

The Commoner.

he had loaned. The republican state convention met before his parole expired and adopted a resolution demanding that he be returned to the penitentiary, and the governor immediately complied with the resolution. Mr. Bartley returned no money during his freedom. Soon after his return to the penitentiary he made known the fact that Mr. Goold, the republican candidate for regent of the state university, who voted his delegation for the resolution demanding the ex-treasurer's reimprisonment, was one of the men who borrowed state money and failed to return it. This announcement caused a sensation and was followed by the withdrawal of Mr. Goold from the ticket.

The election resulted in a republican victory, and in less than three months after the election the governor, who was rebuked before the election for giving Bartley a two months' parole, gives him a complete pardon.

If Mr. Bartley and his family were the only persons interested there would be unanimous acquiescence in the governor's act, for no one can find real pleasure in the punishment of another, even though that punishment is well deserved. Every one sympathizes with the wife and the children of a man who is paying the penalty, however just, for a crime committed, but citizens cannot afford to consider the question from a personal standpoint, neither can they allow sympathy to control their judgment in such cases. There are many men in the penitentiary who could be discharged with reasonable certainty that they would not commit again the act for which they were incarcerated; there are many women who are sadly waiting for the return of their husbands, and many children whom a penitentiary deprives of a father's care. If the appeals of all these were listened to, the prisons would soon be empty. Why are they denied pardon? Because they lack the political, financial and social influence that Mr. Bartley could summon. They cannot secure a petition ornamented by the names of prominent men, therefore they must still endure the rigors of prison life.

We must consider the effect of such pardons on society, and what is that effect? Evidently it is to make the mass of the people feel that offenses against society are measured, not by the degree of criminality involved, but by the prominence and influence of the offender. There is such a thing as a sense of justice, and this is violated when a heavy punishment is visited upon a crime when committed by persons of one class and a comparatively light punishment visited upon the same crime when committed by persons of a different class. It is not necessary to argue that the Bartley pardon was given in order to shield the persons who contributed to the defalcation by a failure to return state money; it is not necessary to emphasize the fact that the pardon was granted after the election rather than before, nor is it necessary to speculate as to the present feelings or future conduct of those republicans who only a few months ago virtuously condemned even a parole.

The serious phase of this question is to be found in its demoralizing influence upon society. It is a matter to be regretted by democrats as well as republicans—for all are interested in the state's reputation and in the welfare of the commonwealth—that the governor of Nebraska yielded to entreaty and violated the sound doctrine embodied in the motto of the state.

Responsibility for Anarchy.

When congress is called upon to consider measures aimed at the suppression of anarchy there will probably be some discussion of the causes which produce anarchy, and if the republican members of congress follow the example set by republican editors, they will attempt to place upon the democratic party responsibility for recent manifestations of the anarchistic spirit in the United States. If such a charge is made it

must not only be met by the democrats, but it should be met with arguments which will show that the real cause of anarchy is to be found in republican policies rather than in democratic speeches.

Republican papers are in the habit of charging the democrats with rousing passions and stirring up hatred, malice and envy. Anarchy is a protest against all forms of government, and no democrat has said anything or done anything to give encouragement to that doctrine. The democrats believe in government, and they show their love of government by trying to so improve it that it will command the confidence of all the people. The physician who suggests rules for health and applies restoratives in sickness is a better friend than the one who encourages dissipation and scoffs at the approach of disease.

Republican papers are in the habit of charging democrats with stirring up class prejudice and hatred. This would be a serious charge if founded upon fact, and it raises the question: Is it wrong to criticize a public official, or to point out the evil effects of a policy? If so, how is a reform to be accomplished? Must we assume that the president not only can do no wrong, but can make no mistake? When the Wilson bill was passed republican papers all over the country claimed that mills were closed, that men were thrown out of employment, and that destitution and starvation were brought to tens of thousands of people. If some man out of work had taken a notion to kill the author of the bill, the congressmen and senators who voted for it, or the president who permitted it to become a law and then enforced its provision, would the republican editors have been morally responsible for the assassination?

The republican newspapers and speakers charged that the panic of 1893 was due to the agitation of the money question. That panic broke up business men, suspended enterprises and largely increased the necessity for charity. If some one who suffered by the panic had undertaken to avenge himself by killing the advocates of bimetallism, would the republican editors have been morally responsible for the act?

The New York Sun recently declared that the overthrow of the trusts would cause terrible industrial disasters and the same charge has been made by other republican papers. Suppose some man who has faith in the judgment of the editor of the Sun undertakes to prevent the predicted calamity by killing the men who are trying to exterminate the trusts, will the Sun be responsible for the act?

No rule is sound which is not of general application. If the democrats must abstain from criticism for fear some ignorant or vicious man may resort to force instead of the ballot to correct the wrong, the rule must apply to republicans as well, and we must suspend entirely the discussion of such questions. The republicans say that the democrats attempt to array class against class. In the first place this is untrue in the sense in which the republicans use the term, and in the second place every editor who makes this charge is more guilty than those whom he accuses. The republicans coined the phrases, "home industries" and "infant industries;" they have appealed to the manufacturers as a class and collected large campaign funds from them on the ground that they are specially interested in republican policies. They have constantly arrayed the interests of one portion of the population against the interests of another portion. In 1896 they charged that the mine owners were seeking to secure an advantage at the expense of the rest of the people, and they asserted that debtors were trying to get out of debt by the use of cheap dollars; they excited the fears of bankers; they frightened depositors; they coerced employes. They never hesitated to attack any class or any portion of the country that opposed republican policies. In the campaign of 1900 they

claimed credit for better times, and said that a panic would follow a change in administration. When they appealed to the religiously inclined, they represented imperialism as a divinely appointed chance for missionary enterprise. When they appealed to the commercially inclined, they represented it as a profitable venture, and to those with an ambition for office they held out the possibilities of foreign service. They have never hesitated to tickle the palate of the tax-eater with promises of rich reward, and yet they complain if the attention of the taxpayer is called to the fact that he must pay the bill. The republican editors cannot point to a word spoken or an act done by those who believe in democratic doctrines which has not more than its counterpart in the constant practice of republicans.

But while we are investigating the question of responsibility let us consider whether the republicans are not morally responsible for the growth of anarchy. Anarchy is not indigenous to American soil; it is of foreign origin and culture. It is the outgrowth of conditions which to the anarchists seem unchangeable. Arbitrary power suppresses all God-given instincts and arouses a resentment that always follows the disregard of natural justice. It has been the boast of our government that it differed from the governments of Europe in that it rested upon the consent of the governed. Anything which tends to obliterate or lessen this distinction cannot but create here the conditions out of which anarchy grows.

In Europe there are classes separated by birth. Some are born to rule, others are born into the aristocracy, while the masses are born to serve. These artificial distinctions naturally excite a hatred which, when long suppressed, bursts forth into hostility to the government which recognizes and enforces these distinctions. The creation of artificial distinctions in this country tends to create the same conditions, and the republican party has done more than all other parties combined to separate the people into classes. It is assumed that only the manufacturers are capable of deciding on the tariff question and the tariff law of 1890 was, according to the testimony of a United States senator, written by the beneficiaries of the tariff. It is contended that only the financiers are competent to legislate on the financial question, and that only business men have a real and vital interest in good government. Trust magnates are allowed to select the attorney general and corporations often have a controlling influence in the appointments of judges and in the action of United States senators.

The individual who is driven into bankruptcy by a great monopoly and then sees the beneficiaries of that monopoly prominent in society, in politics and in the councils of the nation, is in excellent condition to listen to the theories of the anarchist. Government is a great blessing when it is administered with justice, but it appears as an unspeakable evil to the helpless citizen who is forbidden by law to avenge his own wrongs and then vainly appeals to the government for protection.

The republican party is today engaged in an imperial policy that will do more than all else combined to cultivate the anarchistic spirit. Those who know what imperialism is in the old country can imagine what it will be in this country when fully developed. It means a centralization of the government, followed by a gradual change which will give more emphasis to the strength of the government and less to the rights of the individual. It also means a lessening of the regard shown for human life. According to the doctrines of a republic, life and liberty are priceless; under an empire liberty is measured in dollars and cents, and life is unimportant when it stands in the way of trade. We cannot wage wars of conquest in order to help our merchants without making men a matter of merchandise; we cannot give commercial reasons for the killing of the Filipinos without arousing a discussion as to the relative value of