

THE WEEKLY PRESS FORUM.

Glaucrook (Ia.) Northern: The national banks will not be satisfied until they own the whole money system.

Minden (Neb.) Courier: An honest carpet-bag government like civilized warfare is a contradiction of terms.

Marion (Ill.) Press: The would-be reorganizers of the democratic party are gracious enough to permit the old landmark democrats to vote for them.

Carlyle (Ill.) Constitution: The workingman who voted two years ago for a "full dinner pail" will hardly be able to put much beef in it at the present high price.

Rolla (Mo.) Sharpshooter: The man that takes no interest in politics should bear in mind the fact that the corporations do, and that is why the corporations are getting all the "prosperity" that is loose.

Pekin (Ill.) Times: Governor Taft says the Filipinos are corrupt because they have been used to corruption. From all accounts, there are Americans over there who are giving them plenty of what they are used to, too.

Lincoln (Neb.) Independent: The Boston Herald wants to know how many more reports similar to the one made by Major Gardener are hidden away in the archives of the war department. Secretary Root could tell, but he won't.

Rushville (Ind.) Jacksonian: It was a Lincoln who said "no man is good enough to govern another man without that man's consent." But the Taft commission has a different theory. It finds it convenient to forget what Lincoln said.

Winfield (Kan.) Tribune: There is no reason for protecting in the home market a manufacturer who can export his goods, for that means that he can meet foreign competition abroad, and if he can do that he can do it more easily at home.

Clarksburg (Mo.) Review: It is "treason against the United States" in the Philippines to "join a political party or any society for the promulgation of any political opinion or policy." If this isn't imperialism, what is it?

Chicago Public: Now comes the wild-eyed Inter Ocean and propounds this conundrum: "Is Republicanism a Crime?" Giving the accused the benefit of the doubt, we should say that in Illinois it is simply a case of disorderly conduct.

Bolivar (Mo.) Herald: By the way, what has become of Babcock, who was going to clip the wings of the trusts by putting all trust made goods on the free list? He has been lost in the shuffle, as all republicans will be who talk about attacking this octopus.

Massena (N. Y.) Forum: Even our sires of the revolutionary days, great as were their achievements, do not equal Botha, DeWett and Delarey. Meanwhile we are looking on and assisting the British. What has become of the spirit that animated Americans in '76?

Xenia (O.) Herald: The democratic voters of Ohio are not exerting themselves to obtain political advice from gold democrats and other republicans, and cannot be fooled by their representatives. The game of wolf in sheep clothing has become too transparent.

Frankfort (Ind.) Standard: Did it ever occur to the opponents of electing senators by the people to look

over the list of senators and count the men who never would have had a seat in that body if their election had been left to the people. Sit down and think it over. It's a longer list than you would suppose.

Fulton (Mo.) Telegraph: The Telegraph has been an outspoken advocate of the free silver cause since the day it was presented to congress by the late Hon. Aylette H. Buckner—long before some of the "smart Alecks" were born—and we have no apologies to offer for our course nor cause to regret our action in the matter.

Joshua (Tex.) News: Let our newly converted democrats remember that, while the old man did truly welcome the prodigal son with much rejoicing, he did not turn the place over to him and tell him to run it to suit himself. Nor did the prodigal son have the nerve to ask for such a thing; he only wanted to come in as a servant.

Monticello (Ia.) Times: The magnates of the lumber trust have raised the price on the higher grade of white pine lumber from \$2 to \$3 per thousand feet. While the forests of the United States are disappearing and the price of lumber is increasing the tariff on lumber is still maintained. These are golden days for the magnates of the lumber trusts.

Monmouth (Ill.) Democrat: Is it possible that the republicans are putting time limits on the legislative acts they foster—the ship subsidy bill and the paltry Cuban concessions—because they have no faith in themselves or their measures, or because they think the people will submit to acts labelled "temporary"?

North Vernon (Ind.) Sun: It is said the ship subsidy bill will be killed in the house—rather it will be given knock-out drops that will put it to sleep until after the elections next fall. The people can't be fooled this way. They are getting tired of a congress for monopolies and they will make a clean sweep next November.

Salem (Va.) Times-Register: Those who favor the retention of the Philippines do not seem to take into account that the Philippines do not want the class of goods we manufacture, and no system can be devised by which we can make a profit in the islands at all commensurate with the great outlay of life and money.

Rockville (Ind.) Tribune: It is a little tough on Democratic farmers to be compelled to contribute to the republican campaign fund, when they buy rural mail boxes, but they can't help it. Of course the fourteen favored firms who manufacture mail boxes are opposed to "Bryanism," and will contribute to its defeat at any and all times.

Corning (Ia.) Free Press: The editors of the Manila papers are in jail because they told about the steals going on there in government quarters. They were sentenced under the sedition laws that require them to keep silent. Taft says that such exposures cause the natives to lose confidence in the military bosses. And we are told we have freedom of the press. Pshaw!

Celina (O.) Democrat: Hanna is a friend of labor—Chinese cheap labor. We always thought he was, notwithstanding some of his recent demagogic vaporings. A few days ago when his pet ship subsidy bill was under consideration he showed his love for American laborers by voting against the Patterson amendment, which provided that no bounty could be paid to vessels carrying Chinese crews. Mr. Hanna still knows his business, but there is a great big gob of American workmen who don't know theirs.

STONE'S CARNEGIE INTERVIEW

To the Editor of the Republic.

Macon, Mo., April 20.—While in Kansas City last week my attention was called to a telegram from Columbia to the effect that one or more gentlemen connected with the state university were making an effort to induce Mr. Carnegie to donate a sum of money to erect a library building on the university campus upon condition that the state would meet him half way and appropriate a similar sum for the same purpose, and I expressed my unqualified disapproval of the movement. The language of the interview with me was that of the interviewer, not mine, but outside the personal phases of the interview, which where made unnecessarily harsh, I endorse what I was represented as saying.

In Friday's Republic I find an editorial criticising what I said and taking issue with me, and while the criticism is couched in terms a little sharp, it is a fair criticism from the standpoint of one who does not agree with my view, and I have no complaint to make of it. However, I would like to say a few words on the other side.

The vulgar criticisms I have seen in one or two papers, not the Republic, of my protest against this Carnegie library scheme, attributing to me demagogical and unworthy motives, are wide of the mark. I have no thought of attacking Mr. Carnegie or any man simply because he is rich, nor did I have any thought of making a general onslaught on accumulated wealth. There seems to be a class of oversensitive people who appear to think that every time an ordinary American citizen fails to prostrate himself before our giant men of gold—our mighty Moneybags—he is in design, at least, a dangerous man, and the newspaper organs of that class, standing vigilant guard, take up the cudgel promptly. Such of those organs as have berated me in this instance after the fashion indicated, wholly misinterpret my motives. Fair criticism like that of the Republic I do not object to, but rather invite, since the question involved is one of great moment and ought to be dispassionately discussed; but mere vilification is contemptible.

I had no thought, and have none now, of assailing men of wealth simply because they are rich; nothing of the kind. Nevertheless it is a fact—I believe it to be a fact—known to most observant men, that an effort is being made, and for a long time has been, put forth by our millionaires and billionaires, operating through different agencies, to control or to influence the selection of certain lines of text-books used even in the common public schools, and especially those used in the leading colleges and universities of the country; and still more it is especially apparent that these people are endeavoring to direct the course of instruction in the great universities on political economy, covering the whole field of finance and industry, and also on civil government and political history. Many of these men, as we know, have accumulated their vast fortunes by methods and through governmental agencies which would not be permitted or tolerated if the government were administered according to democratic ideas instead of republican ideas—according to the principles of Jefferson, instead of the principles of Hamilton. This class of enormously rich men are selfishly interested—or, if you please, interested from higher motives—but interested, very deeply interested, in maintaining and perpetuating the public policies of which they have been, and still are, the lavish beneficiaries.

These men are seeking, I am sorry to say, with too much success, to get

control of the great schools of the country. This they are accomplishing by princely donations and endowments. They place the institutions receiving their gifts under great obligations to them, if they do not make them dependent upon their bounty. They become potent in the college directorate, and, while they pose as philanthropists and patrons of learning, they have much to say, if not a controlling voice, in determining what shall be taught on certain subjects, and who shall or shall not teach it. The purpose of all this is evident. Every year these great schools are sending forth an army of highly equipped young men, who begin almost immediately to exercise a strong influence on the community, and who soon become dominant forces in society. If they have been taught a certain way, educated on certain lines, they are apt to lead off and go in that direction. If they are educated in the faith of the plutocrat, they are apt to adhere to the creed of the plutocrat. If they are taught to believe in the ideas of Hamilton, they may never adopt the ideas of Jefferson.

Am I mistaken in my premises? Am I mistaken in saying what our multimillionaires, or some of them, are attempting to do, or have done? Am I talking of realities or merely conjuring a specter, baseless and unsubstantial as a dream? Many disgraceful things occurring in some of the leading universities of the country, notably the peremptory dismissal of the president of Brown university and of Professor Bemis of the Chicago university, might be pointed to prove the truth of what I say. What were these men dismissed for? Because they refused to teach political economy and monetary science according to the rules prescribed by the republican millionaire philanthropists who had endowed the schools with a few of their surplus millions.

The temptation to accept these munificent gifts and endowments, I know, is great; but I would, if I could, save the University of Missouri from the danger of subserviency or truckling to the blandishments or power of individual wealth. I am the firm friend of the university. It is the glorious crown of our great public school system. I wish I could inspire every Missourian with pride in it and love for it. I wish I could induce every parent in the state to send his children from the high schools, the normals and denominational schools to the university. I wish I could induce the people of the state to endow it and put it above the necessity of asking for annual appropriations for its ordinary support. I wish I could persuade our people to do whatever might be necessary to make it one of the very greatest universities in the world. But I would not for any consideration, however tempting, mortgage, much less sell, its independence to any man or set of men. I would never put its liberty of thought and action in jeopardy. If politics, partisan politics, is to be taught in the classrooms, which never ought to be done at all, I do not want to run the risk of having Jefferson and Jeffersonian democracy tabooed in the University of Missouri.

I am for the library building; it is undoubtedly needed, and the state ought to build it, and build one commensurate with the needs and dignity of the institution. But I am opposed to the state of Missouri going into partnership with Mr. Carnegie for the support and conduct of its chief institution of learning. A donation from Mr. Carnegie for a library building would be simply an entering

(Continued on Page 12.)