

## The Commoner.

thought of referring to the administration as the "government."

The fathers taught their children that the people and their constitution constituted the government, and that the men in immediate authority were but the servants of the people. A Supreme Court decision antagonistic to a policy of imperialism might upset the administration but would not upset the government. A decision supporting the administration's policy of imperialism would in truth and in fact upset the government. Not that there would be any disbanding of authority or crumbling of the national structure, but such a decision would upset the government as it was founded by the Washingtons and preserved by the Lincolns. It would upset the government as the American people have understood the government.

We have been taught that every man of whom this government requires allegiance, obtains in return the same privileges and immunities guaranteed to every other citizen.

We have been taught that there cannot be under our system of government any such a thing as a subject.

We have been taught that the constitution is the fundamental law of the land; that in it the men in authority find their powers, and that where no powers are granted, no powers can exist.

We have been taught that there are three distinct branches of government, the executive, legislative and judicial, and that one should not encroach upon the other.

We have been taught that tariff duties must be uniform throughout the United States and all places subject to their jurisdiction.

We have been taught that it is impossible for congress to lay an export tax.

A decision upholding the administration's policy would mean that the American people must learn their lessons over again.

It would mean that the government as we have learned it, and as the fathers founded it, would be completely upset and that a new government fashioned on imperialistic lines would take its place; it would be a government in which the executive possesses whatever arbitrary powers he may choose to assume; a government in which the congress is not controlled by the constitution; a government in which the judiciary is not bound by the fundamental law of the land; a government which may mean liberty to one man and despotism to another; a government which may give to one territory free trade with the states, and erect between the states and another territory a high protective wall; a government wherein citizens may be burdened with a tax upon the goods they export; a government which assumes authority over the people of Porto Rico while declining to recognize them as citizens of the United States and designating them as "Citizens of Porto Rico;" a government in which slavery may, at the pleasure of the executive, thrive and flourish beneath a flag that has been dedicated and re-dedicated to the absolute freedom of men; a government, part of whose people are citizens and part of whose people are subjects; a government that is part slave and part

free; a government comprising not a union of indestructible states and territories, each territory enjoying the hope of ultimately becoming a state, but a government comprising some states and some territories enjoying the privilege of ultimately becoming states, and some colonies specifically denied the right of entertaining such a hope or realizing such an ambition.

This is the government as it would exist if the Supreme Court upheld the administration's policy of imperialism. The old government would in fact be "upset;" the old constitution, the old notions, the traditions of a century, the sentiments of an age, the lessons of generations would all be "upset," and in their place the notions of kings, the sentiment of monarchs and a government of imperialism would be enthroned. Are not the American people justified in believing that Senator Spooner unwittingly told the truth when he said, "The Supreme Court will not dare to 'upset' the government."



### The World Loves a Lover.

Recently the newspapers have been filled with an "English" woman's love letters. These have been widely read, not, it must be confessed, because they were particularly attractive, but for the reason that "all the world loves a lover" and there is no lover whom the world loves so much as the devoted husband or wife.

Bismarck, "The man of iron," was the kind of lover whom the world delights to honor. Recently the love letters of Prince Bismarck have been published. The following are interesting extracts:

"My Love—I have just received your letter with much pleasure, and have read it in a very tiresome committee meeting held to consider the punishment of people who try to corrupt the soldiers. Hair-splitting lawyers and would-be orators enlarge so upon the simple question that I can't prevent my thoughts from wandering, and I give them a free course to you, my angel, whither your dear little letter points the way."

"You must look with contempt on every one who does not know enough to appreciate your merit; and to every one who has not yet proposed to you, or would not at least like to, you must say, 'Sir, the fact is that Herr von B. loves me, and this proves that every male person who does not adore me is a blockhead without discernment.' Why should not Lepsius worship you? 'Tis his duty and obligation. Don't be insultingly modest, as though I, after wandering around among the rose-gardens of North Germany for ten years, had finally grabbed at a buttercup with both hands."

"I am genuinely homesick and long to be with you quietly in Schoenhausen. Have you received the ribbon for Annchen?"

"On reaching the village I felt more distinctly than ever before what a beautiful thing it is to have a home—a home with which one is identified by birth, memory and love. The sun shone bright on the trim houses of the villagers, and their portly inmates in long coats and the gayly dressed women in short skirts gave me a much more friendly greeting than usual; on every face there seemed to be a wish for my happiness, which I invariably converted into thanks to you."

"My Sweetest, Dearest Heart—Why so sad?

for it is pleasant in foreign lands, but I can hardly restrain my tears when I think of the quiet country life with you, and all that goes with it; the life that will probably be a thing of distant dreams to me for some time to come and which just now appears more charming than ever. Why do you talk of a long separation, my angel? Do accustom yourself to the idea that you must go out with me into the winter of the great world; how am I to warm myself otherwise?"

There is nothing more beautiful than the love between husband and wife, and the older they become the more beautiful seems their affection. In New York, recently, a couple, both of whom were more than 90 years of age, were in dire financial straits. It was suggested that they be sent to the poor house, but owing to the rules of that institution that would have necessitated a separation. They pleaded to be permitted to remain in one another's company and finally the New York Journal took up the case and made provision for them so that the 90 year old lovers will be permitted to remain together until their death.

Such a case as this would offer a great opportunity for men of wealth, who, like Mr. Carnegie, do not want to be disgraced by dying rich. A little money expended in behalf of such people would go very far toward what Mr. Carnegie calls "the making of the soul."



### Progress in Education.

A magazine called "Money," whose efforts are devoted to the support of the single gold standard, congratulates Nebraska on the result of its recent senatorial election. It points out that the two Nebraska senators are national bank presidents, and says their election was not only logical but timely. "Money" thinks the significance of these elections is "the more remarkable" because this state is the home of the editor of THE COMMONER, and has for years been "one of the most prominent states in the forces of populism." It regards the election of these two gentlemen as an indication of "a progress in education on the money question that is exceedingly gratifying, and encourages those who have been tireless in their efforts in that direction." "Money" concludes:

"It would have been a bold prophecy, ten years ago, to predict that the constituency, which, next to Kansas, exhibited the most extreme symptoms of 'isms,' would, in the opening year of the new century, select two national bank presidents to voice its sentiments in the senate of the United States. Verily time changes and men change with them."

It does, indeed, seem strange that two national bank president should be chosen to represent an agricultural state in the United States senate. But these gentlemen were not chosen primarily because they were national bank presidents. The corporations were in full control in the legislature. For personal reasons they were unable to elect their first choice, and they settled upon the successful candidates because each had established by years of servitude, a claim upon corporation favor. It would have been difficult indeed to have found in all the state two men more thoroughly indentified with corporations or more entirely subservient to corporation interests than the two gentlemen whom the corporations