

the auction block and sell it to the highest bidder. As long as the reorganizing democrats are headed toward republican policies even a Mississippi legislature will find it impossible to deliver the democratic voters into the keeping of those reorganizers.

There runs through the resolution the Mammon-worshipping spirit which today dominates the republican party and those democrats who have in recent years been affiliating with the republican party. No great principle is mentioned, no great reform promised, no appeal is made to head or to heart—it is all commercial; all mercenary.

Plutocracy embraces two classes of people—the purse-proud possessors of money and the impetuous flatterers who hope to secure a few crumbs from an overloaded table. The McAllister resolution puts the people of Mississippi in the position of mendicants begging favors from corporate wealth and offering to enlist under the flag that represents the most money. The supporters of the McAllister resolution do not ask what the eastern democrats stand for; they are, to all appearances, indifferent as to issues. No matter whether the eastern democrats favor gold or silver or paper, no matter whether they favor trust supremacy or the annihilation of trusts, no matter whether they favor tariff reform or a high tariff, no matter whether they favor self-government or imperialism—according to the resolution it matters not what the eastern democrats favor or oppose, the Mississippi democrats are to take them for better or for worse and, so far as the supporters of the resolution can bind them, they agree to “love, honor and obey” the eastern spouse.

Mr. McAllister will never be accused of plagiarizing from the utterances of Jefferson or Jackson, but he will find many republican speeches so like his resolution in sentiment that with a few verbal changes he can quote them in support of his doctrine.

What is to be done? The doctrine presented in the resolution has never been submitted to the democrats of Mississippi; they have never authorized their legislators to make such an announcement. It is purely the individual opinion of those who voted for the resolution. The agents acted beyond the scope of their authority and it remains for the principal—the people—to indorse or repudiate the act of the agent.

For the good name of the Mississippi democracy let us hope that the repudiation will be speedy and emphatic.

A Word as to Clubs.

The editorials which have appeared in former issues of *The Commoner* relative to debating societies have brought several inquiries as well as numerous suggestions. A Snohomish, Wash., reader of this paper calls attention to a club there which is non-political in its character and which discusses important questions as they arise, each member being called upon to give expression to his views. There is in the city of Lincoln a similar club, known as the Round Table. It was organized about twelve years ago and meets every two weeks, except during a recess of about three months in the summer. The club is in a very prosperous condition and has been extremely beneficial to those who are members. It includes representatives of the various occupations and professions, as well as representatives of different parties and religions. The club has no president and the secretary's only duty is to inform the members of the place of meeting and the subject.

The club meets from house to house, according to the convenience of the members, and they lead the discussion in alphabetical order.

According to the rules of the Round Table the leader selects his subject and presents his views upon it, after which the other members are called upon in turn.

Such an exchange of ideas is immensely helpful to those who desire to keep abreast with the

times. This club is a little different from the ordinary debating club and may suit some better than a debating club, but the method of procedure is not nearly so important as the discussion of current questions.

In this connection answer will be made to two inquiries submitted. First, as to the form of a question presenting the subject of a protective tariff and second the form of a question presenting the principle of the income tax.

The tariff question may be stated in several ways, among others the following: “Resolved, That a tariff levied, not for the purpose of collecting revenue, but primarily and principally for the purpose of protection, is right in principle, wise in policy and necessary to the extent that we now have it.”

“Resolved, That the principle of a protective tariff is wrong, and that import duties should be collected for revenue only.”

These two questions present the tariff question in such a form that the principle involved can be discussed. Those who advocate a protective tariff assume the burden of proof, and must show that the principle is correct, that the policy is advantageous and that the rate asked for is necessary.

The income tax question can be presented as follows: “Resolved, That an income tax is just in principle and that the constitution of the United States should be so amended as to specifically authorize the collection of such a tax whenever congress deems such a tax desirable.”

This question presents the income tax principle and compels the opponents of the tax to meet the question squarely. If the principle of the tax is right, then congress should be permitted to decide upon the desirability of applying the principle. In the campaign of 1896 the opponents of the income tax, instead of meeting the issue fairly, pretended to see in the democratic platform a reflection upon the supreme court and a threat to reorganize that august body. No such construction could justly be placed upon the platform, but the question as above stated avoids that criticism and defines the real issue. In this issue will be found an argument in favor of the income tax presented by Mr. Bryan when the Wilson bill, containing the income tax provision, was before congress.

Two Republican Planks.

Republican newspapers are now urging the passage of the ship subsidy bill on the ground that the republican party in its national platform promised the adoption of such a measure. It will be interesting to read the republican plank relating to this question and the republican plank relating to trusts and then observe the manner in which republican newspapers and republican leaders insist that each of these planks be carried out.

The republican plank relating to shipping is as follows:

Our present dependence upon foreign shipping for nine-tenths of our foreign carrying is a great loss to the industry of this country. It is also a serious danger to our trade, for its sudden withdrawal in the event of European wars would seriously cripple our expanding foreign commerce. The national defense and naval efficiency of this country, moreover, supply a compelling reason for legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade carrying fleets of the world.

The republican plank relating to trusts is as follows:

We recognize the necessity and propriety of the honest co-operation of capital to meet new business conditions and especially to extend our rapidly increasing foreign trade, but we condemn all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production, or to control prices; and favor such legislation as will effectively restrain and prevent all such abuses, protect and promote competition and secure the rights of producers, laborers, and all who are engaged in industry and commerce.

Now it will be observed that no explicit pledge

is made in the plank relating to shipping. That plank promised “legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade carrying fleets of the world.” But this did not necessarily mean legislation that would vote enormous subsidies into the pockets of a favored few, although the plank is now being interpreted in that direction.

The plank relating to trusts was considerably plainer than the plank relating to shipping. “All conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production or to control prices” were condemned in this plank of the republican platform; and the people were promised “such legislation as will effectively restrain and prevent all such abuses, protect and promote competition and secure the rights of the producers, laborers, and all who are engaged in industry and commerce.”

And yet how different is the position of republican leaders today with respect to this trust pledge and the position of these same people with respect to the shipping pledge. In their platform they condemned the trust and they promised legislation that would prevent all such abuses and yet today the only remedy they have for these “conspiracies” is “publicity”—and not much of that. They close their eyes to the weapon immediately within their reach, the weapon suggested by Mr. Babcock of Wisconsin and the weapon proposed by the Kansas City platform, which would result in removing the tariff advantages from the products of the trust. The republican platform referred to the trusts as “conspiracies,” but the republican president in his message referred to the trust magnates as “captains of industry.”

Now if the ambiguous plank relating to shipping requires the passage of the ship subsidy bill on the ground that that plank was a solemn pledge to the people, why does not the explicit plank relating to trusts require fulfillment?

Will some republican organ undertake to explain the zeal for the enactment of a law that will vote fortunes into the pockets of a few men under the pretense of carrying out an ambiguous plank, while there is a very apparent determination to repudiate the explicit pledge made in the plank relating to trusts—a plank which, if honestly carried out, would deprive a number of “conspirators” of the opportunity of fleecing the people?

Prince Henry's Visit.

Prince Henry, brother of the German emperor and representative of the German government as well as the German race, has had an enjoyable visit in the United States and has seen a considerable portion of our country as well as a large number of our people. He has been treated with great cordiality and returns home with the assurance—if any assurance had been needed—that there is a feeling of genuine friendship between this country and Germany.

Insofar as the efforts of our people were directed toward proving the existence of this feeling these efforts were entirely commendable; insofar as they were intended to show hospitality toward the representative of a foreign government they were praiseworthy. Some may have felt an un-American thrill when brought into actual contact with a real, live representative of European royalty, but the prince doubtless met enough people to convince him that the toadies and would-be aristocrats are in the minority. One of the opposition members in the German legislature recently commented on the so-called democratic ways of the prince and suggested that they were purely for foreign consumption. It is entirely probable that he was more democratic here than he is at home, for here he was trying to please his host, but our envoys to the coronation will get even when they go to Europe, for they will doubtless be more aristocratic abroad than they would dare to be at home.

Let us hope that the visit of the prince will re-