

empties his purse into his head no man can take it away from him. An investment in knowledge always pays the best interest." Ruskin said that "education, briefly, is leading the human mind and soul to what is right and best and to make what is best out of them, and these two objects are always obtainable together and by the same means. The training which makes men happiest in themselves also makes them most serviceable to others." Channing said: "He is to be educated, not because he is to make shoes, nails or pins, but because he is a man."

Every young man and woman should seize the opportunity to obtain a college training. The offer now being made by The Commoner places a college education within the reach of every young reader of this paper. The attention of every reader is directed to this offer, the details of which are stated in another column of this issue. If any Commoner reader has a young friend who is unable, under existing circumstances, to take a college course, the attention of that young friend should be directed to The Commoner offer. Further details will be provided upon application to this office.

McKinley on Tariff Revision.

F. O. Schuster, a governor of the Union Bank of London, is reported to have said in a speech delivered in London, July 29, that he "had a private interview with the late President McKinley two years ago" and that on that occasion Mr. McKinley said: "My tariff bill has done its work. We have been able to build up many great industries in a short time and now gradually, but inevitably, our tariff must be reduced."

Mr. Schuster is a man of good reputation and those who know him do not doubt that, substantially, he quoted the former president correctly. But if one requires corroborative testimony it may be found in the last speech delivered by President McKinley at Buffalo, September 5, 1901. On that occasion Mr. McKinley said:

"We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible it would not be best for us or for those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and production and thereby make a greater demand for home labor. The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not. If, perchance, some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and protect our markets abroad?"

In response to the sentiments expressed by Mr. McKinley at Buffalo, and in line with an intelligent recognition of the necessities of the times, there developed within the republican party a very strong sentiment in favor of tariff revision. In the state of Iowa this sentiment took formidable shape and was represented by the so-called "Iowa idea." The "Iowa idea" was the term by which was designated the plank in the platform adopted by the Iowa republicans for the years 1901 and 1902 as follows: "We favor the modification of any tariff schedules that may be required to prevent their affording shelter to any monopoly."

Although republican leaders profess to be devoted to Mr. McKinley's principles and invoke Mr. McKinley's memory whenever they find it convenient to do so in providing defense for some of their schemes, republican leaders very generally have caused it to be made known that there will be no revision of the tariff. In line with this disposition, there has grown up in the republican party a body known as the "stand patters," and at this writing it seems that on that proposition there is no difference among republican leaders although, to be sure, among the rank and file of the party there are many, and perhaps they are in the majority, who really believe in a revision of the tariff.

But the republican party is not a majority

party. While professing to reflect the public sentiment, its policies are adopted by a small coterie of men. While claiming Abraham Lincoln as the party's patron saint, republican leaders repudiate Lincoln's teachings and while insisting that they are but adhering to the teachings of William McKinley, and pointing to him as a model of all that a statesman should be, they have turned their backs upon Mr. McKinley's last speech, have repudiated his counsel and now insist that however unjust the tariff schedules may be, however much shelter those schedules may provide to the trusts, there will be no revision and that the republican party is unalterable in its purpose to protect special interests.

Long ago the republican party ceased to be, on every proposition, the party of Abraham Lincoln; and there are reasons, at this time, for believing that the party leaders are determined to ignore the counsel offered by William McKinley in the last and perhaps the greatest speech ever delivered by that gentleman.

Legislation, Not Petition.

On another page will be found a Courier-Journal editorial which illustrates the servile attitude of the gold bug papers toward the trusts. The Courier-Journal shows how the tobacco trust controls the market and is able to fix the price; it shows how the trust has watered its stock and made huge dividends on fictitious capital, and then instead of urging legislation that will make a private monopoly impossible it petitions the trust to deal mercifully with the tobacco growers. On bended knees it begs the trust to consider the poor farmer who makes it possible for the trust magnates to grow rich. While it intimates that "a mighty power" may teach the trust a lesson if it does not look out, it assures the trust that "a recognition of the rights of producers will further good feeling."

Brother Watterson ought to know enough about human nature to know that it is not safe to leave the producers of wealth at the mercy of the trusts, relying only on persuasion and such mild threats as a corporation-controlled organ dares to make. He ought to know also that the trusts cannot be killed so long as each class of producers is willing to "further good feeling" with some particular trust in return for a little consideration. If the trusts are to be overthrown the principle of private monopoly must be attacked wherever it manifests itself. There can be no compromise and no flirting with a trust merely because it happens to be near at home.

The Wages of Sin.

Those who are opposed to imperialism doubtless read with great interest the concluding paragraph of Mr. Roosevelt's letter to the governor of Indiana. In that paragraph Mr. Roosevelt said:

"The nation, like the individual, cannot commit a crime with impunity. If we are guilty of lawlessness or violence, whether our guilt consists of active participation therein or in mere connivance or encouragement, we shall assuredly suffer later on because of what we have done. The cornerstone of this republic, as of all free governments, is respect for, and obedience to, the law. Where we permit the law to be defied or evaded, whether by rich man or poor man, by black man or white man, we are by just so much weakening the bonds of our civilization and increasing the chances of its overthrow and the substitution therefor of a system that shall be violent alternations of anarchy and tyranny."

Mr. Roosevelt here stated a proposition that has frequently been put forth by those who criticize the republican party's policy toward our new possessions. Yet republican orators and republican organs have had many sneers for such statements as these when they were made by those who do not subscribe to republican doctrine.

Jefferson wrote: "I know but one code of morality for men, whether acting singly or collectively."

Franklin wrote: "Justice is as strictly due between neighbor nations as between neighbor citizens. A highwayman is as much a robber when he plunders in a gang as when he plunders singly, and a nation that makes an unjust war is only a great gang."

Men may dare to do in crowds what they would not dare to do as individuals, but the moral character of an act is not determined by the number of those who join it. Force can defend a right, but force has never yet created a

right. If it was true as declared in the resolution of intervention that the Cubans "are and of right ought to be free and independent," it is equally true that the Filipinos "are and of right ought to be free and independent."

As Mr. Roosevelt says: "The nation, like the individual, cannot commit a crime with impunity." To be sure, the nation like the individual, can commit a crime. It can by its acts repudiate its best traditions and it may violate the great principles to which its founders successfully appealed for their own liberties; but just as Mr. Roosevelt says, "We shall assuredly suffer later on because of what we have done."

The young man upon reaching his majority, can do what he pleases; he can disregard the teachings of his parents; he can trample upon all that he has been taught to consider sacred; he can disobey the laws of the state, the laws of society, and the laws of God; he can stamp failure upon his life and make his very existence a curse to his fellowmen, and he can bring his father and mother in sorrow to the grave, but he cannot annul the sentence "the wages of sin is death."

And so with this nation. It is of age and it can do as it pleases; it can spurn the traditions of the past; it can repudiate the principles upon which the nation rests; it may employ force instead of reason; it can substitute might for right; it can conquer a weaker people; it can exploit their lands, appropriate their money and kill their people, but it cannot repeal the moral law or escape the punishment decreed for the violation of human rights.

In the concluding paragraph of his letter to the Indiana governor, Mr. Roosevelt but stated in another way a principle treated in pleasing verse by a well-known American poet:

Would we tread in the paths of tyranny,
Nor reckon the tyrant's cost?
Who taketh another's liberty
His freedom is also lost.
Would we win as the strong have ever won,
Make ready to pay the debt,
For the God who reigned over Babylon
Is the God who is reigning yet.

Will They Deny It?

Some of the gold papers object to the truth when told about our distinguished ex-president. At Urbana, O., Mr. Bryan said:

"The democratic party in 1892 played a confidence game on the people and put a bunco steerer at the head of the party, and I want to say to you that the disreputable man who stands on the street curbing and leads the unwary traveler into a game where he loses his money is respectable compared with the man who accepts the suffrages of 5,000,000 people and then leads them into Wall street to be betrayed."

Will any one deny it? Will any one dispute that Mr. Cleveland had a secret understanding with a few Wall street magnates to carry out a policy which he would not have dared to advocate during the campaign? This secret understanding enabled his committee to secure a large campaign fund from the monied institutions and corporations, and his purpose was concealed from the voters. Shall we condemn the petty offense of the man who lures the unsuspecting into games in which they lose a small amount—shall we do this and then condone the treachery of those who trifled with the confidence of the people and who used the highest office in the land to reward those from whom he had received favors? It will do no harm to have Mr. Cleveland and his friends know the feeling of the democratic voters toward him.

John Gilbert Shanklin.

In the death of John Gilbert Shanklin of Evansville, Ind., the country has lost a high-minded, intelligent and patriotic citizen, the democratic party an earnest, loyal and courageous exponent of its principles and the editor of The Commoner a valued personal friend. His was a noble, manly life. His home was his citadel, and made strong by the affection of his family he went forth to fight life's battle with unflinching bravery. He prepared himself thoroughly for his work and illumined every subject which he discussed. The greatest solace that one can find in the contemplation of the death of such a man is in the grateful recollection of his words and deeds and in the survey of his large contribution to the welfare of his fellows. He lives in the hearts of his countrymen and the impress made by his life cannot be effaced.