

# The Nebraska Independent.

VOL. XII.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, JUNE 28, 1900.

NO. 7.

## SENATOR TELLER.

He Says That He Will Stick to Bryan Whether the Democrats Nominate Towne or Not.

Senator Teller arrived at his home in Colorado a few days ago, where he was enthusiastically received. In an interview he said:

"The silver republicans and populists cannot but lead their aid to the party of Mr. Bryan so long as we think so nearly alike," said the venerable law-maker.

"But when it comes to calling ourselves Democrats, that is another matter. We do not want to do it, because there are some points on which we do not agree. We may not always be together. I do not care to predict what the democratic convention will do with reference to Mr. Towne. I think that it would make votes for that party should it endorse him. There can be no doubt that Mr. Towne will withdraw if he is not endorsed, and give place to the democratic nominee for the vice presidency, and the silver republicans will stand with Mr. Bryan's ticket to a man."

"For myself, I would a great deal sooner go into the democratic party than the republicans, as the two are now constituted. When I was a republican no such thing was known as compelling the whole membership to stand by the ruling of a caucus in a law-making body. Things are different now down at Washington. The supreme court says a piece of legislation must go through, every republican is compelled to vote for it. Chandler is the only one who has dared to disregard this practice."

"The senator declined to discuss the report that his party would try to run him for the governorship this fall. With reference to the prospects for fusion in Colorado, he thought they were good, and expressed the feeling that the democrats who opposed it were not loyal to the principles of the party."

"The principal issues of the national campaign," continued the senator, "will be those of imperialism, trust questions and that of imperialism. The democrats will reaffirm the Chicago platform, and the additional planks peculiar to the new conditions that have arisen will be framed by the convention. Such planks as the one on the supreme court, for instance, are just as important now as ever. The supreme court plank never sought to do away with the tribunal, but who has a right to contend that any person is above criticism in a republic? Some of the greatest crimes in history have been chargeable to the judiciary, and the democratic party never criticized the supreme court so much as the minority in the instant case has done in its report. There is nothing in the Chicago platform that should not stand."

"The silver question is just as important as ever. The fact that we are now having prosperity, a thing the republicans have been fighting for years, to prove that the contention of the bimetalists with reference to the amount of real money in circulation has been correct. The world's money supply in gold has increased one billion and a half dollars since 1896, and this is the great reason why we are now prosperous. When the republicans have the right to paper money, secured by United States bonds, but the secretary of the treasury has already begun to outline plans for a wildcat system of bank notes secured by assets. This will probably go through next winter."

"The question of imperialism is of especial moment, just at the present time. Congress in letting the Spooner bill go over until next winter undoubtedly indicates that the administration fears to commit itself just before the campaign. As it was introduced by Spooner, however, there can be no question but that it represents the policy of the president. The bill does not recognize the people of the Philippines as having any rights in the government. They are to be subjects and nothing else. The republicans contend that they have given the same rights to Porto Rico as were given to the territories, but this is far from being so. The territories have a right to elect their own legislative bodies, but the Porto Ricans are under the veto of the special council appointed by the president, and this body controls all matters relating to corporations and franchises."

"With reference to the proposed trust legislation of the administration, Senator Teller said it was meant merely for show. "If the people of the United States really believed the party led by Mark Hanna was opposed to the immense corporations, they were bigger fools than he could imagine them to be. The constitutional amendment as a limitation on trusts could not have been drawn more satisfactorily to Rockefeller and others than it was, since it aimed to place the trusts under the control of the national legislative body, and take it out of the hands of the individual state governments. In other words, it proposed to establish the corporation to get along with trying to buy only one body, whereas they had to buy between forty and fifty now."

**A Wonderful Trade.**  
The interests of commerce are, indeed, important, but there is nothing more deceptive and unjust than the idea that trade follows the flag, and therefore that the prosecution of war for making trade can be justified. Furthermore, the value of oriental trade in comparison with the cost of getting it through warfare may be easily exaggerated and a few figures re-

## UNPARALLELED APPROPRIATIONS

Five Times as Much Per Capita as When Old Hickory was President—McKinley Worst of All.

The speech of Senator A. S. Clay of Georgia on June 2 brings out some interesting facts and statistics in reference to the expenditures of the government since the time of Washington. According to Senator Clay the administration of President McKinley is by far the most extravagant in the history of the nation. With a population of less than four millions in 1790 the national expenditures were \$3,797,435, or 91 cents per capita. Twelve years later under Jeffersonian simplicity, with a population of 5,308,483, the national expenditures amounted to \$2.49 per capita. Under Jackson's administration in 1830, with a population of 12,866,020, the total national budget was \$24,585,281 or \$1.90 per capita.

Up to the civil war there has been no material increase in the per capita national expenses and at no time did they exceed \$2.00 per capita.

In 1873, with a population of 43,951,000, under Grant's administration following close upon the Civil War, the expenditures were \$6.25 per capita and a general demand for economy resulted in the defeat of the republican party at the polls in 1876. Two years later the per capita expenditures had been reduced to \$4.98. In 1888, the population of the country had increased to 59,974,000 yet the expenditures were reduced to \$4.33. Under Cleveland's second term the population had increased to 71,233,000 and the national debt was maintained at \$1.94 per capita.

The expenses per capita for the year 1899 have risen to \$7.97, and for the year 1900 on a basis of 77,000,000 population. And yet this is not the limit of extravagance for the estimated expenditures for the year 1901 amount to \$9.59 per capita. For the year 1900 the appropriations amount to \$94,406,489.64, and for 1901 the estimates amount to the sum of \$78,855,248.75.

What a contrast between the administration of Washington and William McKinley. The citizens now pay ten times as much as then, while more than four times as much per capita is now collected from the pockets of the people for the support of the government as in the days of Jefferson. Five times as much is now required per capita as when old Hickory Jackson sat at the presidential chair, and twice as much as in the time of Ben Harrison and Grover Cleveland.

If the people desire to know why this strange about it, there is an answer to be found in the great increase in the amount appropriated to the support of the army. From an appropriation of \$23,000,000 in 1896, the appropriation for 1900 has increased to \$114,000,000. With the growth of imperialism and the necessity of a largely increased military establishment, we shall soon be heavily taxed as the governments of Europe. This is one of the evils of a colonial policy which we already begin to realize and the worst has not yet come.

## Nebraska All Right.

Nebraska is in luck this year. The wheat crop will be the largest for years. The weather, except in a very few spots, could not have been better if it had been made to order. While this is true, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois and the other central states have very little or no wheat. The Dakotas are suffering drought, and at present prospects are very poor for much wheat there. Nebraska, California, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas must furnish the great bulk for the United States. This is the condition in Uncle Sam's dominions, as is well known. India is suffering the most dreadful famine, and for three or four years has been taken out of the list of wheat exporting countries. If such conditions do not make better prices, there is something strange about it. There is an answer. Why should Mark Hanna shower his blessings on Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas and withhold them from his own faithful state?

## Practical Politics

Some fusionists seem to think that Towne's nomination by the democrats at Kansas City may be assured by convincing the democrats of his eminent fitness. Let us whisper a word. It's victory those fellows want. Assure them of that and fitness may take its chances. The more you convince such men as Hill, Croker, Van Wyck, et al. of Towne's fitness to be Bryan's mate the less they will like him. Convince them that they can win with Towne, but will fail without him, and they'll every one whoop'er up for Towne. That's practical politics.—Peoples Champion.

## Chauncy M. Depew said in 1896:

"There are 50 men in New York who can in 24 hours stop every wheel on all our manufacturing, look every switch, our telegraph lines, and shut down every coal and iron mine in the United States. They can do this because they control the money which this country produces." Probably a much smaller number can do this same thing today.

The problem is now before the people to decide whether money or men shall rule.—Oklahoma Register.

## HOW IT WAS DONE.

The Republican Platform—The Nomination of Roosevelt—The Clash of the Bosses at Philadelphia.

Washington June 24.—(Special correspondence.)—The republican national convention has hardly adjourned before the republican party is beginning to rub its eyes, feel of its bones and hold its aching head. It doesn't know whether it has had the delirium tremens or a nightmare.

Certain things, however, are so visible that the whole country can take part in the spectacle. Roosevelt's nomination for vice president was forced upon Mark Hanna and McKinley by the shrewd manipulation of Senators Platt and Quay.

Roosevelt himself was the unwilling victim of the deal. McKinley and Hanna did not want him for many reasons. They knew him to be erratic, headstrong and impracticable. They knew the difficulty of keeping him in the saddle.

There is more than a grave suspicion that he voted for Cleveland in 1884. As assistant secretary of the navy he insisted on being the whole show. When war with Spain was threatened and McKinley was trying to stave it off, Roosevelt became hysterical, incoherent and unbalanced. He had a dozen different schemes a day, and wore out the patience of the white house with his frettings and importunities.

Mark Hanna realizes that Roosevelt is not the sort of a man the corporations and trusts want to see on the ticket with McKinley. He is too much of a braggart and war. He is an element of weakness and not of strength.

McKinley carried New York state by a plurality of 268,000. Roosevelt pulled through by a narrow plurality of less than 18,000 and did not get a majority at the convention of all Roosevelt has on his record and numerous occasions given vent to his honest opinion regarding McKinley's character. On one of these occasions relative to the Porto Rican scandal, Roosevelt said to a number of people: "McKinley has no more backbone than a chocolate éclair in a candy store."

Several injudicious remarks of the same tenor and temperament are liable to come to light during the campaign. But Platt and Quay had ends of their own to serve. Quay was largely one of revenge against Hanna for having voted against the seating of Quay in the senate. Several considerations are in the mind of the campaign, and the promise of a campaign contribution of \$300,000 by John W. Wamaker. Platt's reason was a colder purpose. He knew that Roosevelt could not again be elected governor of New York, and it was therefore necessary to shelve him permanently.

Roosevelt will only too well aware that the vice presidency, whether won or lost, would terminate his political career, but his struggles were in vain. In the stress of the situation he showed the weaker side of his character. He became hysterical. He was of a dozen opinions in as many hours, but finally, after the presidential nomination on the "neck or nothing" principle.

But it should be clearly borne in mind that there was a strong popular movement in the convention favorable to Roosevelt's nomination, otherwise Hanna would have had his way, and Platt and Quay would have been defeated. What was the reason of the movement in favor of Roosevelt?

The glamour of militarism coupled with a visible opposition to Hannaism. The expression was found in every quarter of the convention that Hanna was going to be a headstrong carry, and someone had to be discovered to arouse party enthusiasm. Within a month, within a week in fact, the republican party will realize its error.

Roosevelt has certain good qualities. He is brave, but he is reckless. He is generally honest, but he lacks good judgment. He means to do right, but he generally ends in doing wrong. His ideal is the "strenuous life," which means war and battle and bloodshed, but the American people love peace. In every point of character and temperament he is the opposite of McKinley. It is an ill-mated ticket. Roosevelt's stump will arouse the intense enthusiasm of jingoes and extremists like himself, but he will offend and drive away from the republican party thousands of voters who are neither jingoes nor extremists. Roosevelt is a boomerang.

As one prominent republican says, "It devotes two thousand words to the campaign of 1896 and only three hundred to the issues of 1900."

Its first and principal note is "prosperity." The trusts have been prosperous out of all proportion to the prosperity of the people, and even that prosperity is beginning to wane. The democrats can meet this issue.

The platform renews allegiance to the principle of the gold standard and abandons all pretense of friendship for bimetalism. But what does the platform mean by this?

"We recognize that interest rates are a potent factor in production and business activity, and for the purpose of further equalizing and lowering the rates of interest we favor such monetary legislation as will enable the varying needs of the seasons and of all sections, to be promptly met, in order that trade may be evenly sustained, labor steadily employed and commerce enlarged."

Now this means either the extension of additional note issuing powers to the national banks, or such an attack upon the low rates of interest now being paid by saving banks and other institutions of deposit as will cause serious alarm to the millions of depositors whom the republicans pleaded so earnestly for when the free coinage of silver was proposed. If the dollar of the small depositor is to draw less interest than ever, it would seem that that dollar would have a lessened value. At the same time it is

known that the trust magnates realize anywhere from 20 to 100 per cent on their actual investment.

The platform favors the principle of reciprocity, yet the republican senate has failed to ratify a single treaty of reciprocity.

The labor plank is the most remarkable production in the platform. Had it appeared in a democratic or populist platform it would have produced only smiles of contempt from the republican press. It favors a more effective restriction of the immigration of cheap labor.

Well, McKinley has had two favorable republican congresses, why have they not legislated in this direction?

It declares for the protection of free labor as against contract convict labor, yet just such a measure is being up in congress by republican action.

It favors "the extension of opportunities for working children, the raising of the age limit for child labor, and an effective system of labor insurance."

With none of these has the national government any special function. They belong to the eighteenth century legislation. As for the latter proposition of labor insurance, it is a feature of the state socialism of Germany, but has never yet been demanded by labor in this country.

On the other hand organized labor has urged strenuously upon congress the adoption of the eight-hour day, a restriction of the anti-injunction bill, both of which have been pigeon-holed by this republican congress.

Following this "labor" plank is the ship subsidy bill. It is certainly folly to claim that our present dependence on foreign shipping is a great loss to the industry of the country, when in another paragraph it is claimed that the "industry" of this country is as prosperous and as busy as it can possibly be. It is, moreover, a notorious fact that every shipyard in the country has contracts to the extent of their capacity for years to come.

It is well known that one of the three great issues of the campaign will be the administration's colonial policy. But the platform hardly has a shaving, let alone a plank on this important subject. It declares in favor of a reduction of the war taxes, but why didn't congress reduce them?

It declares in favor of the construction, ownership, control and protection of an isthmian canal, but why didn't congress pass the Nicaragua canal bill? And why does the administration still stand by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which takes the protection of such a canal out of the hands of the United States?

It condemns trusts in guarded terms, but why didn't congress pass the anti-trust bill?

It hopes for peace in South Africa, yet is afraid to express sympathy for the Boers.

Yet this platform will not furnish the basis of the campaign; that will be fixed at Kansas City.

## WHAT THE GOVERNOR SAID

Extract from Mr. Poynter's Message Concerning the Payment of Bounty.

In certain quarters considerable is being and the grossest misrepresentation is being made as to what Governor Poynter said in his message concerning the payment of the bounty due under the act passed by the state legislature in 1895. In order that all may know exactly what the governor said, the Independent reproduces ALL that part of the message referring to the payment of the claim. Governor Poynter said (see page 73 official report of message and inaugural address):

"In 1895 the legislature passed an act offering a bounty of one dollar per ton to be paid to the growers of sugar beets, upon the theory of encouraging the development of the sugar industry in our state. For some reason best known to itself the legislature failed to make provision for the payment of claims which might arise from the passage of such an act. The sugar company, acting under the provisions of the bounty act, made their contracts with the growers to pay them one dollar per ton extra for the beets grown and delivered them, and in the best harvest of 1895 the company did pay growers the extra dollar per ton for beets. The company presented its claim for bounty to the auditor and part upon the theory of encouraging the development of the sugar industry in our state, refused to allow further claims under the act, and in the suit following his refusal our supreme court decided that the claims could not be paid, there having been no appropriation made to meet the claims."

"In the harvest of 1896 the contracts of the company with the growers were made provisionally, agreeing to pay them one dollar per ton extra, provided the court sustained the payment of the claims. The court decided against the payment of the claims, holding the payment unconstitutional. For the reason that the legislature failed to make appropriations in compliance with its provisions; whereupon the company not only refused to pay the extra dollar, but actually kept back one dollar per ton from payments made in the latter part of the season, to reimburse themselves for the amount already paid on the 1895 crop, thereby giving the growers but four dollars per ton for beets instead of five dollars, as they contracted to do should they be sustained by the court. Now these claims for bounty under the act of 1895 are in the hands of the sugar companies and those for 1896 are in the hands of the growers of beets. The sugar companies have sought relief in the highest court in the state, and that court has decided against them. These farmers made their contracts and raised their beets in good faith, making their estimates for profits on the basis of the bounty which they received as bounty from the state. I AM, INDIVIDUALLY, AND THE PARTY OF WHICH I AM A MEMBER IS

## SEEKING WEALTH AND GLORY

But the Shadow of the Awful Question, Will History Repeat Itself, and the Nation Sink in Gloom and Decay will not Disperse.

A short time since, Justice Brewer of the supreme court of the United States, delivered an address before the Liberal club of Buffalo, N. Y., from which the following extracts are made.

It is said the Anglo-Saxon race has manifested a capacity to govern well; that we are of that race, and that, therefore, we could well govern the Philippine Islands as colonies. I do not question the capacity of the race well and wisely to govern others. I object to the Philippine policy because it antagonizes the principles upon which this government was founded, which have controlled its life up to the present time, and the perfection of which has been the hope and inspiration of every true American.

Very few nations, very few individuals, live up to their high ideals, but surely the Declaration of Independence has been the ideal of our life, and we have striven to make it more and more real. Now, government by force is the very antipodes of this, and to introduce government by force over any portion of the nation is to start the second quarter of the second century of our life upon principles which are the exact opposite of those upon which we have hitherto lived. It is one thing to fail of reaching your ideal; it is an entirely different thing to deliberately turn your back upon it.

The test of government is not in the outward mechanical display of order, but in the capacity to develop the best men, and we have lived in the faith that government by consent of the governed develops the best men. We have not let the wise men rule the ignorant, the learned the unlearned, the rich the poor, but we have appealed always to "the plain people" as the ones in whose judgment to rely, and upon whose shoulders should rest the burden of government.

Ideas are, after all, the eternal force. Human life and destiny are controlled by them. They may seem to-day of little significance, but around them gather material interests, and to-morrow their power is disclosed.

Government by consent and government by force, no matter how well the government may be administered, are two essentially antagonistic principles. Doubtless no immediate conflict will follow, but the seeds of a large measure of prosperity; but are we not sowing the seeds which in the days to come will grow up into a harvest of trouble for our children and our children's children?

A necessity of colonial possessions is an increase in our regular army, and the first increase proposed is from 30,000 to 100,000 men. It is a strange commentary that at the close of the nineteenth century the head of the most arbitrary government in the civilized world, the Czar of the Russias, is inviting the nations of the world to a decrease in their arms, while this, the freest land, is proposing to increase its army in its own territory by the imperative need, if we enter upon the system of colonial expansion.

Now, the great economic problem in this country is not how can a few men make more money and pile up larger fortunes, but how can the great body of the people make a fair and comfortable living. The right to work is again and again insisted upon as more important than the right to vote, and the cry of the right to work is supplemented by the cry that the state furnish work to all who cannot obtain it elsewhere.

Are we likely to aid in solving this problem by bringing into our national life 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 of unskilled Malay laborers? We have shut the doors against the Chinese. Are they any worse than the Malay? Shall we introduce in this nation more cheap labor? I do not wonder at the action of the Federalists in protesting against a new competition of cheap labor as an increase of the army, with its consequent increase of burden and taxation on the employed laborer.

But there is money in it. And after all this is really the most potent factor in the proposed reaching out after the Orient. The wealth of the Orient and of India is to-day as ready to be appropriated by any dominant power. All the nations and tribes come within Lord Salisbury's definition of dying nations, and must soon be divided between and appropriated by the living and growing nations. China is held out as a dying nation, filled with untold wealth, and why should we not share in its appropriation? What a picture this is! The eagle of liberty standing like a buzzard to grow fat over an expected corpse.

Will fate the land to hastening ill a prey. Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

The Caesars saw the spears of their victorious legions flash in the sunlight of every known land, and in their triumphant return they brought with them the accumulated wealth of all the nations they had subdued. The splendor of imperial Rome outshone the world, but the wealth thus obtained without value given undermined the empire, and the glory of Rome is simply a memory. Napoleon beheld the shining star of destiny; and then? Does human nature change through the centuries? We stand today facing the temptation which comes from the possibility of rapidly accumulated wealth. What right have we to anticipate that the same result will not follow if we pursue the same course of taking what we have not fully earned?

The problem we have sought to work out in this nation is that of government of and by and for the people. A great

(Continued on the 12th page.)

## THE SHADOW OF THE AWFUL QUESTION

Will History Repeat Itself, and the Nation Sink in Gloom and Decay will not Disperse.

A short time since, Justice Brewer of the supreme court of the United States, delivered an address before the Liberal club of Buffalo, N. Y., from which the following extracts are made.

It is said the Anglo-Saxon race has manifested a capacity to govern well; that we are of that race, and that, therefore, we could well govern the Philippine Islands as colonies. I do not question the capacity of the race well and wisely to govern others. I object to the Philippine policy because it antagonizes the principles upon which this government was founded, which have controlled its life up to the present time, and the perfection of which has been the hope and inspiration of every true American.

Very few nations, very few individuals, live up to their high ideals, but surely the Declaration of Independence has been the ideal of our life, and we have striven to make it more and more real. Now, government by force is the very antipodes of this, and to introduce government by force over any portion of the nation is to start the second quarter of the second century of our life upon principles which are the exact opposite of those upon which we have hitherto lived. It is one thing to fail of reaching your ideal; it is an entirely different thing to deliberately turn your back upon it.

The test of government is not in the outward mechanical display of order, but in the capacity to develop the best men, and we have lived in the faith that government by consent of the governed develops the best men. We have not let the wise men rule the ignorant, the learned the unlearned, the rich the poor, but we have appealed always to "the plain people" as the ones in whose judgment to rely, and upon whose shoulders should rest the burden of government.

Ideas are, after all, the eternal force. Human life and destiny are controlled by them. They may seem to-day of little significance, but around them gather material interests, and to-morrow their power is disclosed.

Government by consent and government by force, no matter how well the government may be administered, are two essentially antagonistic principles. Doubtless no immediate conflict will follow, but the seeds of a large measure of prosperity; but are we not sowing the seeds which in the days to come will grow up into a harvest of trouble for our children and our children's children?

A necessity of colonial possessions is an increase in our regular army, and the first increase proposed is from 30,000 to 100,000 men. It is a strange commentary that at the close of the nineteenth century the head of the most arbitrary government in the civilized world, the Czar of the Russias, is inviting the nations of the world to a decrease in their arms, while this, the freest land, is proposing to increase its army in its own territory by the imperative need, if we enter upon the system of colonial expansion.

Now, the great economic problem in this country is not how can a few men make more money and pile up larger fortunes, but how can the great body of the people make a fair and comfortable living. The right to work is again and again insisted upon as more important than the right to vote, and the cry of the right to work is supplemented by the cry that the state furnish work to all who cannot obtain it elsewhere.

Are we likely to aid in solving this problem by bringing into our national life 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 of unskilled Malay laborers? We have shut the doors against the Chinese. Are they any worse than the Malay? Shall we introduce in this nation more cheap labor? I do not wonder at the action of the Federalists in protesting against a new competition of cheap labor as an increase of the army, with its consequent increase of burden and taxation on the employed laborer.

But there is money in it. And after all this is really the most potent factor in the proposed reaching out after the Orient. The wealth of the Orient and of India is to-day as ready to be appropriated by any dominant power. All the nations and tribes come within Lord Salisbury's definition of dying nations, and must soon be divided between and appropriated by the living and growing nations. China is held out as a dying nation, filled with untold wealth, and why should we not share in its appropriation? What a picture this is! The eagle of liberty standing like a buzzard to grow fat over an expected corpse.

Will fate the land to hastening ill a prey. Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

The Caesars saw the spears of their victorious legions flash in the sunlight of every known land, and in their triumphant return they brought with them the accumulated wealth of all the nations they had subdued. The splendor of imperial Rome outshone the world, but the wealth thus obtained without value given undermined the empire, and the glory of Rome is simply a memory. Napoleon beheld the shining star of destiny; and then? Does human nature change through the centuries? We stand today facing the temptation which comes from the possibility of rapidly accumulated wealth. What right have we to anticipate that the same result will not follow if we pursue the same course of taking what we have not fully earned?

The problem we have sought to work out in this nation is that of government of and by and for the people. A great

(Continued on the 12th page.)

## THE SHADOW OF THE AWFUL QUESTION

Will History Repeat Itself, and the Nation Sink in Gloom and Decay will not Disperse.

A short time since, Justice Brewer of the supreme court of the United States, delivered an address before the Liberal club of Buffalo, N. Y., from which the following extracts are made.

It is said the Anglo-Saxon race has manifested a capacity to govern well; that we are of that race, and that, therefore, we could well govern the Philippine Islands as colonies. I do not question the capacity of the race well and wisely to govern others. I object to the Philippine policy because it antagonizes the principles upon which this government was founded, which have controlled its life up to the present time, and the perfection of which has been the hope and inspiration of every true American.

Very few nations, very few individuals, live up to their high ideals, but surely the Declaration of Independence has been the ideal of our life, and we have striven to make it more and more real. Now, government by force is the very antipodes of this, and to introduce government by force over any portion of the nation is to start the second quarter of the second century of our life upon principles which are the exact opposite of those upon which we have hitherto lived. It is one thing to fail of reaching your ideal; it is an entirely different thing to deliberately turn your back upon it.

The test of government is not in the outward mechanical display of order, but in the capacity to develop the best men, and we have lived in the faith that government by consent of the governed develops the best men. We have not let the wise men rule the ignorant, the learned the unlearned, the rich the poor, but we have appealed always to "the plain people" as the ones in whose judgment to rely, and upon whose shoulders should rest the burden of government.

Ideas are, after all, the eternal force. Human life and destiny are controlled by them. They may seem to-day of little significance, but around them gather material interests, and to-morrow their power is disclosed.

Government by consent and government by force, no matter how well the government may be administered, are two essentially antagonistic principles. Doubtless no immediate conflict will follow, but the seeds of a large measure of prosperity; but are we not sowing the seeds which in the days to come will grow up into a harvest of trouble for our children and our children's children?

A necessity of colonial possessions is an increase in our regular army, and the first increase proposed is from 30,000 to 100,000 men. It is a strange commentary that at the close of the nineteenth century the head of the most arbitrary government in the civilized world, the Czar of the Russias, is inviting the nations of the world to a decrease in their arms, while this, the freest land, is proposing to increase its army in its own territory by the imperative need, if we enter upon the system of colonial expansion.

Now, the great economic problem in this country is not how can a few men make more money and pile up larger fortunes, but how can the great body of the people make a fair and comfortable living. The right to work is again and again insisted upon as more important than the right to vote, and the cry of the right to work is supplemented by the cry that the state furnish work to all who cannot obtain it elsewhere.

Are we likely to aid in solving this problem by bringing into our national life 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 of unskilled Malay laborers? We have shut the doors against the Chinese. Are they any worse than the Malay? Shall we introduce in this nation more cheap labor? I do not wonder at the action of the Federalists in protesting against a new competition of cheap labor as an increase of the army, with its consequent increase of burden and taxation on the employed laborer.

But there is money in it. And after all this is really the most potent factor in the proposed reaching out after the Orient. The wealth of the Orient and of India is to-day as ready to be appropriated by any dominant power. All the nations and tribes come within Lord Salisbury's definition of dying nations, and must soon be divided between and appropriated by the living and growing nations. China is held out as a dying nation, filled with untold wealth, and why should we not share in its appropriation? What a picture this is! The eagle of liberty standing like a buzzard to grow fat over an expected corpse.

Will fate the land to hastening ill a prey. Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

The Caesars saw the spears of their victorious legions flash in the sunlight of every known land, and in their triumphant return they brought with them the accumulated wealth of all the nations they had subdued. The splendor of imperial Rome outshone the world, but the wealth thus obtained without value given undermined the empire, and the glory of Rome is simply a memory. Napoleon beheld the shining star of destiny; and then? Does human nature change through the centuries? We stand today facing the temptation which comes from the possibility of rapidly accumulated wealth. What right have we to anticipate that the same result will not follow if we pursue the same course of taking what we have not fully earned?

The problem we have sought to work out in this nation is that of government of and by and for the people. A great

(Continued on the 12th page.)

(Continued on the 12th page.)