

of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question."

If republicans are unwilling to accept the authority of Thomas Jefferson, they ought certainly to heed the words of Henry Clay. The whig party was the forerunner of the Republican party, and Abraham Lincoln was one of Clay's warmest supporters. In 1818 Clay made a speech in the House of Representatives on the emancipation of South America (See the World's Best Orations.) In the course of his argument he took occasion to condemn the very sentiment which now finds expression in the Republican papers. Here are his words:

"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 cannot command universal assent to the proposition, it is then demanded to particular nations; and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us. I contend, that it is to arraign the dispositions of Providence himself, to suppose that he has created beings incapable of governing themselves, and to be trampled on by kings. Self-government is the natural government of man."

If, however, the Republicans want some more recent authority—authority more closely identified with the Republican party—let them turn to the speech made by Abraham Lincoln at Chicago in 1858 and they will find there a complete and conclusive answer to such a sentiment as that quoted from the Democrat and Chronicle.

Lincoln said:

"Those arguments that are made, that the inferior race 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 enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument."

What a fall is this! The self-evident truths, proclaimed in the beginning of our nation's history and revered for a century and a quarter, have become "unconscious anarchy!" They must not be uttered aloud for fear they will stimulate anarchy. Was ever a party's transformation more complete?

If one says, as the editor of THE COMMONER did, "partiality in government kindles discontent, the exaltation of money above human rights, the fattening of the few at the expense of the many, the making of artificial distinctions between citizens and the lessening of the sacredness of human life—all these in their full development encourage the anarchistic spirit—is he guilty of "unconscious anarchy?" The Democrat and Chronicle even finds fault with the declaration that "our government must be made as good as intelligence and patriotism can make it." This, also, is "unconscious anarchy."

Anarchy cannot be defended under any circumstances, and no Democrat has any sympathy with it or toleration for it, for the word 'democrat' means that the people rule; it is not chaos that is desired, but "a government of the people, by the people and for the people." But

a Democrat not only believes in government, but in just government, and he will not be deterred from pointing out and correcting injustice by the fear that some one will carry his discontent to the point of despair. What is the alternative? It is to praise evil or to be silent in its presence. It is to encourage misrule and corruption; it is to bring this government down to the condition of those governments in which oppression is so great and relief so remote that the people become desperate. To point out the governmental abuses which cause anarchy is not to justify or defend anarchy. A disease cannot be treated until the cause is ascertained. To charge a Democrat with being responsible for anarchy because he tries to apply a rational and permanent remedy is as unfair as to blame a physician for a disease which he points out and tries to cure.

If those who believe in self-government and who want to make the government entirely beneficent are to be charged with "unconscious anarchy" of what are they guilty who pervert government, profit by its perversion and then denounce criticism of their misdeeds?

### Christian Advocate on Trusts.

It is a matter of regret that the Christian Advocate should appear as a defender of the trusts. It does not say that they are good, but does say: "The simple facts are that there are no trusts in the country, and though some concerns or owners are united for the same purpose, they are not trusts, nor have they by any means all the legal powers that the trusts had." After declaring that there are no trusts it fails to condemn private monopolies in the form in which they now appear. It simply says: "Whether some way of regulating the size of such corporations can be devised without violating essential rights, or whether, if possible, it should be done, are other questions."

The readers of the Christian Advocate have reason to expect more frankness and candor than are shown in the editorial quoted. If the Advocate believes that the trusts are good, it ought to say so and attempt to defend them. If it believes them bad, it owes it to its readers to condemn them and point out a remedy. The Advocate will find it difficult to support the trusts system without so amending the commandment as to make it read "Thou shalt not steal—on a small scale." Trusts steal on a large scale, and cannot be justified on political or economic grounds, much less on religious grounds.

### Mr. Cummins' Error.

In a speech delivered at Centerville, Iowa, Mr. Cummins, the Republican nominee for Governor, said: "Five full years of experience have approved every statement, verified every argument and vindicated every principle asserted by the Republicans."

Let us take a glance at the statements, arguments and principles asserted by the Republican party in 1896.

The leaders of that party asserted that we did not need more money and yet today, after "five full years of experience" they boast that

their party has made wonderful increase in the volume of money.

They declared that the policy of protection was "the bulwark of American industrial independence and the fountain of American development and prosperity," and yet in the last speech delivered by Mr. McKinley that great Republican leader pointed out very clearly that the Republican position on the question must be modified.

That platform asserted the principle of bimetallism by international agreement. No serious effort was made to fulfill the pledge relating to international bimetallism and after "five full years of experience" the Republican position of international bimetallism in 1896 has been abandoned for the Republican position of the single gold standard in 1901.

That platform declared that the Nicaraguan canal should be built, owned and operated by the United States and yet a Republican secretary of state after several "full years of experience" sought to negotiate a treaty in which much of the practical control of that canal would have been surrendered to Great Britain.

That platform declared that "from the hour of achieving their own independence the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other American people to free themselves from European domination;" and yet after "five full years of experience" the Republican party today finds itself in a position where it dare not express sympathy with the struggles of the Dutchmen of South Africa to free themselves from European domination.

That platform promised to the American workingmen "protection against the fatal competition of low priced labor" and declared that the immigration laws should be thoroughly enforced; and yet no serious effort has been made to fulfill this pledge.

That platform declared in favor of a strict enforcement of the principle of the civil service law and after one or two "full years of experience" this pledge and its principle were violated by the removal of at least 10,000 public positions from the civil service list.

That platform promised the creation of a national board of arbitration to adjust differences between employer and employee and yet that pledge has never been fulfilled.

That platform promised that the remaining territories would be admitted and that the citizens of Alaska should have representation in congress and yet neither of these pledges has been fulfilled.

There are many statements, arguments and principles asserted by the Republican party that have not been approved, verified or vindicated after "five full years of experience." The above are a few.

### Where is the Majority?

The Austin, (Texas) Statesman asks:

"If Mr. Bryan is that good a democrat he claims to be why does he not bow to the majority and let the democratic party be reorganized on a sounder basis than at present, even if that reorganization eliminates himself as a factor and as a leader?"

If the "majority" want to reorganize the