

deprive the man, particularly qualified for the banking business, of the privilege of working for himself and profiting by his toil and his ability; and in the place of independent bankers it will give us, as every trust has given us, a great body of hired men, working upon a salary, dependent for their positions upon the whim and pleasure of an employer.

The trust system is adverse to the interests of the country bankers, exactly as it is adverse to the interests of people generally. It is directly adverse to the interests of the country bankers because as certain as night follows day a great banking trust will be established in this country unless the people unite for the purpose of crushing out the trust system altogether.

We cannot encourage the organization of trusts in some lines and deny the privilege in others; and this will be particularly true with relation to the business which deals in money.

The country bankers will do well to array themselves against the trust system. They will do well to turn their backs upon the republican party and give their support to a political organization that demands equal rights to all and protests against special privileges to any class.

Strenuosity in Demand.

The Washington correspondent of the Chicago Journal tells of a breakfast recently given at Senator Hanna's house at which the president was the guest. This correspondent says:

Here is the explanation. Tuesday James J. Hill was in the city. He lunched and dined with Senator Hanna and he went to the capitol and talked with all the senators and most of the representatives from the states of the northwest. What Hill said to the senators and members was not complimentary to Roosevelt.

Six months ago, when Hill was here, he lunched at the White house. This time he put up at the Arlington and lunched with Hanna. He told everybody he met that the man in the White house was a dangerous radical; that his anti-railroad campaign was a menace to the prosperity of the country; that he was stirring up populism in the northwest; that he was no better than a socialist, and many other things of the kind.

What the eminent railroad merger king told Hanna was much to the same effect. He also told Hanna something to be repeated to Roosevelt, and it was to talk over this message that the now famous breakfast was arranged at the unseemly hour of 8 a. m.

Without professing to repeat the exact words used at the breakfast, and without violating any confidences, it may be stated that Mr. Hill wished Roosevelt to understand that he could not go on as he had been doing, bringing suits under the Sherman anti-trust law against his railroads, stirring up the interstate commerce commission to bring injunctions, prosecuting the meat and other trusts, and generally interfering with the peaceful operation of railroad business, without being brought to account for it.

A great many people have been puzzled because of Mr. Roosevelt's proceedings against the beef trust. It is true that those financiers who are not directly interested in the packing houses have no great concern for the beef trust and yet it is evidently feared, and naturally so, that if the proceedings against the beef trust are successful, a popular demand will be made for similar proceedings against other trusts.

If Mr. Roosevelt should in all seriousness proceed against the trusts, it cannot be doubted that a very strong opposition would be built up against him within his own party, however much he might have the approval of the rank and file of the party.

However important the figure of J. J. Hill may be in business circles, it is humiliating that a trust magnate engaged in a violation of law would dare to threaten the president of the United States if the president undertook seriously to enforce the law.

If Mr. Roosevelt really intends to wage a serious fight against the trust system, he will have

need for all the "strenuosity" he can summon. He will be discouraged by party leaders and threatened by men of high influence in business and political circles. It is probable, also, that a serious fight against the trusts by Mr. Roosevelt would result in his defeat for the republican nomination, but there are things worse than political defeat and there are things better than political victory.

The people are feeling the exactions of the trusts and if Mr. Roosevelt shall make a determined effort to protect the people from the evils of the trust system, and to punish the wealthy and influential lawbreakers, even though he be defeated in the republican convention he will retire from office honored and respected for patriotic effort shown in a warfare against a mighty evil.

In a speech at Minneapolis, when he was vice president, Mr. Roosevelt said that it might be necessary in the future to "shackle cunning as in the past we had shackled force." The "future" to which Mr. Roosevelt referred is at hand. It is time the "shackling" process was commenced. The shackles will not, however, be securely placed if the president shows the least timidity in the discharge of his duty.

"Cunning" may be effectually shackled if Mr. Roosevelt is as strenuous in the discharge of his public duty as he is in the delivery of his public speeches.

A Novel Defense.

The Chicago Record-Herald provides a novel defense for General Smith. In an editorial entitled "Well to Remember" the Record-Herald says:

Even if General Smith shall be convicted of issuing an order at variance with the rules of civilized warfare and abhorrent to American ideas of Christian conduct toward the most treacherous foes, it will still be well to remember that there has been no evidence produced yet that his orders were obeyed or resulted in the wholesale slaughter of Filipino women and children.

Until this is established by credible testimony Americans have a right to believe that United States soldiers in the Philippines disregarded orders where obedience would have exposed them to the execration of the Christian world. In such a matter involving the honor and humanity of the American army judgment should wait on facts and not be rendered on hysterics.

It is not at all likely that intelligent men will regard it their duty to acquit General Smith on the theory that even though he gave these outrageous orders his subordinates refused to carry them into effect.

It is the soldier's duty to obey orders and it is not at all probable that any soldier, having regard for his personal welfare, would refuse to obey an order given by his superior.

To believe that General Smith's brutal order was carried into effect on many occasions cannot be attributed to "hysterics." A man who would be so brutal as to issue such an order would be sufficiently determined to see that the order was carried into effect, particularly if one of his subordinates undertook to test the question as to whether a subordinate might pass upon a superior's instructions.

"Patriotism of the South."

The Washington Star says: "Confidence in the patriotism of the south is not confined to a few men north of Mason and Dixon's line. Mr. McKinley felt it and had occasion to prove it. Mr. Roosevelt feels it and declares it. It is widespread among men who really count in the national equation and it is not complimentary to our discernment that so important a fact should for a moment anywhere be obscured by the mere cackle of windjammers and machine politicians."

Is it not also about time to quit discussing the "patriotism of the south?"

It will occur to the average man that no ma-

terial contribution to the cordial relations existing between the north and the south is made by constant reference to the fact that at one time these sections were pitted against one another. It must also grate somewhat harshly on the southern man to be constantly reminded that the orator who is addressing him, or the newspaper editor who is writing for him believes that he is a "patriotic citizen."

The south is a very important portion of this union. There is no difference between the patriotism of the average southern man and the patriotism of the average northern man. Confidence or a pretended lack of confidence in the patriotism of the south on the part of the politician is not of serious consequence. The south is today a more important portion of this country than it ever was in all its history; and it is just as unnecessary for one to continually harp upon the "patriotism of the south" as it would be foolish for any one to express the opinion that the south is untrue to itself by being untrue to the country of which it is a most conspicuous and important part.

When two neighbors have been reunited after a serious falling out, they display their wisdom by avoiding reference to their late unpleasantness; and certainly these neighbors would not contribute to the cordial relations if when the two came together, the time was employed in assuring one another that the differences were at an end.

It is just as well to take facts for granted; and "the patriotism of the south" does not really provide a subject for serious comment.

Freedom the Schoolmaster.

The Kansas City Journal, republican, takes issue with a statement made by Senator Carmack. Senator Carmack said,

Freedom is the only schoolmaster that can teach the lesson of freedom. No people ever learned self-government under a tutor. No people ever learned to govern themselves by being held in subjection by a higher and stronger power. The idea that you are going to transform the character of a whole people by teaching them to read English, by setting up a carpetbag government for them to look at and pay taxes to; the idea that you can teach them to govern themselves by making them bear the burdens of a foreign government, is the wildest, the craziest, the most fantastic dream that ever flitted through a lunatic's brain.

Even while taking issue with Senator Carmack, the Journal confuses itself when it says:

Example has ever been the greatest civilizing force known to humanity. If liberal forms of government are extant upon the earth it is because the people of one region seek for and adopt the methods found successful by their neighbors.

If example "has ever been the greatest civilizing force known to humanity," why do we now substitute conquest for example?

If liberal forms of government exist because people seek for and adopt the methods found successful by their neighbors, will any people be influenced to adopt a republican form of government when the greatest republic on earth has failed and refused to apply the cardinal principles of republicanism as we fail and refuse to do with respect to the Philippine islands?

No less an authority than Daniel Webster said, in effect, what Senator Carmack has said. Daniel Webster declared: "Who supposes that anything but the independence of this country made us what we are? I say to you, as I have said before, and shall continue to say until the time of my death, that it is not the nature of any colonial system of government to raise a country and raise a nation to the highest pitch of prosperity. It is independence, self-government, the liberty of people to make laws for themselves, that has elevated us from the subdued feeling of colonial subjection and placed us where we are. It is independence. Hail, Independence! Hail, thou next best gift to that of life and an immortal soul!"

In a speech in favor of the recognition of the South American republics, Henry Clay said, "With respect to the nature of their strength, I have not now for the first time to express my opinions and wishes. I wish them independence. It is the first step toward improving their condition."