

direct conflict with the testimony of officers who had served on the frontier at the time Colonel Woodruff was there. General Miles always carried a herd of cattle with his troops and in the fall of 1876, the Indians stampeded 275 of Miles' cattle up the Tongue river and the general sent a detachment of cavalry to recapture them. The World correspondent says that at the time Colonel Woodruff's testimony was given, the man who had charge of General Miles' herd and the man who slaughtered the cattle were in the Soldiers' home at Washington, but they were not called although the commission was requested to summon them.

No serious effort has been made to question the accuracy of any of General Miles' reports. Every possible effort has been made, however, to humiliate him. Many people find it difficult to understand how it happens that Mr. Roosevelt has so readily inherited the antipathy toward the commanding general when they remember the part Mr. Roosevelt played in the famous "round robin," during the Spanish-American war. But whatever the mystery may be, it is clear that Mr. Roosevelt does share the prejudice against General Miles. The method he employs of displaying that prejudice is in keeping with the method chosen by the preceding administration and these persistent efforts to humiliate a faithful army officer are just as discreditable to the Roosevelt administration as they were to the preceding administrations.

Long ago Mr. Roosevelt told us that "words are good when backed up by deeds, and only so." If the people were to rely upon Mr. Roosevelt's words, they would not expect him to promote Colonel Woodruff under the circumstances; but long ago many people learned, and sooner or later the American people very generally must learn, that it is a far cry from Mr. Roosevelt's words to Mr. Roosevelt's deeds.

Argument.

The Brooklyn Eagle, one of the organs of the reorganizers, says: "Here it is straight from the Atlanta Journal: 'Bryan can bring about harmony in the democratic party by keeping his mouth shut.' If he did, he couldn't eat. If he couldn't eat he would become too weak to talk. If he couldn't talk, he would die. The Journal might as well tell him to commit suicide."

The above is reproduced as a fair sample of the tone of the organs of those who insist that they have a monopoly upon intelligence so far as democrats are concerned.

Surely the readers of the Atlanta Journal and the readers of the Brooklyn Eagle must be impressed with the idea that all the arguments that appeal to intelligent men are with the cause represented by those publications.

Making the Issue Plain.

The decisions rendered in the two merger cases present the issue very clearly. Judge Thayer in deciding the case in which the United States government was prosecuting said that the merger

"Destroyed every motive for competition between two roads which were natural competitors for business by pooling the earnings of the two roads for the common benefit of the stockholders of both companies, and, according to the familiar rule that every one is presumed to intend what are the necessary consequences of his own acts, when done willfully and deliberately, we must conclude that those who conceived and executed the plan aforesaid intended, among other things, to accomplish these objects."

In the case in which the state of Minnesota was plaintiff, Judge Lochren said:

"I am compelled to reject the doctrine that any person can be held to have committed or to be purposing and about to commit a highly penal offense merely because it can be shown that his pecuniary interests will be thereby advanced and that he has the power either directly by himself or indirectly through persuasion or coercion of his agents to compass the commission of the offense."

It will be noticed that in the Thayer decision a monopoly is condemned because the influence of selfishness was recognized, while in the Lochren decision the court refused to recognize the bias which one naturally has in favor of his own interests. The democrats take the view expressed by Judge Thayer and say that "a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable," while the republicans insist that there are good trusts and bad trusts and that only the bad ones should be disturbed. This is the point on which the fight

will turn and the people might as well acquaint themselves with the issue. To make it plain, let us take a familiar case. Suppose Judge Lochren was trying a jury case, and suppose a juror admitted that he had a large pecuniary interest in the result of the suit, would the judge say: "I refuse to believe that the juror will disregard his oath merely because it can be shown that his pecuniary interests will be thereby advanced." There would be just as much sense in allowing a biased juror to serve and then put on the injured party the burden of proving his injury as to permit the trusts to be formed and then throw upon the victim the burden of protecting himself from trust exactions. A private monopoly is a highwayman and it is not sufficient to say that it shall be moderate in its exactions—it must be exterminated. Extermination of trusts does not mean that all corporations should be attacked or that all combinations of capital should be prohibited, but it does mean that the line should be drawn against every attempt to monopolize any article of merchandise. It means that the fight must be made against all private monopolies everywhere.

Describe the Policy.

The Atlanta Constitution appears to be very hopeful of democratic success in 1904. The Constitution says that "the trend of all the active factors in the party are saying is that there is democratic life in the old land yet and if the followers of Jefferson will only get together upon a platform adjusted to the people's national needs, no more and no less, there is an even chance to win next year."

Then, perhaps by way of describing a platform "adjusted to the people's national needs, no more and no less," the Constitution says:

"Discussions of the future platform all point in one direction. The country is suffering today the dread of accumulating evils from the Dingley tariff schedules and the trusts they have saddled upon the backs of the people. Whatever expansion of currency has occurred by the coinage of our silver bullion without warrant of law and by the enlargement of our gold stock has been overbalanced by the absorption and locking up of vast amounts of money in inflated stocks and bonds. Liquidation and losses from that peril of prosperity are already raising the specter of panic.

"It will be the opportunity of its life next year for the democracy to go to the country squarely with candidates and a platform guaranteeing honest American tariff reform and a financial policy for the benefit of business instead of by and for Wall street gamblers."

Democrats have a fairly accurate idea as to what is meant by "honest American tariff reform," but how may they interpret "a financial policy for the benefit of business instead of by and for Wall street gamblers?"

Does this sentence provide a hint as to the language to be employed in describing that financial policy?

Is the proposed policy to be so described in the platform that, as in 1892, it may be interpreted in Wall street to suit the financiers and among the masses to suit the people?

Advocates of monometallism tell us that a financial policy for the benefit of business means the single gold standard; the advocates of bimetalism say that it means bimetalism and no surrender to the banks of the money issuing functions of the government.

The readers of the Constitution might be interested in having that newspaper explain just what it means by "a financial policy for the benefit of business instead of by and for Wall street gamblers." By itself that sentence resembles the famous declaration made in the Iowa republican state convention for 1903 wherein it was declared that "duties that are too high should be reduced and duties that are too low should be increased."

General Miles Retires.

At noon, August 8, Lieutenant General Nelson A. Miles ceased active connection with the regular army and went upon the retired list. As a soldier General Miles has served his country well and faithfully. He won his way from the ranks to the position of lieutenant general by force of his ability as a leader and his prowess as a soldier. He enlisted as a private in the Fifty-first Massachusetts volunteers, and was successively promoted until he became a major general of volunteers. At the close of the civil war he was made a colonel in the regular army. As an Indian campaigner he attracted the attention and

won the admiration of the whole people, and was promoted through different ranks until he became senior major general. Upon the death of Lieutenant General Schofield he was promoted to the highest rank in the army. During the later years of his active service General Miles was bitterly assailed by many who either could not or did not care to conceal their ulterior motives, but he gave his attention to the duties of his high office and deported himself as a gentleman and a soldier. His farewell address to the army is published elsewhere in this issue, and the attention of Commoner readers is called to it. The address is characteristic of General Miles and bears evidence of his regard for the army over which he so long exercised command, and of his loyalty as a citizen of this great republic.

The Producers' Club.

On another page will be found an interview which appeared recently in the Carroll (Ia.) Herald describing a practical work which has been undertaken by Prof. W. P. Johnson and his pupils. It is so laudable an effort that The Commoner is glad to call attention to it and to commend it. The occupation of the boy during his vacation is a problem not easy of solution—a problem which has long vexed both parents and teachers.

Professor Johnson's experiment has worked well this summer and if after the "new" wears off he is able to keep up the interest and enthusiasm his example is sure to be widely followed. The editor of The Commoner had the pleasure of inspecting the co-operative garden and found it a model in its way.

Governor Hogg of Texas once advised the boys of his state to organize hoeing clubs instead of ball clubs and take care of the gardens of the widows in their respective towns, but the advice was not generally followed. Professor Johnson has put the idea into use and the prospect of a little profit has helped to make the work popular among the boys.

The pupils will return to their books in the fall the better for their experience in agriculture and the habit of industry formed will enable them to make good use of their intellectual training.

The Money Question.

In its issue of Friday, July 31, the Wall Street Journal said:

"As it was in the beginning of the year, is now, and is likely to continue to be during all of 1903, the money question is the one of most vital importance. There is nothing in the business situation as it presents itself at this time, to prevent a continuance of our national prosperity, except the congestion of the money market, due to its inability to expand as rapidly as the trade and industries of the country."

The Journal addresses the bankers when it reminds them that "the money question is the one of most vital importance."

When other representatives of Wall street address the people, the people are assured that the money question is a dead issue.

From the standpoint of these men the people should not tamper with the money question. They should not discuss it. They should not insist upon having a part in the arrangement of our monetary system.

But with the bankers it is different. They are to be reminded that "the money question is the one of most vital importance," and they are to be counseled to urge senators and representatives in congress to see that this question is disposed of entirely in line with the vital interests of the financiers.

But when the Wall street Journal admits that "the money question is the one of most vital importance," with what reason does it assume to draw the line where the discussion of this question may terminate?

Does it object to the bimetalists urging their method of providing the country with what they believe to be a sound monetary system? Or does it insist that all discussion with respect to this question of "most vital importance" be limited to a consideration of the currency system proposed by the financiers and that participation in that discussion be confined to the financiers themselves?

The Wall Street Journal has made a most interesting confession. Whatever men may say about the "dead and buried past," whatever men may say about "worn-out issues," the indisputable fact remains that in the discussion of our financial system the "money question" cannot be separated from the money question.