


**Follow  
the  
Keystone**



When you buy a watch, first select the works and then tell the jeweler you want a Jaa. Boss Stiffened Gold Case. To protect yourself from deception be guided by the Keystone trade-mark which you will find in every

**JAS. BOSS**  
**Stiffened**  
**Gold Watch Case**

Better than an all-gold case because stronger; cheaper because no gold is wasted. The Jaa. Boss Case is guaranteed for 25 years. Won't wear thin. Send for book.

The Keystone Watch Case Company, Philadelphia.

meaning they were intended to convey.

Can you truthfully say that your club is not a part of the eastern political movement, by which it is intended, if possible, to take the public mind off the financial question? Is it not true that the larger part of the members of your club, that controls its action, is in accord in sentiment with the sentiment of what we usually denominate the "financial interests?"

You know that, while you may distinguish the members of it by various political names, there is practical unanimity in their desire that the money question shall not be made prominent. If this be true, then it strikes me as little better than a quibble when you say that the club is not influenced by these sentiments.

You came to Indianapolis and, in a few hours after you arrived, there was a banquet at the Grand hotel, the occasion of which was your presence. It is immaterial who got it up. The inference is justified by the circumstances and what occurred that the purpose of it was to create the impression that the money question had ceased to interest the people. You may not have had any such intention, but your club was the instrument by which, through you as its representative, the attempt was made, as I stated in the article. I said in addition to what you quote that, "When the time comes for congressional action, they (these two clubs) always get together . . . as they did when the Wilson bill was under consideration."

I have been an observer of the actions of the two classes of influences represented by the two leagues for a good many years. I say very deliberately and sincerely that the purposes of both, judging by what has occurred in the economic history of the country, have been almost purely commercial and pecuniary. "Patriotic duty," no doubt, controls some, but I am afraid, if there was nothing nearer or more personal in interest than the welfare of the masses of the common people of the country, it would not take long to count the active members of either league.

During the only interview I had with you, while you were in this city, I was surprised to hear you state that you knew very little about the financial question. How are you able, then, to charge that I am "prejudiced" or "fanatical" in my views of the question? The words are quite familiar as stock arguments from the mouths and pens of men who have not, like you, admitted their want of information, but who nevertheless disclosed it.

You seem to think the league very broad because it has made a motto of Jefferson's words, and applied them to the one purpose of your league. The words were not uttered from so narrow a viewpoint. To cramp and shrivel these immortal words to fit the dimensions of how a tariff shall be applied to imports is not evidence of a very broad grasp of social and economic conditions. It is certainly not broad enough a grasp to justify your league, or any member of it, in implying that any one, who does not think that the tariff question is all the question there is in American politics, is possessed of only one idea.

To me nothing seems more "absurd and ridiculous" than for the official representative of a club that, confessedly, has but one idea, and seeks to occupy the whole political field with that idea, to talk about "subservience to a single idea," when some other question is forced upon the attention. In my judgment, there is no hope of a correct settlement of the tariff question in the interest of the people until the financial question is adjusted according to correct economic principles.

I suggest, therefore, that those of

your league, who are actuated by ideas of "patriotic duty," give a little time and study to the money question, so that they may be able to understand how the question is related to the question of foreign trade and duties on imports. When they do, they may be able to see that my opinion of the protective tariff league of New York and the American free trade league of Boston is not without foundation in facts. I agree with you (no difference what may be correct in principle concerning protection and free trade) that a tariff now, for any other purpose than revenue, is robbery. But must I shut my mouth about everything else? Must I allow myself to be humbugged and deceived by a fight over this question to the exclusion of every other question? I confess that I have no longer any patience with that political insight that is not able to see that the tariff question, while in a certain sense important, is only a bagatelle in comparison with questions that involve the surrender of the prerogatives of government to the control of private interests. And I must be pardoned if I am sometimes forced to doubt the sincerity of the devotion to what seems in comparison so trifling a cause. Sincerely yours,

FLAVIUS J. VAN VORHIS,  
Indianapolis, Ind.

### REPUBLICAN TRUST BUSTING

**The Pirates do not Fear Publicity More  
Than They Would a Dose of Soothing  
Syrup**

A senator recently declared that the trusts did not fear a publicity bill any more than they would "a dose of soothing syrup." This is true, and more than true. The publicity measure has been admitted by many newspapers, without regard to partisan alignment, to be as mild and milky as the trusts could desire. All the publicity provided for in the Nelson amendment, which is a law, is the requirement that the chief clerk and secretary of the new department of commerce "make diligent investigation into the organization, conduct and management of the business of any corporation engaged in commerce among the several states."

The spectacle of the secretary and his clerks patiently and laboriously making diligent investigations into the carefully prepared books of the combines, while the suffering public stands helplessly by with the trusts plundering its pockets, is indeed a striking one.

The measure provides that this information, when finally gathered, will be presented to the president, who in turn shall examine it, and who may then make suggestions to congress to legislate away any evils which the facts show to exist. The information so collected shall be made public only if the president wishes to give it out, and under the amendment a president friendly to the trusts could suppress it all.

This, then, is the much heralded publicity. The clerk of the new department of commerce, Mr. James R. Garfield, will collect the information, or whatever he can obtain, from the unwilling trusts; he will then give it to Secretary Cortelyou, who will in turn hand it over to President Roosevelt, who can examine and suppress it, or publish it, and make recommendations to congress for legislation. This is a long and devious course to find out something that the whole country knows about and to inform congress of how the trusts are robbing the people. It will take some astonishing mental juggling for campaigners to convince the people that there is anything to trouble the trusts in such a program.—Denver News.

### THE SPARTAN IDEAL

**Mr. Sampson Criticises President Roosevelt's Letter to Mrs. Van Vorst—The Question of Motherhood**

Editor Independent: In the papers of February 12 appeared a letter from President Roosevelt to a Mrs. Van Vorst, published as the preface of her book, entitled, "The Woman Who Toils."

The letter is characteristic as illustrative of the chief executive's strenuousness. With such strenuousness the undersigned has no quarrel beyond the observation that undue strenuousness is admittedly a chief evil of American individual life, and that national strenuousness is sweeping the republic into the maelstrom of empire.

Nor does the writer fail to appreciate the several manly virtues inculcated by the president, and his statement that the most valuable possession in life are those that cost effort.

But the chief executive's ideal is evidently the Spartan Ideal—an ideal worthy to a limited extent, but whose comparative value for individual and national life may be determined by the fact that, while Sparta is but a name, Athens, which stood for a different and broader ideal, has been a power in civilization for twenty centuries, and will continue to be a world power, in the best sense, so long as the race shall endure.

It is chiefly with the president's conception of parenthood that the writer is compelled to differ. Large families of healthy children appears to be his domestic ideal. The trouble here is similar to the trouble with the chief executive's conception of our national life, involving the sacrifice of American ideals to territorial aggrandizement, namely, the subordination of the spiritual to the material. With the president, quantity seems to be the chief consideration. Quality is comparatively unimportant.

As for health, the writer would perhaps go further than the chief executive, and advocate the prohibition of marriages likely to result in unhealthy children, with drastic penalties for illegitimacy. But, on the other hand, the question of family size is not properly a health question at all. The ability to have a large family of healthy children involves no obligation whatever to have such a family. Man is more, infinitely more, than an animal. In this supreme concern, character, education, opportunity, should be the controlling determinants. The larger the family, the less opportunity there is to mould the character of each child, the less opportunity to educate it broadly, the less opportunity has each child for self-development and a life of high service to his fellow-men. And, as Emerson says, "America is but another name for opportunity." But the president would abridge this priceless heritage of the American citizen.

To subordinate character, education, opportunity—the highest interests of life—to sensual gratification or the pride of numbers—this is to commit an unspeakable wickedness. To bring into being an immortal soul without its God-given right to the best possible inheritance, not only physically, but also intellectually, morally, and spiritually—this is the great crime against society. To be well born is the fundamental right of every child of God, and to the neglect of this right are chiefly attributable the evils of the social state.

But perhaps the swarms of healthy children, the swarms of healthy men and women, in all the great centers of population, whose reformation defies the charitable instrumentalities of society, afford the best practical commentary on the chief executive's doctrine.

As for the race-suicide, complete or partial, which the president deems the greatest of possible national evils, it would seem more practical, in view of the steadily increasing population of the world over, to ponder the problem of poverty—the poverty that ever increases with so-called "progress," the poverty that is chiefly attributable to over-population.

Nor can the writer indorse without qualification the chief magistrate's assertion that "the greatest thing for any woman is to be a good wife and mother." As a general proposition it might be true, were society differently constituted. But, so long as church and state subordinate women in the domestic relations, so long as a comparatively low estimate of woman and her mission prevails, she is quite as likely to achieve her greatest development and usefulness outside of marriage as in it. The error of the president is here again a fundamental error, namely, that women exist primarily to advance the comfort and pleasure of men. The truth is, that women exist no more for men than men exist for women. The ministry

of the sexes to each other should be of mutual dignity and importance; or, if there is any difference, the order of creation would suggest that emphasis be placed on the service rendered by men to women.

It is no more woman's mission to be good wives and mothers than it is men's mission to be good husbands and fathers. The chief object of marriage is conceived to be the development of character through the reciprocal influences of the sexes in this most intimate of relations. The rearing of children always falls heavier on the mother than on the father, and a large family almost certainly proves an embargo on the mother's personal development—the development which should zealously be guarded as her most sacred trust. Parenthood should be distinctly incidental to marriage—important, but subordinate to life's supreme object, the development of character. To be a wife and mother may be a blessing to all concerned. Too often it is a dire evil. And to be a good wife and mother, one must first be what is greater than either—a royal woman. Only as she is such, should she accept the sacred responsibilities of wifehood and motherhood.

JOHN SAMPSON.

2420 14th street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

### Predicts Political Revolution.

At the recent convention of the West Virginia state grange, a resolution indorsing the optional referendum and direct initiative in governmental affairs was unanimously adopted. This is the eighth state grange that has declared for majority rule—six having made the declaration since December 1.

In reporting the action of the West Virginia grange, the master, T. C. Atkeson, dean of the college of agriculture in the state university, says:

"Evidently the referendum idea is growing in this country. A political revolution of some kind is not very far in the future. Just what form it will take it is now impossible to say."

The growing movement for an increase of power in the people through the right to a direct ballot is an indication of the probable character of the revolution. It can be installed in national affairs through rules of procedure, and therefore can be provided for in the election of next year if a majority of the congressmen are pledged and a majority of the senators are strongly instructed. The Declaration of Independence was the result of instructions, and it is quite probable that the final chapter in the change to majority rule will be secured by instructions.

Let us make the Independent School of Political Economy a great body of truly educated men and women, and thus counteract the evil being done by the National Economic League, with its plutocratic college presidents, trust magnates, and Grover Cleverlands.

## Dr. Shoop's Rheumatic Cure

**Costs Nothing If It Fails.**

After 2,000 experiments, I have learned how to cure Rheumatism. Not to turn bony joints into flesh again; that is impossible. But I can cure the disease always, at any stage, and forever.

I ask for no money. Simply write me a postal and I will send you an order on your nearest druggist for six bottles Dr. Shoop's Rheumatic Cure, for every druggist keeps it. Use it for a month and, if it succeeds, the cost is only \$5.50. If it fails, I will pay the druggist myself.

I have no sam'es, because any medicine that can affect Rheumatism quickly must be drugged to the verge of danger. I use no such drugs, and it is folly to take them. You must get the disease out of the blood.

My remedy does that, even in the most difficult obstinate cases. No matter how impossible this seems to you, I know it and take the risk. I have cured tens of thousands of cases in this way, and my records show that 39 out of 40 who get six bottles pay gladly. I have learned that people in general are honest with a physician who cures them. That is all I ask. If I fail I don't expect a penny from you.

Simply write me a postal card or a letter. I will send you my book about Rheumatism, and an order for the medicine. Take it for a month, as it won't harm you anyway. If it fails, it is free, and I leave the decision with you. Address Dr. Shoop, Box 940, Racine, Wis.

Mild cases, not chronic, are often cured by one or two bottles. At all druggists.