

## Beveridge—Reactionary

Indiana, always politically interesting, is giving us an innovation this year. Ex-Senator Beveridge, who in days past posed as a progressive, is now appearing in the role of premier reactionary. The New York Times has discovered in Senator Beveridge the Moses for which predatory wealth has been searching. It quotes him as saying that business has been clogged by unscientific efforts at restraint and that these laws, having been put upon the statute books, have not been repealed because of "the selfishness and cowardice of politicians, the audacity and bluff of demagogues and the political torpor and timidity of business men themselves." The Times says that it can only echo Mr. Beveridge's declaration that "the time has come to clean house" and that "we cannot have the prosperity we ought to have until this job is done."

It will astonish the progressives of Indiana to learn that Senator Beveridge regards himself as called to rescue the nation from "the legislative dead hand on the industrial and business activities of the American people." Big business has needed some bold man of ability to defend the creed of the greedy, and with willingness to do it. Only a few men have enough confidence in themselves to think that justice will cower before their glance and that the masses will sink away under their whip. Mr. Beveridge belongs to that very small class (it is fortunate for the country that the class is small) whose members cannot conceive of opposition and would not brook it if they could conceive of it. He seems to think that big business needs a political engineer who has the courage to ignore grade crossings and speed laws.

He has always been Hamiltonian in his views; he thinks that society is suspended from the top and that, if the government will only take care of the rich, the rich can be trusted to take care of the poor. He would interpret the story of Lazarus and Dives to mean that Lazarus was lucky to have a Dives near so he could get the crumbs that fell from the table.

And now he wants the repeal of laws that restrain business—the anti-trust law is chief among the few that we have. His logic seems to be: Why should the trusts be interfered with? Why should a little business concern object to being squeezed out or bankrupted by overgrown corporations? Then there is the anti-option law—why should enterprising gamblers on the market be restrained from juggling with the farmer's prices? And why should the packers be regulated? Can they not be trusted to fix the prices on the farmer's meat products? Why any of this "dead hand legislation" that aims at guarding the God-made man from aggressions at the hands of man-made giants called corporations?

The farmers and laborers of Indiana had better investigate Mr. Beveridge's tinsel progressivism before they give him a six years' term at Washington. His views seem to have undergone a complete change since he began to study Chief Justice Marshall. When he goes to Washington—if he ever does—he will make Senator Watson look like a progressive by comparison.

Fortunately, the Democrats of Indiana have in ex-Governor Ralston a man whose sympathies are with the people of Indiana and in whom the masses can find a representative.

W. J. BRYAN.

Henry Ford has given public notice that on September 16th he will close his immense automobile manufacturing plants because the coal operators, taking advantage of the artificial scarcity produced by the strike of miners, have attempted to hold him up for seven million dollars on his next year's coal bill. Mr. Ford will have the sympathy of every householder in the land, coupled with a regret that they are in not in a position to fight the profiteers in the same manner.

### THINGS INEXCUSABLE

Violence is inexcusable; no one can justify it. The laboring man who resorts to violence in any form is the enemy of his class. But while we insist on obedience to the law we must not overlook other inexcusable acts. Turning the army over to the railroad executives is also inexcusable. The army belongs to the government and should only be used to carry out the decrees of the government.

### GUESSING RUN WILD

Just to illustrate how wildly a man can guess when he gets the idea that he has brute blood in his veins, the following letter just received is submitted to the readers of The Commoner. The name and the personal part are withheld:

"We are told in Genesis 2:7 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.'

"Now the question at once arises as to the meaning of the word 'dust.' The ordinary interpretation appears to satisfy most persons but in this case, from the importance of the point at issue, it is well to consider it more carefully. On doing this we find that the word 'dust' is used again in the ensuing chapter. On condemning the serpent God says in verse 14, 'Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.'

"Again considering the subject carefully for the reason above stated, we find that the ordinary interpretation is absolutely inadequate as a serpent could not subsist upon dust as we term it; snakes being known as carnivorous subsisting entirely on lower forms of life such as live in the dust or on the ground such as frogs, insects, etc., or anything alive inhabiting the dust. The meaning of the inspired narrative thus takes on a new aspect its significance being indubitable and unmistakable. In our haste we have been accusing the narrative of assuming an unnecessary difficulty in the creation of man—namely, forming him out of actual dust or 'inanimate matter' a meaning which even science does not assume at present to be possible or at least probable.

"The Bible does not, of course, say positively that dust consists of insects or other life but if we interpret the word in the light of modern zoology, as we have the right, it certainly places the burden of proof on the other side; i. e. on those that claim, unnecessarily we believe, that man was created from actual dust as we understand the term."

### MICHAEL COLLINS, MARTYR

Michael Collins had already ascended to the top rank of great Irishmen by his fearless and intelligent devotion to Ireland's welfare. His assassination lifts him into the ranks of the Irish immortals and gives world-wide importance to the lesson that comes with his death. "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church" is an old phrase and is as true as it is old. Sacrifice is the final test of love and the tragedy of death is the argument that surpasses all others in effectiveness. The example of one who lives for a truth exerts a very large influence—a life is much more potent than mere words, but death is more potent than life.

Collins was a powerful factor in the triumph of Ireland's aspirations for home rule but he will do more in his death than he could have done in his life. The shedding of his blood will arouse the friends of Ireland to new activity and it will shame into submission those who are responsible for the assassination.

"Without the shedding of blood there is no remission," is Bible doctrine and its seems almost as true in the world at large. Wrong seems on the point of victory when death startles the world—someone's blood arouses the determination that puts an end to the wrong and carries reform to success. An enemy is thus made to serve a righteous cause; wrath defeats itself. Michael Collins has accomplished even more than he had in mind; his services aid a world instead of a nation.

A press dispatch under a Springfield, Illinois, date, carries the news that the coal operators have decided to raise the price of coal one dollar and twenty-five cents a ton. The mine workers come back with a statement that this is pure profiteering. The miners get no increase in wages and there is no other increase in costs—it is just greed taking advantage of an opportunity. The time will come when the government will feel it its duty to restrain such highway robbery as it now restrains the use of a gun by the highway man on the roadside. These polite highway men operate on a large scale and "hold up the public" for millions. Why should not the government act now?

A poll of Boone county, Iowa, farmers was taken the other day on the ship subsidy question. The vote, as reported, was 615 against to 1 for. The accuracy of the poll can be readily assumed. That is about the proportion the people at large would give if they had a chance to express their opinions.

## Whose Army Is It?

The people of the United States may soon have to deal with a very important question, namely, to whom does the army of the United States belong? We are supporting over one hundred thousand men and the chief reason for them seems to be for use in labor troubles. The forts have been withdrawn from the frontier to the neighborhood of cities. No loyal citizen will object to the use of the military arm of the government to enforce law and suppress lawlessness, but who is to decide when the army is needed or the purpose for which it is needed?

If railroad companies or coal companies fall out with their employees so that public business is interrupted, has either side to the dispute a right to decide upon its course, regardless of the opinion of the other and regardless of public welfare and then summon the army to carry out private opinions? If the employers decide that the employees are unreasonable in their demands, can the employers use the army to carry out their private decision? If, on the other hand, the employees decide that the employers demands are unreasonable, can they call upon the army to enforce their demands and what they have decided is just? Is it not the duty of the government to decide in such cases? The army is not a band of mercenaries to be employed in carrying out the personal views of either employers or employees; it is the arm of the government to be used for the support of the government in the enforcing of its decrees. The army belongs to the people and the people speak through the government—what right has any man, whether employer or employee, to demand the use of this instrument of the government for private purposes?

It used to be customary for men engaged in what is called "big business" to answer requests for arbitration by saying that there was nothing to arbitrate. They claimed that they were attending to their own business and had a right to attend to it as they pleased. But is a man really attending to nothing but his own business when he attempts to fix the conditions under which thousands and tens of thousands shall live? Granted that a man has a right to decide things that affect HIMSELF ONLY, but what right has he to decide arbitrarily matters that affect the lives of a multitude?

As long as employers and employees agree the public pays little attention to wage scales and time contracts, but when they cannot agree the government becomes an interested party because it speaks for the people when it speaks with the army. It must speak for the WHOLE people and do what the whole people want done, not that which may be desired by a group of employers or employees.

The present strikes have brought great hardship upon the public, but they will have been worth something if they bring the American people to a realization of the fact that the army belongs to the government and can only be used by the government for the enforcing of that which the government thinks ought to be enforced.

W. J. BRYAN.

Representative Fordney, whose name is attached to the highest tariff bill ever passed by the house, is to retire at the end of his term. Our own guess is that he will feel the need of the addition to his income that comes from drawing a congressman's salary if the tariff bill passes in its present form.

### A CORRECTION

In a recent issue of The Commoner I quoted what a Chicago newspaper reported Rev. John H. Williamson, Law Enforcement Officer of Chicago, had stated in regard to education among the criminals at Joliet. The paper quoted him as saying that five out of six of all the criminals had a college training. When the figures were disputed I wrote to Mr. Williamson and received a letter from him saying that the newspaper report was inaccurate. What he really said was that of the FIVE criminals selected from among the prisoners for examination by a committee of the Bar Association FOUR out of the five had a college or high-school training. Mr. Williamson accompanied the committee. I am glad to make the correction.

The facts as he states them are warning enough. A successful criminal must have an education; no uneducated criminal can do much in the way of forgery, embezzlement, or swindling. The figures show that moral development is necessary to restrain the increased power that comes with intellectual development. W. J. BRYAN.