

"shackled force." This, too, shows that he wants the trust magnates to understand that "there is but the scantiest justification for most of the outcry against the men of wealth, as such," but he is willing to allow the public to forget the harsh things that (in a fit of "hysteria?") he inadvertently said about the shackling of cunning.

He says nothing of the bill framed by a republican committee of the house of representatives, passed by the house almost without opposition, and then strangled by the trust representatives in the senate. It was not an adequate remedy and yet strong enough to make Attorney General Knox call it drastic and certainly worthy of passing notice if the president intends to do anything further on the trust question.

The suits brought by the government are mentioned as conclusive proof that the present laws are being enforced. The merger suit is referred to and yet it is well known that there have been more consolidations among railroads the last few years than ever before; he speaks of enjoining the packers' combine, but he neglects to say that the packers have now formed a trust that avoids the force of the injunction; he speaks of the Federal Salt company, but neglects to say that the big salt trust is still in undisputed control of the salt supply of the nation and is not vexed by suits. He has mentioned a few instances where civil process has been used, but does not explain why he refuses to use the criminal clause. If a mail carrier steals a dollar out of a letter he does not have the attorney general enjoin him from doing so again. If a man sells a gallon of liquor without license he does not use the injunction against him. Why are small violations of the law punished in the criminal court and the large criminal only enjoined? Then, too, why does he overlook the oil trust, the sugar trust, the cracker trust, the starch trust, the harvester trust, the steel trust, the tobacco trust, and the hundreds of other trusts? The conclusion is irresistible that he has no objection to a trust, but thinks the government ought to interfere only when the trust does some outrageous act. For instance, the Federal Salt company raised prices several hundred per cent and that was considered ground for prosecution, but what about the plate glass trust that takes advantage of a protection of over one hundred per cent?

One of two conclusions must be drawn from the president's speech: either he has no idea of attacking the principle of private monopoly or, if he has any such purpose, it does not manifest itself. What motive could he have for concealing his purpose if he really intended an active crusade against private monopolies? Does he doubt that the people are prepared for energetic action? He cannot so mistake the sentiment of the people. Is he afraid of the influence of the trust magnates in the next convention? If he must conciliate them to secure a nomination, will he not serve them after the election?

Here is an opportunity for the display of moral courage, but where is the courage? O, strenuousness! what frauds are committed in thy name! The overawing of the Filipinos—even the ride up San Juan Hill, how insignificant both would seem in comparison with a real, sure-enough attack on the citadel of the trusts. All his boasting about "iron in the blood," all his scoffing at "cowards and weaklings" only give emphasis to the timidity he shows in the presence of insolent and arrogant monopolists.

The Milwaukee speech would seem to be the death-knell of the anti-trust movement so far as the president is concerned.

The Roosevelt Monopoly.

Mr. Wm. D. Brinnier, an attorney of Kingston, N. Y., sends The Commoner a copy of an early law passed by the state of New York, June 6, 1712. It is found in chapter 241, entitled, "An act to encourage the making of lintseed oyle." It reads:

Chapter 241. An act to encourage the making of lintseed oyle. Passed, June 6, 1712.

Whereas, John Van der Heul and John Roosevelt having set forth in their petition presented to the general assembly, that by their industry and great charge they have erected in the city of New York a mill for grinding flaxseed and making lintseed oyle, and have therein pray'd that an act may pass in their favour that no such mills may be permitted, used, or erected in this colony, for a certain terme but by their heirs or assigns. For the encouragement of others that may incline to advance or project any other manufacture in this colony. Be it enacted by the governour, council and assembly and by

the authority of the same, that no person or persons whatsoever from and after the publication of this act shall or may erect or make use of a mill for grinding lintseed or flaxseed to make oyle for publick sale or market for and during the terme of ten years from the publication of this act, but the said John Van der Heul and John Roosevelt and their assigns to whom the sole benefit, profit and advantage of making the said oyle shall accrue and belong.

And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that such person or persons as shall erect or make any mill to grind lintseed and flaxseed for producing the said oyle from and after the publication of this act, whereby the true intent and meaning thereof may be frustrated, shall forfeit and pay the sum of two hundred pounds, current money of the colony of New York, unto the said John Van der Heul and John Roosevelt to be by them and their assigns recovered in any court of record within the said colony by action of debt.

It would seem that the legislature of New York was persuaded to grant a monopoly for ten years, and the only reason given was that the monopolists had already established an industry in the city of New York, and it was made unlawful for any one to erect or use any other mill for grinding lintseed or any other seed during the term of the monopoly. It seems that John Roosevelt was one of the monopolists of that day, but let it be said to John's credit that, instead of running his monopoly in violation of the law, he took the precaution to get the legislature on his side. The records will probably show whether the Roosevelt of two centuries ago belongs to the family of the president. There is one "o" less in the name, but an inspection of the law will show other peculiarities in orthography, such as "oyle" and "peticon," which would indicate that the Roosevelt of 1713 might be a relative of our chief executive. Of course, it would be absurd to say that a monopolistic tendency would of necessity remain in the family for two centuries, but it is interesting to know that the greatest oil monopolist of today has an enthusiastic supporter in a president whose name is so similar in spelling to the name of one of the first oil monopolists of whom we have a record.

The Commoner is obliged to its informer for this interesting bit of history.

Riot Cartridges.

It is a little singular that the national administration should announce its readiness to furnish riot cartridges to the various state administrations just at the time when republican leaders are boasting of universal prosperity, universal contentment and universal approbation of republican policies. The very discussion of a riot cartridge is suggestive of conditions that need remedying. Victor Hugo has described the mob as "the human race in misery," and it is as important that mobs should be prevented as that they should be dispersed. Is it not an indication of the application of the imperialistic idea to domestic conditions, that the administration should spend more time devising means to put down a mob than it does in devising remedies for the evils that lead to the formation of mobs?

Imperialism rests on force rather than justice; imperialism coerces rather than persuades; imperialism, instead of curing evils, compels silent submission to those evils. The republican party today is loading the masses with taxation while it permits great aggregations of wealth to plunder with impunity. When reminded that there may be clashes between labor and capital, instead of providing boards of arbitration for the settlement of conditions, it prepares riot cartridges for distribution; instead of destroying government by injunction it prepares to back up the judge with the army, while he uses the courts to enforce the demands of the employer as against the claims of the employe.

And yet a sleeping people must be awakened and it may be that the riot cartridge will do what reason and logic have failed to accomplish. If the rank and file of the republican party are not ready to administer a rebuke to the leaders of the party their decision may be hastened when they are brought face to face with the horrid realities for which the administration seems to be preparing.

The democratic party is sometimes accused of being radical. As a matter of fact, it is the conservative element in the country today. It seeks to apply well settled principles to gross evils; it seeks to preserve law and order by the

most effective means, namely, the establishment of justice. The republican party, on the other hand, boasts of its love of law and order, and yet it fosters and promotes injustice and favoritism.

The democratic party has been accused of being hostile to the well-to-do. This indictment is as absurd as it is false. The democratic party is the best friend of honestly acquired wealth, and by attempting to protect each person in the enjoyment of that which he earns it offers the greatest stimulus both to industry and to thrift. The republican party, on the other hand, by confusing wealth acquired by spoliation with wealth acquired by brain and muscle, is liable to bring upon honest accumulations an odium that ought to be reserved for predatory wealth.

It is to be hoped that the riot cartridges will never be needed, but the mere issuing of them ought to educate the people to the gloomy and melancholy end of republican theories and republican policies.

Defend Democratic Principles.

Reports received by The Commoner show that the work of organization among democrats for the protection of the party and the preservation of democratic principles is progressing at a gratifying rate.

While the organs of the reorganizers are preaching "harmony," they are insisting that men who subscribe to the democratic national platform must have no voice in the democratic convention of 1904. These gentlemen have worked themselves up to the point where they are bold enough to declare that devotion to the principles set forth in the democratic platform is thoroughly "undemocratic." Indeed, the New York World, in a recent issue, went so far as to say that a certain man who did not subscribe to the platform, but who in 1900 is said to have voted the ticket, would not be a strong candidate for the reorganizers to present, because the fact that he had supported the ticket in 1900 would be to his disadvantage.

In the view of these gentlemen, then, the real democrat is the man who has not only repudiated the party platform, but who has voted against the party candidates. In the view of these gentlemen, the real democrat has so conducted himself as to win the approval of J. Pierpont Morgan and other trust magnates. To be sure, the organs of the reorganizers do not frankly admit this much, although their arguments in favor of reorganization and relating to the work to be performed by the democratic convention of 1904 is clearly susceptible to this interpretation.

Henry Watterson, who advocates practically the same things favored by Grover Cleveland, seems to be very much alarmed lest Mr. Cleveland become the nominee. It cannot be doubted that the leaders of the reorganizers would prefer Mr. Cleveland as the nominee and it must be admitted that he is the logical candidate; and yet even though time shall demonstrate that it is not good policy to urge Mr. Cleveland's candidacy, it may be depended upon that the candidate agreed upon by the reorganizers will represent the same influences and the same policies that dominated Mr. Cleveland's second administration.

In a recent newspaper interview, Senator Morgan of Alabama said that he was willing to welcome to the democratic party the prodigal sons and he insisted that there was no reason for closing the democratic doors in the faces of penitent men. But there is nothing to indicate that these men have repented. On the contrary, they boast of their repudiation of the democratic platform and the democratic ticket. In the Courier-Journal of Wednesday, April 8, Mr. Watterson has an editorial in which he says:

"The editor of the Courier-Journal has nothing to regret except a series of disasters, for which he was nowise responsible. Looking back over that record, he asserts that, from first to last, he, and those democrats with whom he acted, were right, and that events have amply vindicated them."

This, then, is the spirit of the reorganization now undertaken by the men who deserted the democratic party. They do not come as penitents. They resent the imputation that they are in the attitude of the prodigal son. They assert, in the language of Mr. Watterson, that from first to last they were right and that events have amply vindicated them. As a matter of fact, none of the policies for which they stood have been vindicated. While at this very moment they are engaged in declaiming loudly against the party which they helped to place in power, they charge that that party is "rotten to the core" and that the administration is controlled by selfish inter-