

behavior, removable only by conviction, on impeachment, for some crime or misdemeanor."

According to Hamilton's plan the senate was to consist of persons chosen by electors "elected for that purpose by the citizens and inhabitants of the several states," and then he proceeds to fix a property qualification for the electors who are to choose the senators. They must have "in their own right or in the right of their wives, an estate in land for not less than life or a term of years whereof, at the time of giving their votes, there shall be at least fourteen years unexpired."

Not only did he want the president to hold office for life (unless impeached), not only did he want senators to hold office for life (unless impeached), and elected by electors having a prescribed property qualification, but article 8, section 1, of his plan provided "that the governor of president of each state shall be appointed under the authority of the United States and shall have a right to negative all laws about to be passed in the state of which he shall be governor or president, subject to such qualifications and regulations as the legislature of the United States shall prescribe."

Section 2, of the same article, provides that "each governor or president of a state shall hold office until a successor be actually appointed, unless he die or resign, or be removed from office by conviction on impeachment." It will be seen that Mr. Hamilton wanted life terms in the federal government and also wanted the federal government to appoint the governors of the states who were to have a veto over state legislation, and these governors, unless they resigned or were impeached, should hold office during life unless the federal authorities saw fit to supersede them. The people of the state had no authority in the matter whatever.

But why this dispute as to the views of Alexander Hamilton? The record is clear, and there is no excuse for misunderstanding it. The trouble is simply this: Hamilton did not believe in a republican form of government. It is so stated on page 244 of the Madison papers. Here is the language used: "He acknowledged himself not to think favorably of republican government; but addressed his remarks to those who did think favorably of it, in order to prevail on them to tone their government as high as possible."

Hamilton's distrust of the people manifested itself at every turn. On page 203 of the Madison papers will be found a report of his speech in the convention in which he praised the English house of lords, as "a most noble institution," and added, "Having nothing to hope for by a change, and a sufficient interest, by means of their property, in being faithful to the national interest, they form a permanent barrier against every pernicious innovation, whether attempted on the part of the crown or of the commons. No temporary senate will have firmness enough to answer the purpose."

He argued that a seven-year term for the senators would not be sufficient to give the senate an "adequate firmness," and said that those favoring a seven-year term did not duly consider the "amazing violence and turbulence of the democratic spirit." On the same page he argued that a government could not be good unless it had a good executive, saying: "The English model was the only good one on this subject. The hereditary interest of the king was so interwoven with that of the nation, and his personal emolument so great, that he was placed above the danger of being corrupted from abroad; and at the same time was both sufficiently independent and sufficiently controlled, to answer the purpose of the institution at home."

His preference for life tenure was also alluded to on the same page as follows: "Let one branch of the legislature hold their places for life, or at least during good behavior. Let the executive, also, be for life."

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, in his *Life of*

Hamilton (published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston), calls attention to the fact that Hamilton did not believe our constitution "equal to the burden imposed upon it," that he "considered the government too weak." Again Lodge says, on page 282: "He did not believe in democracy as a system of government. He strove with all his energy to make the experiment of the constitution succeed, but he doubted its merit at the outset, and finally came to the conclusion that, in its existing form, it was doomed to failure. He believed in class influence and representation, in strong government, and in what, for want of a better phrase, may be called an aristocratic republic."

Hamilton's very death was due to his lack of faith in our form of government; he was looking for an uprising and thought that a strong man would be needed, and he was to be that strong man. He fought the duel in which he died because he feared to refuse lest it should be attributed to cowardice and make him useless in the crisis for which he was looking. Here is the paper which Hamilton left giving his reason for accepting the challenge. It is quoted by Lodge on page 251:

"The ability to be in future useful, whether in resisting mischief or affecting good, in those crises of our public affairs which seem likely to happen, would probably be inseparable from a conformity with public prejudice in this particular."

The republicans are today making Hamilton their saint, and the fact that they do so shows that they are turning from the democratic republic of Jefferson to the "aristocratic republic" of Hamilton. In 1856 the republican national platform appealed to all who wanted "to carry the government back to the principles of Washington and Jefferson." In 1859 the republicans of Boston celebrated the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, and Lincoln wrote his famous letter expressing regret that he could not attend the meeting, and eulogizing Jefferson. But that was in the earlier days of imperialism. Now republicans denounce Jefferson as a demagogue, ridicule his idea of government by the consent of the governed, and pay their homage at the shrine of the man who would have made this government little less than a limited monarchy.

No wonder the republicans wince when Hamilton's real views are brought out. But they might as well get used to it; if they are going to favor imperialism in the Philippines they must not be squeamish about applying the principles of imperialism at home. They are admitting today charges that they indignantly denied a few years ago, and it will not be long before they will be praising the most undemocratic utterances of Hamilton as the highest evidence of statesmanship.

### Financiers Against Tariff Reform.

Hon. Flavius J. Van Vorhis of Indianapolis, Ind., in an argument recently made, points out that the republicans have made the great financiers pecuniarily interested in the defeat of any tariff reform legislation. He says that the banks are now using without interest a large sum of government money, approximating \$150,000,000, and that they would have to give up this money and lose the interest upon it if the surplus was reduced by the lowering of revenue duties. Six per cent interest on \$150,000,000 would yield nine millions; 5 per cent, seven millions and a half. This is a tremendous sum, and operates, first, as a bribe to the banks to oppose any reduction of the surplus, and, second, it forms a fund from which the republicans can draw in their campaigns. Surely, banks that receive as a gratuity so large a sum in the shape of interest each year could afford to give a very considerable sum to the campaign fund every four years. If, for in-

stance, they gave the equivalent of one year's interest for the opportunity to collect four years' interest, they would give to the republican campaign fund more than twenty times as much as the democratic national committee has had in either of the campaigns of 1896 and 1900. The fact that the elections can be carried by the interest collected on the people's money shows the perversion of the national government, and ought to make honest republicans recognize the abuse of power of which the republican party has been guilty.

Mr. Van Vorhis has done the public a service in pointing out the vital connection between the republican method of running the treasury department and the opposition which the great financiers show to tariff reform. It will be remembered that in 1888 the republican national platform denounced Mr. Cleveland's administration for doing the very same things, although on a less scale, that the republican administration is doing now. The fact is that both the republican administration and Mr. Cleveland's administration purchased the active support of the financiers with the loan of public funds.

### Natural Rights.

A reader of *The Commoner* asks, "What are natural rights?" and says that some of his acquaintances declare that the whole theory of "natural rights" died soon after the French revolution. The Declaration of Independence has reference to natural rights when it declares that there are certain inalienable rights given by the Creator to every human being, and among these inalienable rights are enumerated "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." The right to life is not a right given by the government or by society. It is an inalienable right, and the taking of it cannot be defended except in self-defense or where it is taken by society because of some crime done against society. Those who oppose the death penalty insist that even society has no right to take it, no matter what the crime.

Every individual has the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness, the only condition being that he shall not trespass upon the equal rights of others.

The doctrine of natural rights is not yet absolute, and it is this doctrine that will ultimately destroy imperialism and overthrow the imperialists.

### Passes Unlawful.

Attorney General Cunnene of the state of New York has, at the request of one of the legislators, prepared an opinion on the pass question. He holds that according to the new constitution it is a misdemeanor for a corporation to offer a pass to a member of the legislature, and that the official would forfeit his office if he accepted a pass. The New York constitutional convention deserves great credit for inserting the anti-pass section in the constitution. It is a pity that every state has not such a constitutional provision. The political pass ought to be abolished and it is to be regretted that congress voted down an anti-pass amendment offered when the house was considering the bill to raise the salaries of federal judges. Surely the officials who draw salaries ought to be as able to pay railroad fare as the ordinary citizen, and if he is not willing to pay his fare he ought to be compelled to do so. The pass is not always a bribe, but it is issued by corporations that understand its value and it would not be issued without a purpose.

President Mitchell denounces "government by injunction" as "not only hostile to organized labor, but as hostile to constitutional liberty." For this specimen of Chicago platform democracy President Mitchell will be denounced as an anarchist by representatives of selfish interests who profit through government by injunction.