

that the masses of the American people have not wholly abandoned those things which Mr. Cannon sneeringly assigned to the "realm of sentiment."

Municipal Ownership.

At the recent election in Chicago about 170,000 people expressed themselves on the subject of municipal ownership, the vote standing as follows:

For the ownership by the city of Chicago of all street railroads within the corporate limits of said city, 142,826; against, 27,998.

More than four to one in favor of the municipal ownership of street car lines!

For the ownership by the city of Chicago of the gas and electric light plants, said plants to furnish light, heat and power for public and private use, 129,999; against the proposition, 21,367. Nearly seven to one in favor of municipal lighting! Along with these questions was submitted a proposition for the nomination of all candidates for city offices by direct vote of the voters at primary elections to be held for the purpose. On this proposition the affirmative received 140,860 votes, the negative, 17,654.

The vote on these questions shows the trend of public opinion in favor of municipal ownership. There is no doubt that there is to-day an overwhelming sentiment in favor of the collective ownership and operation of what are called natural municipal monopolies. It is impossible to have competition in lighting, in heating or in street car service, and the private ownership of these franchises not only leads to corruption in city government, but results in high rates and the accumulation of great fortunes for which the people at large receive no adequate return.

It is gratifying to know that the voters of Chicago were almost unanimous in favor of bringing the nominating machinery closer to the people, and the republican senators who still stand out against the popular election of senators will ultimately be made to feel the force of public sentiment on this subject.

Wherever there are evils in government they can generally be traced to the misrepresentation of the people rather than to the people themselves, and while some of our officials are interesting themselves in coronations and in the ways of aristocracy, the masses desire more democracy in their government and in their party machinery.

The vote in Chicago is a large straw and it not only shows that the wind is setting in toward more popular government, but that it is a strong wind.

Wholesale Anarchy.

A prominent Nebraska republican, in a speech before the state university explaining and condemning anarchy, quoted from several noted anarchists to show that they advocate the doctrine that might is the foundation of right, but he unconsciously put the anarchists and the republican leaders in the same class. He quoted "Caspar Schmidt, commonly known as Max Stirner," as saying:

Right is power or might. What you have the power to be that you have a right to be. I derive all right and justification from myself alone; for I am entitled to do everything which I have the power to do.

Now, republicans and democrats alike condemn this doctrine when an individual applies it, but the republican leaders are applying on a large scale in the Philippines exactly the same doctrine that the anarchist applies on a small scale. Imperialism rests on the doctrine of force and on that alone. We are in the Philippines because we have the power to be. The Commoner has already shown by the correspondence which passed between the president and the peace commissioners that Mr. McKinley insisted upon resting

title in part upon "conquest"—that was the word used—and conquest gives us the only title we have. Spain was not in possession when we went through the form of buying the islands and the people, and was not in position to put us in possession. We purchased an option on a fight, and have been fighting ever since. How can republicans consistently condemn an anarchist who asserts his right to kill because he has the power to kill if these same republicans assert that we have a right to govern Filipinos because we have the power to do so, and as a corollary have the right to kill Filipinos if they object to conquest and subjugation. If our nation acts upon the theory that might makes right it will find it difficult to draw a line between wholesale conquest and retail anarchy.

To fight anarchy successfully we must set up a standard of right entirely independent of the force which supports or defends it; we must insist that there are inalienable rights and that governments are instituted among men for the preservation of these rights. Governments are necessary, but necessary for what? For the protection of rights, and they are good just in proportion as they protect the rights of citizens. The republicans have refused to discuss the principle involved in imperialism, but they cannot always refuse. When they begin the discussion they will find themselves defending European principles of government and they will discover upon examination that the empires of Europe are responsible for the doctrine of force asserted by individual anarchists. Is it not time to recognize that a moral principle cannot be affected by the number of persons involved? That might makes right is no more true when the might is employed by 75,000,000 than when it is employed by one, and yet that is the only difference between the doctrine of the imperialist and the doctrine of the anarchist.

Protection Again the Fetich.

In the early part of December, the Chicago Tribune printed a symposium of opinions expressed by republican editors with relation to the tariff question. Many of these editors declared in favor of tariff revision. The editor of the St. Paul Pioneer Press said:

If congress should refuse to adjust the tariff to existing conditions it will arm the enemies of protection with effective arguments against the whole system, which might easily lead to a popular revulsion ending in the overthrow of the republican ascendancy in congress.

The editor of the Sioux Falls Journal said that when it was admitted that there were serious flaws in the Dingley law, that law should not be held as something sacred and inviolable. He said he could not understand this tottering kind of reasoning, nor could he sympathize with the implied suggestion that a congress, republican in both branches, and therefore favorable to protection, should let the tariff alone because it might "tear up everything by the roots and unsettle business generally." He declared that the friends of the tariff should take care that its revision is not turned over to its enemies, and he added: "Generally speaking, the opponents of the tariff tinkering are opponents of the pending treaties for reciprocal trade arrangements."

About the same time the Chicago Record-Herald, speaking on this same subject, said:

A very strenuous effort is being made to keep the party from fulfilling its pledges, and what with broken pledges and the inequalities of the tariff there may be a heavy account to settle at the next congressional elections.

In this connection some interesting reading is furnished by Walter Wellman, the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record-Herald. Under recent date Mr. Wellman wired his paper as follows:

One of the greatest problems confronting

the republican party is what to do with the tariff question and when to do it. It is admitted on all sides that nothing will be done with the tariff at this session of congress beyond the small reciprocity concession to Cuba. In no other way will the tariff be touched this year. Notwithstanding the demand of the people for relief from the high prices at which trust-made goods are sold, no relief will now be afforded. President McKinley's general reciprocity scheme will come to naught. Members of the cabinet who talked with the late president say he was very much in earnest in his desire to promote reciprocity as a means of letting out some of the water behind the protection dam. "He used those very words to me," said one member of the cabinet to the writer. "Mr. McKinley was thoroughly devoted to the protection principle. He had spent his life in working for it. He had not in any way changed his views regarding it. But he foresaw, as he told me, that unless something were done to afford relief, if the principle were carried to an undue extreme, sooner or later public opinion would turn against it and there would be another revolution. To avert this President McKinley devised his reciprocity plan."

But none of the reciprocity treaties negotiated by the McKinley administration will be ratified. Senator Cullom is determined to have action on the French, Argentine and other treaties now pending before his committee. That is to say, he intends to have them disposed of. But it is known to every one that they will be disposed of by defeat or by putting them back on the shelf. They will not be ratified. Indeed, Senator Aldrich, the chief protection leader in congress, has convinced the foreign relations committee that the French treaty is a bad one and that it should never have been negotiated. If there is anything about which the republican leaders in both branches of congress are agreed it is that there shall be no tariff tinkering of any sort at this session. No reciprocity, no direct revision, nothing whatever. President McKinley's famous Buffalo speech is a classic, and nothing more. It belongs to the dead past.

Mr. Wellman explains that this situation was due to the fact that President Roosevelt, "a new man at the head of affairs, did not dare advocate tariff revision in the face of the opposition of the older men of the party." He further explains that Senator Hanna was opposed to it because he did not want "business interests disturbed," and he volunteers the further information that "Of course Senator Aldrich, and his lieutenants, the eastern protectionists, concurred in this conclusion," adding, "Speaker Henderson and Senator Allison, who should have taken the western or consumer's point of view, if it can be expected to have any friends in congress, have also joined in tacit bargain to squelch all efforts to open the tariff question at this time. So the die is cast. The republican party is going into the campaign of 1904 with the Dingley law as its platform."

St. Louis County in Line.

The democrats of St. Louis county, Missouri, held a convention a few days ago for the purpose of sending delegates to the various state conventions. The following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Believing that questions of national politics are to be determined only by the representatives of the democratic party when assembled in national convention, we denounce as treasonable to the party all suggestions by persons professing to be democrats that its principles as declared in the platform of its last national convention to be disregarded. When delegates to the national convention to be held in 1904 are to be selected, then and not until then does it become democrats to propose departures from or changes in the national policy of their party. Therefore, we as the representatives of the democrats of St. Louis county hereby reassert our fealty to the principles of the Kansas City platform adopted in 1900, and demand that all candidates appealing for support as democrats shall represent it."

Let the good work go on. Every county convention should place itself on record and pledge its delegates to the support of the doctrines of the party as set forth in the last national platform.