

among all the thousands of men who exercise popular sovereignty." He even declares: "The first fruits of democracy are many of them crude and unlovely; its mistakes are many, its partial failures many, its sins not few."

This is the new doctrine of which we have heard since we entered upon our colonial experiment. The idea that government by others is the natural thing and that self-government is an art that is to be acquired—this is something new in the United States. Clay, once secretary of state, and for years a respected authority in this country on matters of government, made a speech some eighty-eight years ago in defense of the independence of the South American republics. In the course of that speech he said: "Self-government is the natural government of man." He went farther and characterized the opposite doctrine as the excuse of kings, saying: "It is the doctrine of thrones that man is too ignorant to govern himself. Their partisans assert his incapacity in reference to all nations; if they can not command universal assent to the proposition it is then demanded as to particular nations; and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us." And then he used a sentence to which Secretary Root's attention is especially called: "I contend that it is to arraign the dispositions of Providence himself to suppose that He created beings incapable of governing themselves, and to be trampled on by kings."

Which is the correct doctrine, the doctrine of Root that "capacity for self-government does not come to man by nature," or the doctrine of Clay, that "self-government is the natural government of man?" Which is right, that God made people incapable of self-government and left them to develop a capacity or that God created them capable of self-government but also capable of improvement?

President Lincoln also had something to say on this subject. In 1858 he said: "Those arguments that are made, that the inferior races are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying, that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow—what are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for the enslavement of the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kings were of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it but because the people are better off for being ridden." Which was right, Abraham Lincoln or Secretary Root? Is the republican party willing to substitute the Root doctrine for the Lincoln doctrine?

The issue is a fundamental one. If we once admit that any people are incapable of self-government and that therefore they can justly be governed from without "for their own good," of course, we abandon the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence—we abandon the theory of government which we have so carefully developed for a century and a quarter and plant ourselves upon the ground occupied by kings and emperors.

A SAMPLE

J. Pierpont Morgan is quoted in Town Topics as saying that cities which try government ownership will have keen and disastrous disappointments. Has he never compared the cost of water in the cities that have municipal plants and those that permit private plants to furnish the water? Lincoln, Neb., and Omaha are an illustration. In Lincoln the city owns the plant. At Omaha a private corporation supplies the water. Although the water at Lincoln is drawn from wells and at Omaha it is drawn from the river, water is furnished to the people of Lincoln at less than half the price which the private company charges the people of Omaha.

"THE ALTERNATIVE IS GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP"

In his annual message President Roosevelt said: "It is unfortunate that our present laws should forbid all combinations instead of sharply discriminating between those combinations which do good and those combinations which do evil." In the same message he said: "What we need is, not vainly to try to prevent all combinations, but to secure such rigorous and adequate control and supervision of the combinations as to prevent their injuring the public or existing in such form as inevitably to threaten injury—for the mere fact that a combination has secured practically complete control of a necessary of life, would, under any circumstances, show that such combination was to be presumed to be adverse to the public interest."

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch recalls that in

the Northern Securities case, Judge Thayer declared that a monopoly is a menace to the public interests whether it actually exerts power to injure or not; that the mere power, latent or actual, is a menace. The Post Dispatch would like to have President Roosevelt say how he would ascertain whether a combination is good or evil. It points out that the experience of the American people is that combination tends inevitably to monopoly and public injury.

Then the Post-Dispatch concludes this somewhat remarkable editorial in these words:

"Again, American experience in regulation and control is not encouraging. It has proven itself a doubtful cure of a disease which might better have been prevented. Combinations have been controlled to the extent of dissolution. But they recombine on another basis and the same wrongs are committed again and again. Moreover, the question presses, will the government regulate and control the good combines or will the good combines regulate and control the government? The knavish resources of monopoly seem to be unlimited. Trust lawyers are fertile-witted men, and it is notorious that some of the worst monopolies are well represented in the government. Mr. Roosevelt himself had experience of this when he sought to procure the passage of the rate bill and the meat inspection bill. There is no middle ground. Monopoly is an evil thing. There is no good in it, and to permit it in any form is to throw open the doors to every abuse of irresponsible power. It must be crushed, not tolerated and regulated. THE ALTERNATIVE IS GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP, which Mr. Roosevelt professes to hold in special horror. But if his views, as expressed in his message, prevail, he will have done more than any other single influence to drive the country to that very issue."

The Post-Dispatch understands the situation. There is, indeed, no middle ground. In the language of the Kansas City platform "a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable." Monopoly must be crushed and other corporations not monopolies must be regulated. "The alternative is government ownership." That is substantially the opinion expressed by Mr. Bryan in his Madison Square speech, for the giving of which, if memory is not at fault, he was criticized by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

PARTICULARLY GREEDY

The senate has adopted a resolution introduced by Senator Hansbrough of North Dakota directing the department of commerce and labor to investigate the National Harvester company. It looks as if justice would at last reach this greedy combine. Success to the investigation.

THE FARMERS' UNIONS

The growth of the Farmers' Union in the southwest, and of the American Society of Equity in the central west, is an indication that the farmers of the country are arousing to the point of realizing the need of concerted action in order to protect their industrial interests. The Farmers' Unions are being organized on the plans of the modern trades union, and in many localities are affiliated with the local Federation of Labor and have delegates in all meetings of that body. The union tradesman insists that he be allowed some voice in the matter of deciding what compensation he shall receive for his labor, and the farmers who are joining in the union movement are merely voicing the same demand. Under present conditions the farmer is compelled to sell his produce at the price fixed by the buyer, and at the same time is compelled to purchase at the price fixed by the seller. This system, like the colored gentleman's con trap, "catches the farmer a-comin' an' a-gwine." It is very much the same system as obtains in financial circles. The bank claims the option of paying you in whatever form of money it elects, and also claims the option of telling you what form of money you must pay the bank when you discharge the obligation.

Very naturally the interests that have been exploiting the farmers for generations are beginning to denounce the new union as a "farmer's trust," but this will deceive only those who dearly love to be deceived. The farmers who are joining it—and they are joining in large numbers, are merely demanding some voice in the matter of fixing the price at which they shall sell the product of their labor, and in order to make that demand effective, they are organizing for mutual protection and benefit. And as the workmen in

the various trades have been benefited by their union organizations, just so will the farmers be benefited in proportion as they shall make their organizations strong, without being tyrannical, and shall make only those demands that are founded in common justice. The Farmers' Union should grow in strength and influence until it practically includes all those who live by tilling the soil.

KEEPING DOWN SILVER

A Des Moines, Ia., reader of The Commoner writes. "I enclose a copy of the Capital of this city, edition of the 13th, with two marked items of telegraphic news. On page one is an item from New York City, reporting the presence of Secretary Shaw in that city, and Wall Street understanding of the purpose of his visit. On page eight is an item from Washington City, that Secretary Shaw has refused all offers of sale of silver bullion at 72 cents because he considers the price too high. For more than forty years this country has been a large exporter of silver bullion, and in the last ten years the exports of silver bullion have exceeded the imports by more than \$200,000,000. It matters not what the price of bar silver has been for a fine ounce, we have been steady and large exporters, yet Secretary Shaw, who poses as being in favor of protection of American industries, exerts himself to the limit of his opportunity to bear the price of one of our great industries, and the basis of the wealth of a large number of our people in all the western states, and at the same moment he is reported as being in Wall street watching to protect the financial interests of the clique controlling it. I have before me the American Almanac and Year Book giving the annual imports and exports of silver bullion and see that my statement of \$200,000,000 excess of exports during the past ten years is much too low. Would not Secretary Shaw be more consistent if he would lend a helping hand to all our industries rather than the favored few?"

In all our history the silver metal has taken care of itself whenever given half a show. In every instance of favorable legislation the price has gone higher. It needed but the announcement that the secretary of the treasury would enter the market for the purpose of buying silver to make a marked increase in the market price of the metal. It would not, however, serve the purposes of the money trust to permit silver to go so high as to remove, even in the consideration of the blindest of men, the "fifty-cent dollar argument." The republican party is "a great friend of home industry," but, as pointed out by the Des Moines reader, it habitually antagonizes one of America's greatest industries. This is not at all strange, however, now that we know that while republican leaders had much to say in protest against what they called a "fifty-cent dollar" they are now paving the way for imposing asset currency upon the American people—and asset currency means a no-cent dollar.

"BLESS EVERYBODY"

A curly head bowed on my knee,
A little form all clad in white,
Two dimpled hands clasped reverently—
And God receives the last "Goodnight!"
No hour so solemn, none so sweet,
No scene of innocence so fair
As this, when Faith and Childhood meet
And know each other in a prayer.
Not blessings born of men she asks—
Petitions for herself alone—
Not countless treasures, easy tasks,
A harvest reaped, though nothing sown;
Not happiness nor length of days,
Nor peace nor pleasure is the plea—
Not even for a mother's praise,
However sweet it seem to be.
For those she loves this little child
In tender accents intercedes,
As if our hearts were reconciled
To make contentment of our needs.
A blessing on each one of kin,
And then—Love's banner all unfurl'd,
As if to take Creation in—
"Bless Everybody in the world!"
Bless all the world? O gentle heart,
That throbs not with one selfish thrill,
That isolates no soul apart,
Forbodes no living creature ill;
The incense from thy altar place
High in the clouds is wreathed and curl'd
To bear the message of thy grace
To "everybody in the world!"
—W. P. H., in Ohio Magazine.