

A Pertinent Criticism. The San Juan, Porto Rico, News, commenting on the Supreme Court decision in the insular cases says:

"We are and are not part of the United States. We are and are not a foreign country. We are and are not citizens of the United States. We are and are not to have our money back. The tariff is and is not void. The constitution does and does not extend and its limitations do and do not apply.

"Upon these points the justices disagree, five in favor and four against. Are we, or are we not, or are we it?"

This about covers the case but the editor of the News should remember that there is a "perhaps" before the freedom of the press in "our possessions" now.

A New Convention Needed. A federal judge in Ohio, of the name of Wing, has outflown all competitors in the judicial race for government by injunction.

When issuing a sweeping injunction against "picketing" by striking molders in Cleveland, Judge Wing made this bold reply to the objection that the "picketing" consisted only in arguing with non-strikers with a view to peaceably persuading them not to work: "Persuasion of itself, long continued, may become a nuisance and unlawful." He therefore issued an injunction broad enough to include peaceable persuasion in furtherance of the strike.

The above is from the Public. As this occurred in Ohio it may become necessary for the State convention to reassemble and condemn government by injunction even if to do so it becomes necessary to reaffirm the Kansas City platform.

The Apostasy of Their Teacher. Senor Greusac of Argentina, commenting upon the United States' disposition toward imperialism said: We find ourselves bewildered like a scholar in the presence of the apostasy of his teacher. Having lost all faith in the apostle, we are in danger of losing faith in his gospel."

The injury accomplished by our policy of imperialism is wide spread. The people of South America have been inspired to free government by our example and the nearer they approached free government the more material has been their progress. It is humiliating to be told by a South American republican that the people of South America who have been inclined to oppose the doctrine of thrones are "bewildered like a scholar in the presence of the apostasy of his teacher," when they contemplate the present policies of the United States. It is humiliating to be told that they have "lost all faith in the apostle" and it is discouraging to hear them say that this faith is so completely lost that they are actually "in danger of losing faith in the apostle's gospel."

The injury accomplished by our policy of imperialism is wide spread. The people of South America have been inspired to free government by our example and the nearer they approached free government the more material has been their progress. It is humiliating to be told by a South American republican that the people of South America who have been inclined to oppose the doctrine of thrones are "bewildered like a scholar in the presence of the apostasy of his teacher," when they contemplate the present policies of the United States. It is humiliating to be told that they have "lost all faith in the apostle" and it is discouraging to hear them say that this faith is so completely lost that they are actually "in danger of losing faith in the apostle's gospel."

Keeping Everlastingly At It. An eastern paper, speaking of the success of the Philadelphia ring in obtaining power so strong as to enable them to defy public sentiment, says:

"They keep so everlastingly at their nefarious game that they intrench themselves in power and are able to laugh to scorn the reform efforts

of the decent citizenship. Before such unceasing efforts the spasmodic reform movements which spring up every now and then in all of our larger cities are wholly unavailing."

This is a good suggestion for the people. If they would protect their public treasury, if they would guard public rights, if they would have law enforced against the strong as well as the weak, if they would preserve liberty, if they would maintain this government in the form in which the fathers made it, they must "keep everlastingly at it." Eternal vigilance is the price not only of liberty in its broad sense, but it is the price the people must pay for the preservation of their best institutions, for the safety of their public funds, and for the maintenance of everything that makes the greatest good to the greatest number. "Eternal vigilance" is but another term for "keeping everlastingly at it." The trouble is, however, that men are apt to forget their public duties in the moment of individual prosperity. They are apt to form the wholly erroneous notion that individual prosperity can exist for any considerable length of time when a handful of men are permitted to shape public interests according to their own selfish advantages.

Civil Government in the Philippines. They call the recently established rule in the Philippine Islands "Civil Government,"

The entire machinery of this "Civil Government" is the creature of one man. It depends for its existence not upon the love of the people whom it is supposed to control, but upon the power of the bayonets that glisten in the sunlight in the vicinity of the Governor's Palace.

There was a bit of hypocrisy in the immense amount of display made when authority in the Philippines was transferred from Gen. Chaffee to Governor Taft. It was proclaimed to be the passing of authority from the military form to the civil form, and yet it was nothing more or less than the passing of authority from one individual to another. Back of the authority in each case were the bayonet and the sword. The consent of the governed was not asked. Everything that was to be done, everything that is to be done under this so call "civil government" depends upon the whim and caprice of the President of the United States. Thomas Jefferson said "Civil Government being the sole object of forming societies, its administration must be conducted by common consent."

The form of government existing among the Philippines today may be called "Civil Government" for want of a better definition and yet a more inaccurate or absurd definition than this could hardly be suggested.

Protests at Wrong time. The Indianapolis News seems hopeful that the Republicans will abandon their subsidy schemes. It says:

"Every new trust or consolidation, every additional piece of insolence on the part of those already in existence, every raising of the price of a trust-made article, every vessel that is built at home without a payment from the treasury, and every acquisition of ships by American citi-

zens, will serve to strengthen the popular opposition to the subsidy scheme."

But if all the influence of the administration is placed behind the subsidy scheme, if the President appoints an attorney general who is partial to the trusts, of what moment is it that there is popular opposition to the subsidy scheme, to the trust system, or to any other evil with which the people are confronted? The republican papers have much to say against the subsidy scheme, they have much to say against the trust evil; but when the President chose as his attorney general a gentleman who had been the attorney for one of the greatest trusts in existence, no serious criticism was made by the republican newspapers. Of what value is it that republican newspapers condemn certain policies of the administration as they condemned the Porto Rican law, as they protested against the policy of imperialism, as they objected to the trust system and as they denounced the ship subsidy bill, when after having done all these things they give cordial support to the administration responsible for them, when that administration appeals for re-election?

How Tariff Helps the Trust. The Detroit Journal in discussing the probable legislation of the next congress has the following to say regarding the action of the republican party:

"No general revision of the tariff is proposed, so that there will be nothing for legitimate business interests to take alarm at. What is to be tested is whether the republican party will unmoved see citizens of this country held up by the trusts to permit the latter to sell to the foreigner for less than we can buy here at home."

When is this question to be tested? The republican party has for many years been "unmoved" when it saw citizens of this country held up by the trusts. Indeed the republican party is responsible for conferring upon the trusts the power to hold up the citizens of this country.

Of course no general revision of the tariff will be made by the republicans, nor is it at all likely that they will remove the protection afforded the trusts of this country. It has already been established that the republican party is considerably more concerned in the trusts than it is in the people.

On this point the New York World makes an interesting reference. The world says that it cost nearly \$12.00 a ton to carry American steel billets to a British Port and thence by rail to an inland British city, and adds:

"The United States Steel corporation is now, according to London advices, delivering them to British buyers in the Black Country, back of Birmingham, paying all freight charges, at \$25 per ton, \$3 per ton less than the lowest market price for British-made billets.

"The price charged by the United States Steel corporation for its billets to American buyers at Pittsburg is from \$24 to \$25 per ton.

"This proves conclusively that the Steel trust is making a profit of at least \$10 a ton on every ton of steel billets sold in this country over and above the profit which satisfies it on its sales in Great Britain—for of course the trust is not constantly seeking foreign trade at a loss. And still the Steel trust magnates are not ready to give up the \$7.84 per ton duty on foreign-made steel billets.

"Abolish the garrote on the American consumer and Americans would be able to buy their steel billets as cheaply as Englishmen."