

ers more than half a century. The elder Bliss, now past eighty-three, and his wife are enjoying an enviable experience. Their active labors over, with minds still alert and with hearts still young, they are spending the evening of their lives near the scenes of their labors and among the children and grandchildren who have blessed their home. Their rest has been earned, and the peace of their latter years is a merited reward. Surely they illustrate the blessedness of lives consecrated to a high purpose and rich in noble service.

Copyright.

"CURED OF ENTERPRISE"

Henry H. Rogers, the Standard Oil magnate, maddened by the attacks upon him, said: "If I ever was diseased with enterprise, I am now cured."

Commenting upon this remark, the Wall Street Journal says:

"Well, there are others who will catch the disease for happily it is epidemic in the United States. If Mr. Rogers refuses to play because he can not dictate the rules of the game, in other words, if Mr. Rogers refuses to engage in business enterprise because public opinion has forced the adoption of new rules for the purpose of establishing fair play, then the loss is his, not the country's. It is true that Mr. Rogers and men who may think as he does by withdrawing from enterprise would be able to inflict much injury to business, but the damage they might do, is after all but temporary, for the country is greater than they, and will soon outstrip them, while other men, willing to play according to the new rules, take their places."

What has come over the spirit of the Wall Street Journal's dreams? It talks just like a Chicago platform democrat. Mr. Perkins' threat to bring trouble upon the world by going out of business was a threat common to the campaign of 1896. Then we were told that if the tariff barons and the money kings were not permitted to dictate they would quit doing business for us. And every republican paper from the Wall Street Journal down to the New York Sun said that the people must heed the threat.

The Wall Street Journal has, indeed, made progress if it has learned that the country is greater than Rogers or any other individual. The democratic speeches of 1896 were full of sentiments such as are expressed by the Journal in the editorial referred to. For instance, in addressing a gathering of business men at Chicago during the closing days of the 1896 campaign, Mr. Bryan said: "I have said that those who so often assume to be the only business men sometimes make a great mistake in supposing that the prosperity of a nation rests upon them. I am going to talk today to business men, and I want to say to you that in pleading the cause of the farmer and the laborer I am trying to lay a substantial foundation upon which the business of this country can be done. If you engage in merchandise and in the exchange of wealth, and suppose that the prosperity of the producer depends upon you, you deceive yourselves. Wealth must be created before it can be distributed. Those who create wealth could live although you should go out of business, but you can not live if the producers of wealth go out of business. I believe that that policy is best for this country which brings prosperity first to those who toil; give them first the inspiration to work and then protect them in the enjoyment of their rightful share of the proceeds of their toil, and their prosperity will find its way up to the other classes of society which rests upon them. I challenge you to find in the pages of recorded history a single instance where prosperity came from the upper crust of society; it always comes from the masses—the foundation of society."

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 both-

ered 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.

"OBVIOUS"

The Washington Post says: "It is obvious to all the common sense in America that gold is not valuable because it is coined, but that it is coined because it is valuable, and that all 'basic' money partakes of sham that is not as valuable in the melting pot as it is in the coin."

If gold is coined only "because it is valuable," why coin it at all?

And why clothe it with legal tender power?

And if we only coin money because the material out of which it is coined is "valuable" what about the silver coinage?

And if it is "obvious to all the common sense in America" that "all basic money partakes of sham that is not as valuable in the melting pot as it is in the coin," what about the 500,000,000 silver dollars now "current money with the merchants," and coined "without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation," at the hateful ratio of 16 to 1?

The Washington Post's editorial on the money question should be consigned to "Something Doing in the Country" the column which the Post uses to poke fun at country newspapers.

WHY NOT ROCKEFELLER?

A Washington dispatch says that the administration is now bent upon "the dissolution of the great Standard Oil Trust." According to this information "the battle to be waged against the Oil trust" will be "similar to that brought against the Northern Securities company, which sent the merger to the scrap heap."

But it will not be overlooked that the conspirators in the Northern Securities affair are doing business at the old stand, although the particular form under which they operated was "dissolved."

Why all this disposition to proceed against the corporation rather than the man? Is it not strange that all the efforts on the "trust busting" line are directed either against the corporation itself or against some inconsequential persons?

The way to dissolve a burglar trust is to catch and prosecute the burglars—particularly the ring-leaders. The way to dissolve that gigantic conspiracy against the public interests known as the Standard Oil Trust, is to arrest and prosecute John D. Rockefeller, H. H. Rogers and other leading conspirators.

The public obtained a hint of the importance of proceedings taken against Mr. Rockefeller personally by the persistency he displayed in dodging a mere writ of subpoena commanding him to appear before a magistrate and testify.

Have not the people grown a bit weary of boast and bombast? From the first proceeding—the "dissolution" of the Northern Securities company—to the most recent instance—the conviction of the rebaters before Judge McPherson at Kansas City—there have been no substantial results. In the first instance it was a paper vic-

tory, which was not followed up to public advantage. In the latter instance it was escape for the important criminals and prison sentence for the go-betweens—a broker and his clerk who, by the way, have not yet commenced their sentence.

If the administration is serious let it procure warrants for the arrest of John D. Rockefeller, H. H. Rogers and their fellow conspirators. There is abundant testimony and if such a proceeding were placed in the hands of an able and determined lawyer, while those administration experts in the "immunity bath" line were kept in the background, everyone of these powerful violators of the law could be sent to prison. These conspiracies in restraint of trade are not to be destroyed by the wiping out of the form under which they operate. Ingenious lawyers will very readily provide them with another form. But once let it be understood that however powerful or wealthy men may be they violate the anti-trust law at their peril and these "captains of industry" will have considerably more respect for the law than they now have.

ONE PARTY DOMINATION

The Wall Street Journal cordially approves Secretary Taft's suggestion that the south break away from the democratic party. The Journal says: "With one party dominating the political thought, these great questions with which the prosperity of the people is involved never receive that accuracy of statement and that fullness of discussion which is necessary for a satisfactory solution."

Why not give some of the eastern states—New York for instance—warning against the dangers of one party domination. The Journal pleads with the south to deliver itself from "the hypnotism of race fear and one party fealty." Why not plead with some of the eastern states to deliver themselves from the hypnotism of the money power and fealty to the party whose campaign funds are supplied by the money power?

PREDICTIONS

The New York Sun predicts that the democrats will elect the next governor of New York, and that the next governor of New York will be elected to the presidency in 1908. Referring to this prediction the New York World says that it has a better prediction, viz. that a democratic governor will not be elected in 1906, and a democratic president will not be elected in 1908.

But the World has made mistakes. It was cocksure that if the democratic party became "safe and sane," according to the Pulitzer specification, it would win in 1904. But if memory is not at fault the democratic national ticket was defeated; and not six months ago the World expressed the opinion that the democratic party is dead, when, as clearly shown by current events, it promises to be a very lively factor in the congressional campaign of 1906 as in the campaigns to follow.

ROOSEVELT AND LAFOLLETTE

The Sioux City (Iowa) Journal, republican, says: "Senator LaFollette is not in accord with President Roosevelt. He is not in accord with the republican majority in congress."

Of course Senator LaFollette is not in accord with the republican majority in congress. That is one reason why the people have confidence in the Wisconsin senator.

A great many republicans who have imagined that Mr. Roosevelt and Senator LaFollette were fighting on the same side in the great contest between public interests and special interests are beginning to suspect that "Senator LaFollette is not in accord with President Roosevelt," or, in other words, that Roosevelt and LaFollette are not fighting on the same side. Parenthetically, does anyone doubt which side LaFollette is fighting on?

SUPPOSE

Referring to Mr. Bryan's statement that the quantitative theory of money has been vindicated the Omaha Bee, republican, asks: "Suppose there had been drouths in the wheat and corn belts, and the weevil had gotten in his work in the cotton belt, and as a sequence the construction of steam railroads, trolley lines and skyscrapers that have created an extraordinary demand for pig iron and steel products had been curtailed, what effect would the increased output of the gold mines have had on the farmers, cotton planters and mine and mill workers?"

Suppose the world had come to an end what would have become of all the people?