

ministration and appeal to the people to substitute constitutional and orderly government for the present despotism. They insist that each individual shall be held accountable for his conduct and that punishments prescribed by law shall be inflicted according to law when the guilt of the accused has been established by the courts.

The situation in Colorado calls for patriotic and rational treatment. The root of the trouble is to be found in the lack of sympathy between employer and employes and no permanent peace can come until they begin to deal with each other in a different spirit. The employers have arrayed themselves against the just demands of those who are engaged in manual labor and the feeling has become more and more unfriendly. As the controversy has grown out of the needs of the employes, it can not be settled by the substitution of other employes unless they have lower aspirations and fewer needs.

The miners' union has sprung into existence to secure for the laborers the reforms which they need for themselves and for their families. An entirely new set of laborers, if of equal intelligence and ambition, would have the same needs and would in a short time form a new union to enforce the same demands. The Peabody plan, then, must result not only in present injustice and disregard of civil rights, but it involves a constant repetition of the scenes which have been witnessed in Cripple Creek, with increasing tension between the classes.

The mine owners of Colorado can not work the mines themselves and if for their own temporary profit they are willing to fill their mines with less skilful, less competent and less ambitious workmen they will only aggravate conditions and invite new forms of trouble.

The democrats would substitute reason for force and instead of attempting to coerce the wage earners into the acceptance of unfair conditions would remove animosity and restore good will by a scrupulous recognition of the rights of both employer and employe. They favor remedial legislation which will insure justice as between man and man.

A democratic victory in Colorado this year will not only be a boon to that state but it will be a warning to employers in other states to observe the constitution and the laws in dealing with their employes.

“Words Are Good”

Under date of August 30, Mr. Roosevelt wrote to General Boynton, representing the army of the Cumberland, a letter in which he paid a high tribute to the services of the volunteer soldiery during the civil war, adding:

In any great crisis of war this nation must rely mainly upon its volunteer soldiery, and the veterans of the civil war have left us forever the model of what such a soldiery should be. We of the younger generation owe you a debt greater than we can ever pay, alike in the lessons you taught us in war, and for the lessons you taught in peace.

Mr. Roosevelt seems to have become suddenly impressed with the importance of the part the volunteer soldiery plays. During the Spanish-American war, under date of Santiago, July 25, 1898, Mr. Roosevelt sent to Secretary of War Alger, the following letter: “We earnestly hope you will send most of the regulars and at any rate the cavalry division, including the Rough Riders, who are as good as any regulars and three times as good as any state troops, to Porto Rico. There are 1,800 effective men in this division. If those who were left behind were joined to them, we could land at Porto Rico in this cavalry division close to 4,000 men who would be worth, easily, any 10,000 national guards, armed with black powder, Springfields, or other archaic weapons.”

Secretary Alger, under date of Washington, August 4, 1898, sent by cable the following reply:

“Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Santiago: Your letter of the 23d is received. The regular army, the volunteer army, and the Rough Riders have done well, but I suggest that unless you want to spoil the effects and glory of your victory, you make no invidious comparisons. The Rough Riders are no better than other volunteers. They had an advantage in their arms, for which they ought to be very grateful. R. A. Alger, Secretary of War.”

Mr. Roosevelt seems now to be greatly impressed because of the great debt that “we of the younger generation” owe to the men who on land and on sea, proved their devotion to their country.

But, without making, to use Mr. Alger's term, “invidious comparisons,” we can not forget that

this same Theodore Roosevelt lost no opportunity to administer snubs to Admiral Dewey, the hero of Manila bay. We can not forget that this same Theodore Roosevelt undertook to place the brand of cowardice upon Admiral Schley, the hero of Santiago bay. We can not overlook the fact that this same Theodore Roosevelt permitted General Nelson A. Miles to retire from his place at the head of the army after forty years of faithful service to the American people with nothing more by way of recognition than the brief and cold-blooded order written by one of General Miles' discredited subordinates.

One of Mr. Roosevelt's favorite sayings is “Words are good when backed up by deeds and only so.” It is difficult to escape the suspicion that Mr. Roosevelt's profession of sympathy for the American soldiery has a distinct campaign flavor.

Judge Parker's Letter

In another column The Commoner reproduces in full Judge Parker's letter of acceptance.

On the question of imperialism, self-government and the encroachment of executive authority, Judge Parker makes himself very clear.

He maintains that “if we would maintain our liberties and constitutional rights unimpaired we can not permit or tolerate at any time or for any purpose the arrogation of unconstitutional powers by the executive branch of our government. We should be ever mindful of the words of Webster: ‘Liberty is only to be preserved by maintaining constitutional restraints and a just division of political power.’”

On the question of imperialism Judge Parker says: “The issue of imperialism which has been thrust upon the country involves the decision whether the law of the land or the rule of individual caprice shall govern. The principle of imperialism may give rise to brilliant, startling, dashing results, but the principle of democracy holds in check the brilliant executive and subjects him to the sober, conservative control of the people.”

On the question of self-government, as applied particularly to the Philippines, Judge Parker says: “In some quarters it has been assumed that in the discussion of the Philippine question in my response, the phrase ‘self-government,’ was intended to mean something less than independence. It was not intended that it should be understood to mean, nor do I think as used it does mean less than independence. However, to eliminate all possibility for conjecture, I now state that I am in hearty accord with that plank in our platform that favors doing for the Filipinos what we have already done for the Cubans; and I favor making the promise to them now that we shall take such action as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it. If independence, such as the Cubans enjoy, can not be prudently granted to the Filipinos at this time, the promise that it shall come the moment they are capable of receiving it will tend to stimulate rather than hinder their development. And this should be done, not only in justice to the Filipinos, but to preserve our own rights; for a free people can not withhold freedom from another people and themselves remain free. The toleration of tyranny over others will soon breed contempt for freedom and self-government, and weaken our power of resistance to insidious usurpation of our constitutional rights.”

Other features of Judge Parker's letter will be treated in a subsequent issue.

All Against Republics

The Kansas City Journal, a republican paper, undertakes to pay a tribute to the Missouri mule and so far as its claim that the Missouri animal has “more docility, more forbearance, more patience, more good nature and more energy and powers of endurance than has any other breed of animals” is concerned the Journal makes a pretty good case. But the Journal says:

The mules of grand old Missouri are indispensable. During the Boer war 115,000 mules were taken to South Africa. They helped the English to win and are now engaged in developing the country.

The American people have not forgotten that during the Boer war large numbers of mules were taken to South Africa. It has been frequently charged that these shipments were used to help the English win, but we believe that this is the first time a republican paper has admitted that so

large a number as 115,000 mules were shipped from this country.

The American people will not soon forget that these shipments were permitted by a republican administration. The Journal might add to its reputation for frankness if it would ascertain and make public the number of men who were recruited at the British camp at New Orleans, under republican administration in this country, and recruited, as the 115,000 mules were shipped for the purpose of “helping the English to win.”

It will be remembered that the friends of the Boers appealed to the federal court at New Orleans for an injunction to prevent shipments of horses and mules to the British troops in South Africa. A cabinet meeting was called and the president and his advisors took the position that the courts had no jurisdiction in matters affecting the international policies of government. Inasmuch as the New Orleans case involved neutrality, it was agreed in the cabinet that the courts were without jurisdiction and that the executive should enjoy a monopoly of authority in the premises.

The cabinet opinion seemed to be sufficiently powerful to prevent any relief in the courts at any time; and yet, it was very generally agreed by lawyers that the question was, properly, one for the courts.

During the administration of Benjamin Harrison, while civil war was pending in Chili, the United States court at San Diego, California, issued a writ for the seizure of a vessel that had been loaded with munitions of war, on the ground that it was engaged in the violation of the neutrality laws. While this vessel was in the custody of a United States marshal, it was forcibly wrested from his control and put to sea. Our government made a demand upon the Chilian government that this vessel and its cargo be returned to the officers of the court, and this demand was recognized. In his message to congress, President Harrison, referring to this point, said: “It would have been inconsistent with the dignity and self-respect of this government not to have insisted that the Itata should be returned to San Diego to abide the judgment of the court.”

Is it not clear that Benjamin Harrison, who stood high among the lawyers of the country, did not entertain the notion that in the interpretation of the neutrality laws the judiciary was without authority and that the executive alone had jurisdiction?

In the same message President Harrison referred to a trial in the federal court of California which trial resulted in a decision holding that inasmuch as one of the contestants in a war had not been recognized as a belligerent, the acts done in its interest could not be a violation of our neutrality laws. “From this judgment,” says President Harrison, “the United States has appealed that we may know what the present state of our law is; for if this construction of the statute is correct, there is obvious necessity for revision and amendment.”

If this were a matter purely of executive authority the government would not have appealed. A cabinet meeting would have been held and notice would have been served upon the federal court that in attempting to interpret the laws, the judiciary was trespassing upon the rights of the executive branch of the government, a branch which, according to old-fashioned notions was designed for the execution rather than the interpretation of laws.

But President Harrison, it will be observed, said that an appeal was taken “that we may know what the present state of our law is.”

There we have, very clearly stated, Benjamin Harrison's idea that when any doubt exists concerning a law, the judiciary must determine it; the judiciary is the branch of government which is to interpret law.

But Benjamin Harrison was educated in the old-fashioned school of law as well as in the old-fashioned school of statesmanship. He had not learned that in this government the executive is the single power before which all other powers must bow. He had not learned that the mandate of men in executive positions is potent irrespective of the equities of the situation.

Class Against Class

Thomas W. Lawson, the Boston financier, has written an open letter to the governor of the Boston Stock Exchange in which letter Mr. Lawson charges that the Exchange is “being used to rob the people in a meaner and more contemptible way than the pickpocket or highwayman employes.” The editor of the Milwaukee News became highly indignant after reading Mr. Lawson's epistle to