

the Minneapolis speech, said: "The strenuous one will now proceed to place the gyves upon cunning as in the past shackles had been placed on force." They said: "Of course he will first carefully overlook the entire field and select an able lawyer for attorney general of the United States, a lawyer whose training has been such that he will be in thorough sympathy with his praiseworthy desire. This great lawyer shall be his strong right arm, the honest blacksmith, as it were, to fasten the shackles and gyves that the strenuous one had determined to place on cunning trust barons and shrewd monopolists, who, through their greed and avarice, were distressing the people."

Then Mr. Burleson pointed out that these men who based their hopes upon the declarations of Theodore Roosevelt as vice president were disappointed in the action of Theodore Roosevelt as president. Instead of selecting a capable blacksmith who is not only able, but willing to shackle cunning, Mr. Roosevelt, as president, retained "a corporation lawyer, a trust attorney, to play the role of brawny blacksmith to weld the shackles for cunning trust magnates he had so long and so faithfully served. In effect, the wolf had been selected to care for and protect the sheep."

Continuing, Mr. Burleson referred to the first message delivered to congress by Mr. Roosevelt as president. Quoting the language of this message with relation to trusts, Mr. Burleson showed that President Roosevelt, when the opportunity came to carry into effect "the declarations so courageously made, had been unable to discover any monopolists or trust barons, but only could see 'captains of industry.'" And then, after all this, Mr. Burleson said: "By way of evidencing an abandonment of all hostility on his (Roosevelt's) part toward trusts, he has recently named the son of the captain of the 'captains of industry' to speak the humiliation of republican America at the coronation of an emperor and king whose government is now endeavoring to destroy every vestige of republicanism on the dark continent."

It cannot be doubted that Mr. Burleson, in his admirable address, made out a strong case against the "strenuous one" and it is creditable to the loving kindness of the gentleman from Texas that he found excuse for this "startling change." By way of explaining this remarkable transformation, Mr. Burleson, referring to Mr. Roosevelt, said: "He is environed by a political organization which is owned body and soul by the trusts; nothing else could be expected." And he added: "The strenuous one is a republican, he is environed by the republican party which is directed and controlled by trusts. This party has looked to trusts and monopolies so long for support and assistance, turning its back upon the people, that now, notwithstanding the strenuous one honestly desires to shackle cunning, when the opportunity came, these old influences were immediately thrown around him and he found himself overcome. He now knows the power of trusts; he now knows their influence; he has been taught it by those who surround him. He is a republican; his environment controls him."

And then by way of extenuation, Mr. Burleson said: "I have no harsh words for him (the strenuous one), only pity because of resultant consequences of his most deplorable surroundings. So far as trusts are concerned, henceforth he is blind, he cannot see; he is deaf, he cannot hear."

This admirable speech was concluded by an arraignment of the republican party—an arraignment that is remarkable alike for its brevity, its severity and its truth. In conclusion Mr. Burleson said:

Gentlemen of the dominant party, permit me to say to you that you are intoxicated with your present power; you have become recklessly indifferent to the wishes of the people. Listen to what I say. The people are at last awakening to true conditions. You have

reached the point where you are anxious to trim, to evade, to dodge, and the people know it. During this congress there will be no revision of the tariff, there will be no interference with the continued reign of the trusts. The trusts have so willed it. Now, mark the prophecy: These issues will bring about your undoing. Already a storm is gathering in the west. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Babcock), who has been on the watch-tower for the republican party for eight years, as chairman of the republican congressional committee, has sounded a note of warning, which has been echoed in effect by the present governors of Iowa and Minnesota, both republicans, but it will avail naught. You are joined to your idols; you are true republicans; you know the power of trusts; they know your venality. This tells the whole story.

Who, having read the proceedings of congress and observed the actions of Mr. Roosevelt since he became president, will say that Mr. Burleson's arraignment of the republican party does not "tell the whole story?"

Why?

The New York World, under the head-line, "Prosperity and Politics," comments upon the report of the secretary of the Nebraska banking board relative to the number of state and national banks in Nebraska, the amount of deposits and the average of deposits for each man, woman, and child in the state. The World says that this is more money than Nebraska ever had before and after describing these very gratifying conditions, adds:

These are doubtless among the reasons why Nebraska, which gave the democratic-fusion candidate for president a plurality of 13,576 in 1896, was carried by the republicans by 7,822 in 1900 and by 12,659 in 1901.

Prosperity is a great deal pleasanter and much more popular than calamity.

In the same issue of the New York World in which the above appeared is an article in which the World says that if the democrats will appeal to the people "to change the control of congress," they will have "an excellent chance to recover control of the house."

Now it is doubtless true that the conditions which the World described relating to Nebraska may be found in any state; and if this condition justifies a republican victory in Nebraska, why may not the same condition justify a republican victory in any other state? And if this condition, existing in all the states, justifies a republican victory, with what reason does the New York World urge the democrats to appeal to the people "to change the control of congress?" With what reason does the World say that democrats will have "an excellent chance to recover control in the house?"

Why not, after all, "let well enough alone?" Why disturb the flattering conditions to which the New York World points with pride?

Why not overlook the fact that the republican party has ceased to be representative of public interests and has come to be the tool of corporations and trusts?

Why not forget it all in the recollection of the interesting claim that the republican party has bestowed upon us prosperity, as it gives to us the sunshine and the shadow, the good health, the good crops, and the many other good things of life for which, in the old-fashioned days, we were wont to give our thanks to Providence rather than to a political organization?

Keep on the Heights.

In a letter to the Chicago Tribune, Wayne MacVeagh protests against sending special embassies to attend royal ceremonies. Mr. MacVeagh says:

It is alike undesirable and undignified in us, whose fathers fought seven years to be rid of kings and crowns, to send persons to pay homage to a gentleman who calls him-

self a king, and who is putting on his head what he calls a crown.

The Tribune approves the suggestion and adds:

The excellent gentlemen who have been selected to see King Edward crowned will have to go. It would be discourteous to revoke their commissions now. But this should be the last affair of the kind. The attitude of the United States concerning future coronations should be one of dignified aloofness. It should not descend from the heights of its republican simplicity to take part in the childish entertainments of Europe in which crowns, scepters, and holy oil are of so much importance.

Now if the attitude of the United States concerning coronations should be one of "dignified aloofness," why not begin with the coronation that is to take place next June? If the best interests of this country requires this "dignified aloofness" certainly "the excellent gentlemen who have been selected to see King Edward crowned "would not regard the revocation of their commissions as "discourteous."

This is a good time for the United States of America to refuse to "descend from the heights of its republican simplicity to take part in the childish entertainments of Europe."

The "Commercial Excuse."

The Washington correspondent of the Lincoln (Neb.) Journal—the representative republican organ of Nebraska—should be credited with being frank. He describes the republican position on the question of imperialism without quibbling. In a recent letter he said:

What does the heedless throng know about the Philippine question, anyway; and what does it care? To be sure the army is costing the people millions annually, but it is furnishing employment for thousands of men who might otherwise be idle, and the army supplies are purchased in this country while the money for munitions and ordnance is disbursed in America to Americans. The war gives employment to idle men and distributes money to the contractors who are manufacturers.

It will be cheerfully admitted that the masses do not know much about the Philippine situation. This is due to the fact that the administration exercises great care in keeping closed the avenues of information. But there are plenty of evidences at hand to prove that the people are not "heedless" and that they are arriving at a thorough understanding of the Philippine question. They are rapidly coming to understand that the war is just what this frank correspondent admits that it is—not a war for a principle, but a war for commercialism; that it is a war prosecuted for the purpose of making business for a favored few. The excuse that employment for idle men and profits for contractors and manufacturers is furnished by a war that results in the slaughter of the flower of American manhood and the destruction of the hopes of a people who would be free, is not one that will appeal to patriotic Americans. But it is the only excuse that the party of imperialism and commercialism can truthfully offer, although it pretends that it is a war prosecuted for the flag, for civilization and for Christianity. But the expression, "heedless throng," fully explains the opinion the republican leaders have of the masses of the people.

The publishers' association met in New York a few days ago and demanded that wood pulp be put upon the free list and the duty on news print materially reduced. Will the republican members of the association please explain why they join in making such a demand? Is the tax not paid by the foreigner? If they reply that the demand was made in order to protect American forests will they please explain the tariff on lumber?