

dent has partially adopted the democratic view on this subject, but so far the republican leaders have resolutely opposed it. The president is helping to educate the people up to the need of railroad regulation but his party, under its present leadership, is powerless to accomplish this or any other important reform. If the democratic party will clearly and unequivocally demand, first, the ascertaining of the value of all the railroads; second, the preventing of over-capitalization; and third, the reduction of rates to a point where they will yield only a reasonable return upon the real value of the roads—if the party will do this, it will commend itself not only to democrats but to those republicans who have been led to study the railroad question. The railroad situation presents a vital issue, and the issue should be so stated that everyone can understand the party's position. While democrats may differ as to the relative importance of the trust question, the tariff question and the railroad question, all must agree that the party must take the side of the common people on all three questions.

Let the line be drawn between those who want to make this a government of the people, by the people and for the people and those who want it to be a government of the corporations, by the corporations and for the corporations.

#### PLANNING FOR WAR

This is a great time for war scares. Put a uniform on a man and he writes with his sword and uses blood for ink. A Hungarian naval expert has surveyed the field and reached the conclusion that we should

First—Create a strong fleet on the Pacific.  
Second—Speedily complete the Panama canal.

Third—Increase western coast defenses and create several new bases.

Fourth—Make an immediate and extensive increase in the standing army.

And why? To resist the attack which, in the opinion of this expert, Japan is planning. And we have at home some of these "experts" whose inflamed imaginations exaggerate every Japanese into a regiment and see the Pacific coasts turned into a Japanese colony.

If our country followed the advice of jingoists and alarmists it would have the people so impoverished by preparations for war that they could not resist an attack if it ever came.

#### THINK IT OVER

In a speech delivered at Jamestown, Governor Hughes of New York said: "Political leaders who have performed the function of clearing-houses for legislation, and who while posing as party workers have served under a retainer of special interests, careless alike of party principles or of public justice, are passing from the stage."

They "are passing from the stage," are they? Undoubtedly that is what the representatives of special interests would have us believe. But even now it is generally believed that these same special interests will dominate the republican national convention, even as they dominate the republican United States senate.

Governor Hughes must be a humorist. How many among the possible nominees of the republican national convention are objectionable to the great corporations? Look at the list and think it over.

#### NOT DIFFICULT

Discussing the question "jail instead of fines" for the trust magnate, the Independent (New York) says: "In the case of great corporations engaged in transportation or manufacturing, the problem is how to fix individual responsibility by law without impairing the value of corporations as instruments of material progress, and it is a problem not easily solved. It is quite possible that drastic legislation fixing such responsibility would do more harm than good."

Why should it be any more difficult to fix individual responsibility so far as the corporation official is concerned "without impairing the value of corporations as instruments of material progress" than it is to fix individual responsibility among men generally without impairing the value of natural persons as agencies in the upbuilding of the community and its business interests?

The corporation obtains all of its powers as well as its life from the law. What the law says it may do that may it do; what the law forbids that it may not do; and what the law says with respect to the plans for keeping trade

and commerce among the several states free from conspiracy or restraint that is the rule; and it is the duty of men who accept responsible office in corporations to see that the law is not violated.

"Corporations as instruments of material progress" are useful only when they serve public interests. When their power is so used as to make them a menace to public interests then they cease to be "instruments of material progress" so far as the public interests are concerned and should be treated even as the flesh and blood outlaw is treated.

We had in the beef trust case a shining example. For years the members of that gigantic conspiracy against the lives of the people had laughed to scorn every proceeding brought against them; but the smiles faded from the faces of the conspirators when they were prosecuted under the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law. In that case it was evident the powers and the limits of the corporation had been so clearly defined and that the responsibilities of the men in authority in those corporations had been so explicitly fixed that everyone of them would have drawn a prison sentence but for the wonderfully opportune "immunity bath," which had been administered by the United States commissioner of corporations.

"Thou shalt not steal" is the law written in the statute books of men even as in the word of God; and to this law the men holding responsible office in corporations are to be strictly held if the corporation is to be in truth an "instrument of material progress" rather than a destroyer of honest business and a pirate upon the high seas of commerce.

#### "AFTER THE ELECTION"

An Associated Press dispatch says that Senator Hopkins of Illinois on leaving Oyster Bay after a conference with the president said that "the conclusion was reached that no tariff revision should be undertaken until after the next presidential election."

"It would be suicidal to the republican party," the senator added, "to undertake a revision of the tariff during the next congress. After the presidential election I believe it will be the duty of the republican party to revise the tariff and that it will be done."

Mr. Hopkins remarked that he believed such an argument would appeal to and be accepted by the republican revisionists in all parts of the country.

In the same interview Senator Hopkins said that Speaker Cannon's chances for the republican nomination were every day improving and that in his opinion the speaker would make the very strongest candidate that could be chosen.

The kind of tariff revision which may be expected from the republican party is well represented by "Uncle Joe" Cannon.

Of course there will be no tariff revision until after the presidential election and of course there will be no tariff revision that will interfere with the shelter provided by the trusts after the presidential election if the republican party has its way.

#### IMPROVEMENT

Dispatches from The Hague under date of July 12 said that the American delegates appointed by Mr. Roosevelt supported the French proposal which was to the effect that there must be a declaration of war before the opening of hostilities.

It will be remembered that Former Secretary of the Navy John D. Long said that while Mr. Roosevelt was assistant secretary of the navy he advised the sinking of the Spanish fleet before a declaration of war had been made. This story, as vouched for by Mr. Long, and also by Francis E. Leupp, one of Mr. Roosevelt's friends, was set forth at length in a recent issue of The Commoner.

Now, according to The Hague dispatches, the same man who advised the attack upon Spain before declaration of war appoints delegates to The Hague who urge that such an attack be made unlawful by an agreement.

The world moves and everyone gathers wisdom as the days go by.

#### BY THE MASSES, OF COURSE

In a recent issue The Commoner printed this editorial:

"Those who urge the nomination of a 'conservative' candidate by the democratic convention studiously insist that 'Mr. Bryan's friends

say he does not want the nomination.' But is this the real issue? The presidential nomination ought not to be regarded as a compliment to be handed to some one because he would be pleased to have it. A candidate should be selected because the rank and file of the party want him nominated—not merely because he wants the nomination. First, what will the party stand for? Second, who can best represent these principles in the campaign? These questions ought to control the selection. Men's ambitions ought not to count for much in a presidential contest."

The New York World reproduces the above editorial and complains that Mr. Bryan "leaves too much unsaid." The World then asks:

"Is he prepared to sink his own ambition for the good of the party?"

"Is he prepared to let the rank and file frame the platform as well as name the candidate?"

It is, indeed, hard to satisfy the World. Its two questions are answered in the very editorial it reproduces: "The presidential nomination ought not to be regarded as a compliment to be handed to some one because he would be pleased to have it. A candidate should be selected because the rank and file of the party want him nominated—not merely because he wants the nomination."

Mr. Bryan has repeatedly said that the rank and file will frame the platform and name the candidate and no man's ambition should be allowed to interfere with that democratic method.

#### FROM TWO STANDPOINTS

Imperialism must be viewed from two standpoints, namely, from its effect upon the United States, and from its effect upon the Filipinos.

Viewed from the standpoint of our own people, we find that imperialism can not be defeated without attacking our form of government. During the Revolution Buckle called attention to the fact that the people of Great Britain could not defend their part in the war without asserting principles which, if carried out, would destroy English liberty as well as American liberty. And so we can not defend a colonial policy without asserting principles which, if carried out, would destroy liberty in this country as well as in the Philippine islands.

Lincoln declared that the protection of our country was not in fleets or armies, forts or towers, but "in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all people in all lands everywhere." "Destroy this spirit," he exclaimed, "and you plant the seeds of despotism at your own doors." It is not an uncommon thing now for people to speak of liberty as a gift which the people of one country may graciously confer upon the people of another country, and we hear much of the doctrine that only so much liberty should be given as the people are capable of enjoying. All of these expressions betray infidelity to the republican form of government. When liberty becomes a chattel, to be separated from the person and sold at will, the person himself is little more than a political chattel.

The daily denial of the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and the constant qualifying and amending of the doctrine of inalienable rights—these can not but weaken the foundation of our own government.

The soldiers who go abroad to give physical support to a carpet-bag government have drilled into them doctrines antagonistic to the ideas of a republic, and those who enter with enthusiasm upon the administration of a colonial government can hardly escape a change in their conceptions of government. No gold that could be brought back in our merchant ships, if a Philippine colony were really profitable, could compensate us for the surrender of that ideal of government which, planted on American soil a century and a quarter ago and watered with the blood of patriots, has become the hope of the world.

But what of imperialism from the Filipinos' point of view? Well, to begin with, it is objectionable because so long as it is continued the Filipino can not speak in praise of American institutions without exposing himself to the charge of stirring up insurrection. We become the enemies of free government rather than its exponents when we make it unlawful for those living under our flag to espouse the political principles for which the flag stands.

Second, the Filipinos have reason to complain of the expensiveness of our government in the Philippines. American officials do not go to