longfellow, in Washington, \$4,000 for pedestal.

“Incorporations: Carnegie foundation for the advancement of learning; Archaeological Institute of America, and Ohio and Lake Erie Canal company.

“Thanks of congress extended to General Horace Porter for recovering the body of John Paul Jones.

“Restrictions on cabinet officers to prevent deficiencies of appropriation.

“Sixty-nine laws enacted authorizing bridges or dams across navigable rivers.

“Forty-three acts for the government of the District of Columbia.

“Three hundred and twenty public acts altogether.

“Three thousand six hundred and ninety Civil war pension acts; 696 private pension acts.

“Bills introduced: House, 20,475; senate, 6,551.

“Number of pages of *Congressional Record*, over 10,000—a new record.”

The bill providing federal insurance regulation and the bill making the representative's term four years were killed.

Measures not acted on were as follows: “Santo Domingo treaty; Isle of Pines treaty; Morocco treaty to be voted December 12; immigration restriction (in conference); Senator Smoot's right to seat; publicity of campaign affairs; prohibiting corporation campaign contributions; ship subsidy; to make Porto Ricans United States citizens; reduction of tariff on products of Philippines; United States to own its embassies and legations abroad; to build government powder factory; Appalachian and White Mountain forest reserves; copyright revision; modification of Chinese exclusion law; prescribing punishments on high seas; codification of revised statutes; navy to have biggest battleship afloat; removal of customs duty on works of art; swamp reclamation similar to irrigation statute; cable to Guantanamo and canal zone; anti-injunction bill; eight-hour law; nominations of Isthmian canal commissioners; army and navy dental surgeon corps; increase in artillery corps; to punish improper use of the Stars and Stripes; retirement of superannuated federal clerks; to establish postal savings banks and parcels post; limiting working hours of railway employes.”

“The president vetoed eight acts of congress: Four changing jurisdiction of courts, two Indian bills, one pension bill on account of beneficiary's death, and the bill allowing carriage of dangerous explosives on passenger vessels.”

MR. RAINEY'S KINDERGARTEN FOR STAND-PATTERS

In the house of representatives recently Representative Rainey, known as "the lone democratic member from Illinois," conducted what he called "a kindergarten for stand-pat republicans." Mr. Rainey addressed the house on the tariff question, showing particularly that under the present tariff system "it has not only become impossible to buy in the cheapest market, but it has become impossible for the American citizen to buy American-made goods in the cheapest market."

Mr. Rainey pointed out that for 1,500 miles along our northern frontier a railroad was built out of American steel rails, and for all of the rails used for the construction and maintenance of that road it cost \$27 per ton. Then he said: "Just on the other side of the border, over in Canada, they have built another railroad—in every sense of the word a parallel and competing line—out of rails that cost \$22 per ton; but the rails out of which the Canadian road is built and the rails out of which the American road is built all came from the same factory here in the United States, protected by our tariff laws."

Mr. Rainey further pointed out that the American manufacturers of agricultural implements ship their products to all sections of the world and sell them from 25 to 50 per cent cheaper than the same goods are sold to the American farmer who lives within fifty miles of the factory.

Mr. McCleary, republican, interrupted to ask Mr. Rainey if it were not a fact that in the last report of the *British Iron Trade Journal* steel rails are quoted at a little more than \$31 in England while they are quoted at \$28 in the United States. Mr. Rainey said while he could not say that that was a fact, he said that it sometimes occurs temporarily as, for instance, in 1898, when this quotation lasted for only sixty days.

Mr. Rainey then referred to the now famous "great protection sale" advertised by Charles A. Keene, a New York jeweler. Mr. Keene is selling Waltham and Elgin watches which he bought in England cheaper than these goods can be purchased in America. Mr. Rainey showed that American-made goods sent abroad could be brought

back without paying any duty. He showed that the watch trust required retail dealers to sign an agreement promising not to sell below the minimum price fixed in the contract, and that Keene buying abroad the Waltham watch that had been shipped there returned it to this country and sold it for \$18.98 when the minimum price for which that watch could be obtained from a merchant dealing with the trust was \$26. Another style Waltham watch whose minimum price is \$35 was sold by Mr. Keene for \$25.38. Another style watch whose minimum price is \$24 was sold by Mr. Keene at \$16.92. Another style, whose minimum price is \$60 was sold by Mr. Keene for \$42.30.

Elgin watches which under similar contracts are sold by regular dealers at a minimum price of \$35, are sold by Keene ten dollars cheaper. Elgin watches whose minimum price is \$24 are sold by Keene at \$16.39. Mr. Williams of Massachusetts here interrupted to remind Mr. Rainey that similar contracts were made by nearly all the trusts.

Mr. Rainey showed that Jeweler Keene had cabled abroad \$130,000 within fifteen months prior to the time he started his business, and that the money was used for the purpose of purchasing American-made watches in the foreign market. He said that he held the American Express company's receipts for this \$130,000, and while they were too bulky to print in the *Record*, he would hold the documents in his possession and invited any one who doubted to inspect them. Mr. Rainey exhibited a number of watches, showing the wide difference in the price demanded by the trust from American consumers and the price at which the watch is sold by Mr. Keene from his stock of American watches purchased in the foreign market.

Mr. Rainey told of a scheme conducted, and successfully, by the trust to put a stop to Keene's enterprise. Recently there arrived at New York 2,400 American-made watches consigned to Keene. Keene's European agents had bought them in the foreign market. When these goods reached the custom house the agents of the watch trust were on hand and they protested against the landing of these watches, claiming that 1,200 of them had been advanced in value and improved upon while

abroad by the addition of Swiss dials, and were therefore not entitled to admission free of duty. Keene's agents investigated, and found that the watch trust, in order to stop the business, had duplicated a dial used in Switzerland exactly the same color as the dials made in this country and similar in all respects, except the words "Made in Switzerland" were stamped on the back of each one of these dials. Because of this fact 1,200 of these watches were refused admission, and it was necessary for Keene to return them to the foreign market.

Answering the republican argument concerning the great benefits to this country from the growth of the watch business, Mr. Rainey said that while the number of employes of watch factories had increased, they employ now 15 per cent. more men than they employed in 1880, but they employ 600 per cent. more women and 200 per cent. more children.

Mr. Rainey, referring to one particular style of Elgin watches, said that it was in great demand for the holiday trade, and that not long ago Mr. Keene bought 2,000 of these watches from the Keystone Watch Case company in London. When this company found that the watches were intended for shipment to the United States they refused to deliver, and Keene and the man who made the purchase for him sued the company. When the brief was filed by the watch case company it was set up that the goods were sold on the representation that all of said watches were required for the market in France only, and would not be sold in the United States. Mr. Rainey says that the Keystone company finally compromised this case and settled the suit by paying Keene five hundred pounds English money.

Mr. Rainey continued to pile fact upon fact in his arraignment of the republican tariff, and republican members were whipped into silence by the powerful showing he made. He told the republicans that in spite of this serious condition they would do nothing to give the people relief.

He quoted from the *Chicago Tribune* the statement of employes of the Elgin Watch company, who were at that time on a strike, to the effect that since the Dingley tariff went into effect the company employed cheaper labor and that it required a finisher to assemble a hundred

watches of a certain kind a day in order to make \$3 a day, and in order to do that work he must lay off and rest at least two days in each week. Mr. Rainey said that five days after these charges were made the watch company, finding that it would not do to advertise these features of their business, settled with the striking employes.

Following is an extract from the *Congressional Record*: Mr. Rainey said: "Now, have I satisfied the gentlemen on the other side? Interruptions are not as frequent now as they were formerly. Have I satisfied the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Dalzell), who had so much to say yesterday about this picture I displayed here on this easel? I displayed the picture here in this room because I had a right to do it under the rules of the house, and because I obtained authority from the proper source before displaying it here.

"The gentleman for so many years and with such signal ability has represented the railroads and the corporations in this body that he cannot understand now how a member can honestly and conscientiously want to represent the people (applause on the democratic side), and he puts into the *Record* these sneering remarks. The gentleman has been a member of the school of protection graft for so long a time that he cannot understand what it means for a man to have an honest motive in a matter of this kind. Have I satisfied the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Lacey)? And for him I entertain the highest personal regard. Have I satisfied the majority leader, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Payne)? I saw him yesterday circulating on that side advising republicans to ask me no more questions. (Laughter and applause on the democratic side.) Have I satisfied him? Are you all satisfied?" (Applause on the democratic side.)

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE SO-CALLED PANIC OF 1893

Secretary of the Treasury Shaw devoted considerable attention to the tariff question in an address delivered at St. Louis. Mr. Shaw reminded his hearers of the hard

times of 1893-4, and he sought to impress upon their minds the idea that tariff legislation by a democratic congress—the Wilson bill—was responsible for the hard times of that period.

It will be just as well to keep history straight. The truth is that every panic since the Civil war originated under republican rule and developed under republican legislation.

The great panic which gave "Black Friday" to history occurred during the month of September, 1869, when the republican party was in power.

The great panic marked by the failure of Jay Cooke & Co. occurred in September, 1873. Then the republican party was in power and eleven months prior to the beginning of that panic that party had been re-elected to power.

The hard times to which Secretary Shaw refers did not begin in 1894; they began long prior to that year and, indeed, long prior to the presidential election of 1892; and it is a fact, although republican orators and republican organs try to forget it, that the so-called panic of 1893 began and played its greatest havoc under that famous tariff law known as the McKinley bill.

It may be well for COMMONER readers to keep readily at hand some of the facts and figures relating to this question:

The republican party was restored to power March 4, 1889.

The McKinley tariff bill became a law October 6, 1890, and remained in effect until August 27, 1894.

The Wilson tariff law, enacted by a democratic congress, went into effect August 27, 1894.

If anyone will take the trouble to examine the republican campaign text-book for 1904, pages 125, 126, and 127, he will find considerable space devoted to a statement of business disasters from July 18, 1893, until November 13, 1894. The republican managers expected their readers to remember that the Cleveland administration was inaugurated March 4, 1893, and that all these disasters occurred under democratic administration; but they expected their readers to forget that the republican tariff law was in force up to August 27, 1894, or covering more

than twelve months of the sixteen months period of business disasters as described by the republican text-book.

In their references to the panic of 1893 republican orators and organs habitually overlook the date when the McKinley law ceased and the Wilson law went into effect. But when in their tariff discussions they are required to face the fact that that panic played its greatest havoc during the life of the republican tariff law they answer that it was the anticipation of tariff legislation growing out of democratic victory in 1892 which brought on these business disasters. For this reason in their list of business disasters they place July 18, 1893, as marking the beginning of that great panic.

Let it be remembered that the McKinley tariff bill became a law October 6, 1890, and that the first indications of the so-called panic of 1893-4 were given November 11, 1890, A LITTLE MORE THAN THIRTY DAYS AFTER THE MCKINLEY TARIFF BILL BECAME A LAW. From that date the panic raged.

The Harrison administration was inaugurated March 4, 1889, and when the first indications of this panic were given President Harrison had not exhausted the half of the term for which he was elected. It is admitted by everyone familiar with the facts that President Harrison's administration had plates prepared for the bonds and Mr. Harrison's secretary of the treasury made a visit to New York for the purpose of negotiating the bond deal. He was wired by Mr. Harrison to return to Washington. Mr. Harrison said that he had concluded not to have any bond issues under his administration and in order to avoid the stigma the Harrison administration warded off the bond issue and unloaded it on the incoming Cleveland administration.

It may not be out of place to point out that when the democratic administration surrendered the reins of government, March 4, 1889, there was in the federal treasury the largest surplus in history. When the republican party went out of power, March 4, 1893, there was a large deficit and the incoming administration was finally persuaded to make the bond issues which its republican predecessor had at one time thought to be necessary, but had skillfully avoided.

The claim that the business disasters of the period referred to were due to the popular fear of tariff legislation to be enacted by democrats is, as has been said, met by the fact that this panic began two years prior to the presidential election day of 1892. The following will serve as reminders on this point:

November 11, 1890, the reports showed financial distress in New York. The New York clearing house association voted its certificates to banks in need of assistance.

The Boston clearing house association did the same thing November 17. Barker Bros. & Co., big bankers in Philadelphia, suspended at that time, with liabilities placed at \$5,000,000.

November 19, 1890, there was a run on the Citizens' Savings bank of New York, and a receiver was appointed for the North River bank.

November 22, 1890, the United Rolling Stock company of Chicago assigned, with liabilities at \$6,851,000.

November 28, 1890, B. K. Jamieson & Co., the Philadelphia bankers, failed, with liabilities at \$2,000,000.

December 6, 1890, the Oliver iron and steel mills of Pittsburg shut down, discharging 2,000 employes. On the same date the cotton firm of Myer & Co., of New Orleans failed, with liabilities at \$2,000,000.

January 3, 1891, the Scottdale rolling mills and pipe works and the Charlotte furnace and coke works in Pennsylvania closed, throwing 10,000 employes out of work.

January 18, 1891, the American National bank at Kansas City suspended, with liabilities at \$2,250,000.

May 8, 1891, the Spring Garden National bank at Philadelphia closed its doors, and the Pennsylvania Safe Deposit and Trust company made an assignment.

The Homestead strike and other strikes during 1892, and prior to election day, are well remembered by the people.

REFERENCE INDEX

- Advocate, India, 65, 71.
 Aguinaldo, Emilio, 40.
 Aldrich Bill, 242, 243.
 Alemany, Dr. Jose, 41.
 American Bankers' Association, 242, 243, 316.
 American Iron & Steel Mfg. Co., 207.
 American Friends' Asso., 23.
 American Society, London, 73.
 Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 21.
 Anti-Trust League, Commercial Travelers,' 72.
 Apponyi, Count, 94, 111, 112.
 Arbitration, 260, 261, 361.
 Arbitration of Labor Disputes, 135.
 Arnold, Matthew, 381.
 Assembly, The Philippine, 327.
 Asset Currency, 242, 243, 311, 316, 317, 318, 338.
 Asset Currency, Bankers Push, 316.
 Austria, Reform in, 344.
 Authority, Federal and State, 374.

 Bagot, Charles, 331, 333.
 Bailey, Senator, 72, 191.
 Bank of Pittsburg, 62.
 Barakutullah, Prof. Mohammed, 150.
 Barr, Albert J., 63.
 Bartholdt, Richard, 93, 95, 106.
 Belmont, Perry, 313.
 Bell, Mr., 234.
 Benkendorff, Count, 97.
 Benton, Thomas H., 315.
 Berry, Bishop Joseph T., 221.
 Beveridge Bill (Child Labor), 322, 340, 341, 342, 386, 387.
 Beveridge, Senator, 227, 229, 244, 322, 342.
 Black, Ex-Governor of New York, 360.
 Bliss, C. N., 62, 65.
 Bowne, Dr., 28.
 Bradley, Justice, 380.
 Breen, James W., 61, 63.
 British Rule in India, 394.
 Brown, Justice, 379.
 Brown, J. A., 180.
 Brown, Mayor Frank W., 115, 170, 171, 175.

 Bryan, Charles W., 169.
 Bryan, W. J., 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 20, 23, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 46, 54, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 92, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 126, 127, 128, 147, 148, 149, 161, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 175, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186, 187, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 201, 204, 210, 211, 213, 220, 226, 244, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 302, 305, 310, 311, 340, 341, 342, 371, 376, 377, 378, 389, 390, 391.
 Bryan, Mrs. W. J., 8, 12, 40, 84, 87, 91, 93, 116, 167, 168, 169, 180, 181, 182, 183.
 Bryan, W. J.,
 At Honolulu, 3, 4, 5, 6.
 In Japan, 8.
 At Kakoshima, 20.
 At Keio-gijiku University, 26.
 In the Philippines, 30.
 At Malalos, 34.
 At Bacolod, 45.
 At Bombay, 65.
 London Interview, 72.
 Fourth of July Address, London, 73.
 Speech Before Irish Club, 83.
 At London Peace Conference, 96, 102.
 Home Coming of, 114.
 Speech in New York, 126.
 In New Haven, 147.
 At Newspapermen's Dinner, 151.
 At St. Louis, Louisville and Cincinnati, 192.
 In Nebraska, 165.
 Reception at Lincoln, 167.
 Reception at Normal, 180.
 Statement at Louisville, 187.
 Speech at Battery D., 210.
 At Ottumwa, 210.
 Speech on Dreams, 244.
 Resolutions at Commercial Congress, 253.

- Suggestions for Oklahoma Constitution, 292.
 Elks' Memorial Address, Lincoln, 305.
 On Issues of the Day, 344.
 Bryce, James, 343.
 Bulletin, Honolulu Evening, 5.
 Burke, Mayor William, 115.
 Burns, Robert, 147.
 Burton, Congressman T. E., 96, 203.
 Callahan's Barn, 323.
 Campaign Contributions, 258, 288, 289.
 Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry, 94, 103, 129, 224.
 Carnegie, Andrew, 258, 313.
 Carmack, Senator, 195, 197.
 Centralization, Root on, 304.
 Century Magazine, 54.
 Chamberlain, Mr., 334.
 Chicago Democratic Club, 226.
 Chikami, Governor K., 20, 23.
 Child Labor, 386.
 China, Awakening, 337.
 Citizen, Brooklyn, 267.
 City Deposit Bank, Pittsburg, 62.
 Civil Service, 340.
 Civilization, Mr. Bryan's Definition of, 27.
 Civil Service National Reform League, 340.
 Clark, Chief Justice North Carolina, 378, 381.
 Clay, Henry, 320.
 Clayton, Congressman, 390.
 Cleveland, Grover, 4, 351.
 Cochran, Charles F., 388, 389.
 Cockran, Bourke, 377.
 Colonialism, 275.
 Commercial Advertiser, Pacific, 3, 4.
 Commercial Congress, Trans-Mississippi, 252, 255, 371.
 Commercial Travelers' Anti-Trust League, 72, 117, 119, 127, 128.
 Commoner, The, 1, 5, 23, 26, 99, 100, 183, 186, 222, 237, 238, 239, 250, 251, 252, 261, 263, 267, 269, 274, 277, 303, 326, 330, 388, 414.
 Conkling, Roscoe, 379.
 Cook, Jay, 414.
 Corporations, Federal License of, 139, 140, 290, 291, 292, 375.
 Cotton, Sir Henry, 399.
 Croker, Richard, 233.
 Crosby, Ernest, 331, 335.
 Cuba, Treatment of, 43.
 Culberson, Senator, 191, 365.
 Cummins, Governor, 234, 387.
 Curzon, Lord, 404.
 Dahلمان, Mayor James C., 115.
 Davis, Governor Jeff, 273, 274.
 Davis, Mrs. Jefferson, 370.
 Day, F. P., 62.
 Declaration of Independence, references to, 11, 78, 134, 245.
 DeLuce, Mayor of Malolos, 34.
 Dempsey, Mayor E. J., 197, 198, 201, 202.
 Depew, Senator C. M., 352.
 D'Estournelles, Baron, 111, 112.
 Directorates, Duplication of, 139.
 Direct Primary, 296.
 Disarmament, a Precedent for, 331.
 Dorrington, Mr. and Mrs., 40.
 Dreamers of History, Some of the, 244.
 Dryden, Senator John F., 374.
 Dual Plan, Railroad Ownership, 213, 216, 226.
 Edward VII, King, 79, 94.
 Eight Hour Day, 135, 281, 282, 300.
 Elks, Manila Reception, 39, 40.
 El Renanciamiento, Manila Newspaper, 36.
 Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 13.
 Enquirer, Cincinnati, 227.
 Express, London Daily, 109.
 Fairbanks, Charles Warren, 227, 229.
 Farmers' Deposit Bank, Pittsburg, 62.
 Fee, W. T., 67.
 Ferguson, Secretary, 40.
 Felix, Conception, President Woman's Association, 45.
 Field, Marshall, 385.
 Fifty-Ninth Congress, Work of, 406.
 First Voters, Suggestions to, 236.
 Fish, Stuyvesant, 328, 329, 330.
 Fisher, Mr., 40.
 Folk, Governor Joseph, 72, 117, 119.
 Folk, Joseph W., Address of, 119, 128.
 Fowler, Congressman, 242, 243.
 Francis, David R., 253, 256.
 Franchises, Perpetual in Philippines, 51, 52, 53.
 Frazier, Governor, 395.
 Fukuzawa, Mr., 26, 27.
 Fulton, Mr., 67, 69, 70.
 Fundamentals, Root on, 319.
 Gallinger, Senator, 205.
 Garfield, President James A., 341.
 Garfield, Secretary, 262.

- Garvin, Governor, 147.
 Gazette, St. James, 107.
 Gazette, Westminster, 106.
 Given, T. H., 62.
 Gehring, Mayor Henry, 115.
 Genato, Senor Ramon, 41.
 Gladstone, William E., 105, 402.
 Globe-Democrat, St. Louis, 312, 313, 361.
 Globe, Joplin, 344.
 Government by Injunction, 280.
 Government Control of Railroads, 126, 142, 143, 144.
 Government Ownership, 189, 191, 194, 195, 211, 213, 215, 217, 218, 219, 256, 321, 389, 391.
 Green, Mr., 167.
 Griscom, Minister, 8, 13.
 Gridiron Club, Washington, 358.
 Grosscup, Judge, 257.
 Guffey, Mr., 63.
 Goltra, Edward F., 115.

 Hadley, Attorney-General, 255.
 Hague Tribunal, 129.
 Hanna, Mark, 61, 63, 64.
 Hanna's War Chest, How Filled, 61.
 Harlan, Chief Justice, 379.
 Harriman, E. H., 28, 256, 391.
 Harrison, President, 415.
 Harris, Mr., of Kansas, 234.
 Harris, Townsend, 9.
 Hastings, Warren, 394.
 Hamilton, Alexander, 222, 223, 247, 349, 350, 351.
 Hatoyama, Dr., 14, 20.
 Hawaii, 5, 6.
 Hearst, William R., 72, 232, 233, 234.
 Herald, New York, 61, 109.
 Herald, New York, Paris Edition of, 109.
 Hill, David B., 3.
 Hillkoff, Count, 97.
 Home Folks, Nebraska, 114, 115.
 Hugo, Victor, 332.
 Honolulu, 3, 4, 6, 8.
 Hopkins, Senator, 384.
 Hughes, Governor, 232, 233.
 Hunker, Mayor F. D., 115.

 Ide, Governor, 40.
 Illinois College, Jacksonville, 2.
 Ingalls, M. E., 313.
 Income Tax, 133, 263, 264, 275, 283, 284, 286, 287, 312, 313, 314, 405, 406.
 Indian Mirror, Newspaper, 65.
 Indiana, Democratic Gains in, 382.

 India, Mr. Bryan's Reception in, 65.
 Individualism vs. Socialism, 54, 261.
 Inheritance Tax, 285, 286.
 Ingaki, J., 28.
 Injunction, Government by, 134.
 Interstate Commerce Law, 190, 365.
 Interparliamentary Union, 93, 98, 102, 107, 108, 109, 110, 113, 114, 129, 203.
 Interparliamentary Union, Mr. Bryan's Speech Before, 102.
 Inter Nation, 324.
 Interstate Commerce Commission, 191.
 Irish Club, Members Present, 83.
 Irish Club, Mr. Bryan's Speech Before, 83.
 Irene, Princess (steamer), 115, 116.
 Ito, Marquis, 11.
 Irish, John P., 255, 256.
 Irvine, Louis C., 255, 256.
 Ivins, W. H., 336.
 Iroquois Club, Chicago, 151, 161.

 Jackson, Andrew, 4.
 James, Congressman Ollie, 191.
 Jefferson Club, Chicago, 155, 161.
 Jefferson, Thomas, 11, 43, 104, 222, 223, 245, 247, 346, 348, 349, 350, 351.
 Jenkins, Sir Lawrence, 67, 68.
 Jerome, William T., 233.
 Job Session, 311.
 Johnson, Tom L., Address of, 125.
 Johnson, Mayor Tom L., 117, 127, 128, 242.
 Johnson, President Andrew, 341.
 Jones, Rev. Sam, 225, 226.
 Journal, Kansas City, 97, 371, 372.
 Journal, Lincoln State, 167, 242.
 Journal, Sioux City, 342.
 Journal, Wall Street, 186, 187.
 Jortich, Senor Joaquin, 45.

 Kamada, President, 26.
 Kaneko, Baron, 23, 24, 25.
 Keene, Charles A., 410, 411, 412.
 Kern, John W., on Government Ownership, 389.
 Kindergarten for Standpatters, Mr. Rainey's, 410.
 Kipling, Rudyard, 75.
 Kirkup, Thomas, 54.
 Knights of Columbus, Report of, 383, 384.
 Knight, Thomas, 256.
 Knox, Senator, 61.
 Kovalevesky, Prof. Maxim, 93, 94.

- Labor Unions, Mr. Olney on, 324.
 Labor Disputes, Arbitration of, 135, 281, 282, 283.
 LaFollette, Robert, 268, 365, 366.
 Lamington, Governor, 395.
 LaTouche, Governor, 395.
 Libertas, Manila, 376.
 Liberty, Vigilance the Price of, 239.
 Limantour, Minister, 318.
 Lincoln, Abraham, 4, 43, 198, 222, 247, 321, 341.
 Lentz, John J., 148.
 Loveland, H. D., 254.

 Mackichan, Dr., 67, 68, 69.
 Madison Square Garden Speech, 118.
 Magna Charta, 78.
 Mail, London, 108.
 Martin, Rev. George W., 170, 180.
 McCleary, Congressman, 410.
 McEwan, Arthur, 378, 379, 380.
 McClellan, Mayor George B., 233.
 McKean, James S., 62.
 McIver, Charles D., 220, 221.
 McKinley Tariff Bill, 414, 415.
 McKinley, William, 4.
 Mehta, Sir P. M., 67.
 Mellon, A. W., 62.
 Mexican Central Ry., 318.
 Mickey, Governor J. H., 171, 175.
 Minto, Lord, 395.
 Mirror, Indian (newspaper), 65.
 Money Question, 271.
 Monopoly, Private, 362, 363.
 Monroe, President James, 333.
 Monroe Doctrine, 333.
 Morgan, J. Pierpont, 258, 321, 330.

 Naguaka, Viscount, 23.
 Nation and State, 325.
 National Bank of Commerce, Pittsburg, 62.
 National Bank of Western Pennsylvania, Pittsburg, 62.
 Nelson, Admiral Lord, 105.
 Nebraska Home Folks, 114, 115.
 News, Japan, 8.
 News, Lincoln, 181.
 New Zealand, 5.
 Netto, Professor, 54.
 Nixon, Lewis F., 115.
 Nobel Peace Prize Given to Roosevelt, 303.
 Noel, Admiral, 15, 28.

 Ocampo, Martin, 41.
 O'Connor, T. P., 84, 90, 91.

 Ogden Gas Co., 165.
 Ohomori, Governor, 28.
 Okuma, Count, 11, 14, 16, 30.
 Olney, Richard, 324, 325, 326, 327.
 Oratory, Explanation of, 17, 18, 19.
 Oregonian, Portland, 335, 336.
 Orr, R. F., 323.

 Panama Canal, 173.
 Panic of 1893, Facts About, 413.
 Parker, Judge Alton B., 267.
 Patstone, Mr., 40.
 Peace Conference, Suggestions to, 331.
 Peace, Mr. Bryan's Amendment to Arbitration Treaty, 98.
 People's National Bank, Pittsburg, 62.
 Perry, Commodore, 9, 14, 21.
 Philippines, 6.
 Philippine Assembly, 327.
 Philippines Estimate, 376.
 Philippines, Free Trade with, 263.
 Philippine Suffrage, 367.
 Philippines, Vassalage in, 266.
 Phillips, Wendell, 394.
 Portsmouth Treaty, 173.
 Postal Deficit, 324.
 Post, Pittsburg, 63.
 Post, Washington, 340, 341.
 Practical vs. Ideal, 371.
 Press, New York, 336.
 Princess Irene (steamer), 115, 116.
 Public Ownership, 188.

 Rainey, Congressman, 410, 411, 412, 413.
 Rate Regulation, 142.
 Real Politicians, 381.
 Record-Herald, Chicago, 2.
 Record, Pens Grove, N. J., 204.
 Redmond, John, 91.
 Reed, Thomas B., 381.
 Reid, Whitelaw, 73, 74.
 Republican, Springfield, 315.
 Review of Reviews, 220.
 Review, North American, 221.
 Richmond, Sir W. B., 73.
 Ridgeley, Comptroller, 242.
 Rizal, 30, 33.
 Rockefeller, John, 137, 227, 258, 363, 364.
 Roosevelt, President, 3, 23, 79, 93, 100, 137, 173, 191, 192, 193, 197, 200, 204, 219, 227, 229, 231, 233, 255, 266, 268, 277, 278, 280, 281, 283, 288, 289, 290, 303, 305, 335, 351, 358, 366, 383.

- Root, Elihu, 253, 254, 304, 319, 320,
 321, 338, 371, 372, 385.
 Rothwell, William A., 192.
 Ruskin Club, Oakland, Calif., 54.
 Ruskin, John, 57.
 Rush, Richard, 331, 333.
 Russo-Japanese War, 22.
 Sagacity, 340.
 Second National Bank, Pittsburg, 62.
 Sellner, George C., 38.
 Senators, United States, Election of,
 132, 245, 274, 352, 387.
 Seward, William H., 198.
 Shallenbarger, Ashton G., 166.
 Shaw, Leslie M., 204, 205, 206, 208,
 209, 211, 212, 213, 252, 253, 254, 312,
 371, 393, 394, 413, 414.
 Ship Subsidy, 311, 312, 338, 339, 340,
 372, 373.
 Sheldon, Governor George L., 166.
 Shimonoseki, Indemnity, 14.
 Shinjin, Tokyo (newspaper), 28.
 Shipman, Daniel, 384, 385.
 Shiras, Justice, 380.
 Sioux City & Pacific Ry., 212.
 Smith, Goldwin, 221.
 Socialism, 145.
 Socialism vs. Individualism, 54, 261.
 State and Nation, 335.
 Saint Louis Convention, 3.
 St. James Gazette, 107.
 Standard, London Evening, 107, 108.
 Stanhope, Sir Phillip, 93, 95, 102.
 Standpatters, Kindergarten for, 410.
 Star, Hawaiian, 6.
 Standard Oil Co., 231.
 Star, Indianapolis, 389.
 State Ownership, 190, 211, 216.
 Stewart, Mr. and Mrs., 40.
 Strong, Justice, 380.
 Stone, Senator William, 191, 195, 197,
 365.
 Sullivan Case, 161.
 Sullivan, Roger, 162, 163, 164, 165,
 384.
 Sumner, Charles, 378.
 Taft, Secretary William E., 15, 28,
 259, 260, 270, 377.
 Tariff for Revenue, 141.
 Tariff, Revision of, 140.
 That Little Brown Baby, 393.
 Thomas, Augustus, 117.
 Thomas, Augustus, Address of, 123.
 Thompson, Judge Owen P., 2.
 Thompson, W. H., 167.
 Times, Bombay, 65, 67, 69, 70.
 Times, Japan, 14, 23, 26.
 Times, London, 110.
 Times, Manila, 30, 38, 41, 42, 376.
 Togo, Admiral, 29.
 Tolstoy, Count Leo, 57.
 Town Topics, 321, 330.
 Trans-Mississippi Commercial Con-
 gress, 252, 255.
 Tribune, Chicago, 242, 412.
 Trunk Lines, Government Control of,
 126.
 Trusteeship, Mr. Bryan's Resignation
 of, 2.
 Trusts, Corruption by, 136.
 Trusts, Development of, 144.
 Trust Magnates vs. Education, 249.
 Trusts, Plutocratic Tendencies of,
 140.
 Trusts, Regulation of, 138.
 Tuttle, D. R., 183.
 Uhlig, Mayor Max, 115.
 Union Trust Co., 62.
 Victoria, Queen, 83.
 VonPlener, Herr, 96, 102, 108.
 Walker, Harry W., 117, 119.
 Walker, Harry W., Address of, 119.
 Warning, A Word of, 330.
 Waseda University, 8, 14.
 Watzke, Mayor R. E., 115.
 Washington, George, 357.
 Watterson, Henry, 195, 196, 197.
 Williams, George Fred, 148.
 Wilson Tariff Law, 263, 414, 415.
 Wolfe, Jacob V., 180, 181.
 World, Indian (newspaper), 403.
 World, New York, 405.
 Wright, Governor Luke, 366, 377.
 Young Men's Christian Association,
 Tokyo, 45.
 Yusay, Judge, 41.

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

Life and Speeches

of William J. Bryan

An illustrated octavo, 465 pages. It contains a biographical sketch of Mr. Bryan prepared by Mrs. Bryan. Also the more important speeches delivered by him during his two terms in Congress and during the two presidential campaigns in which he was a candidate. This is the most complete record of Mr. Bryan's work in public life that has ever been published. It is printed on fine quality of paper, and contains over forty very interesting and instructive illustrations.

Substantial cloth binding, \$1.50 per copy, postage prepaid. Address all orders to THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Nebraska.

The Commoner Condensed

A Political Reference Book

As its title indicates this book is a condensed copy of THE COMMONER for one year. It is published annually and the different issues are designated as Volumes I, II, III, etc., corresponding to the volume numbers of THE COMMONER. The editorials which discuss questions of a permanent nature have been selected, and are reproduced in THE COMMONER CONDENSED.

THE COMMONER CONDENSED contains a complete reference index which makes it a valuable handbook. Facts and figures, arguments and reasoning on leading issues, and information of value to those who take part in discussions of live political questions will be found in its pages.

The book is published to enable readers of THE COMMONER who have not kept a complete file of the papers to obtain the important articles that have appeared during each year, in convenient form for preservation.

Price, in strong cloth binding, by mail postage prepaid, \$1.50; in paper binding, 50c. Address all orders to

The Commoner, Lincoln, Nebraska

