

turer and the middle man, provided always that each is rendering actual service and performing for society a real and necessary work.

The man who overreaches his neighbor or who by craft or cunning accumulates money dishonestly, must not be permitted to throw upon honest wealth the odium which his dishonesty has brought upon his particular accumulation. There is a feeling in this country that the great fortunes which are made by watering stock, by running corners, by conducting private monopolies and by bankrupting corporations merely to give those who are manipulating the markets a chance to buy the stock at a low price, are illegitimate, and that the methods employed are as offensive to good morals as they are dangerous to the government. While this hostility may sometimes manifest itself in individual acts of violence, public attention must not be entirely diverted from the wrong-doing of the victims of violence. Every good and patriotic citizen will condemn and help to punish all acts of lawlessness and violence, but patriotic citizens must also be interested in preventing those larger acts of lawlessness which incite desperate men to violence. To apply remedial and restraining legislation to those who are acquiring money dishonestly it is not necessary to either excuse or defend those who, despairing of legal remedies, take the law into their own hands. A man who has been driven into bankruptcy by a trust or who has suffered great pecuniary loss by the manipulations of speculators, is not in a frame of mind to be lectured on contentment and respect for wealth accumulated by wrong-doing. Those who are interested in the preservation of liberty and in the supremacy of the law must devote themselves to the elimination of the causes of ill-feeling—it is not sufficient that they devote themselves merely to the suppression of manifestations of discontent.

The second means by which wealth can be honestly acquired is by gift. The right of a parent to give money or property to his child is everywhere recognized, and the right of a friend to give to a friend is also admitted. The right of the parent to accumulate for the child furnishes a stimulus that is probably equal, if not superior, to any other incentive to earnest and constant endeavor. The receipt of money, however, from parent or relative to friends not only implies that the recipient has in some way earned the money, but also imposes upon the recipient a responsibility for the proper use of the money. Society has always recognized, and often exercised, its right to discriminate against inheritances. At the present time states like New York and Connecticut have an inheritance tax, and the manner in which the tax is graded shows that the people, speaking through the legislatures, have the power to discriminate between beneficiaries. For instance, in the state of New York property received by a child from a parent, by a parent from a child, or by husband or wife from the other, pays a tax of 1 per cent, while property willed, or descending by law, to other relatives or non-relatives, or to organizations of any kind, pays a tax of 5 per cent. In Connecticut the same distinction is observed, but the rates are half of 1 and 3 per cent.

Not only must wealth be legitimately acquired, but it must be rightly employed, although there is probably less disposition to criticize the improper use of honestly acquired wealth than there is to criticize the employment of improper methods in the accumulation of wealth. But even honestly acquired wealth can be so used as to excite just criticism. For instance, if a person, having wealth, is lavish in the expenditure of money for his own enjoyment and disregards the claims of worthy enterprises and the needy he can properly be charged with being selfish and self-centered. If he spends his money in high living he not only excites criticism from without, but he arrays himself against himself, for his health

will soon be impaired by his excesses. If he uses his wealth to gratify his vanity; if he flaunts his wealth in the face of those who have to struggle for bare existence, he can fairly be accused of being inconsiderate and lacking in sympathy.

It is possible for one to acquire wealth honestly and it is also possible for one to so employ his wealth as to satisfy even the most exacting public opinion, and that, too, with advantage to himself. There is no more reason why a rich man should have public or personal enemies than there is for a poor man to have enemies. Goldsmith, in "The Deserted Village," points out one source of hostility to the rich. He shows how land that ought to have been employed for the sustenance of the people was converted into hunting preserves and play-grounds for the rich, and he sums up the evil of the system in the following strong lines:

"Ye friends to truth, ye statesmen who survey  
The rich man's joys increase, the poor's decay,  
'Tis yours to judge how wide the limits stand  
Betwixt a splendid and a happy land."

There is no place in this country for the idle rich, if by that term we mean people who, having acquired money, have no other purpose than to secure all the selfish enjoyment they can out of the use of their money. But there is not only a place, but a crying demand in this country for those who, having acquired enough to relieve themselves from want, will devote themselves to public affairs and to works of charity and benevolence. Our cities would be better governed if in every city we had a group of men who, after securing a reasonable competency, would cease from money-making and devote themselves to public affairs. It would not be necessary for all of them to hold office. They could contribute their heads and their hearts to their country's service in many ways. They could study public questions and throw their influence upon the side of good government; they could investigate all improvements in the administration of government, and give to the public through addresses and in other ways the benefit of their investigations. The man who cares for no one but himself, who spends all his money on himself, and puts in all his time pleasing himself, must expect to be lonesome in any country where there is a healthy public sentiment, but the man who is anxious to contribute a dollar's worth of service to society in return for every dollar that he draws from it—the man who uses his money to better equip himself for service and who, when he is free from the necessity of accumulating, devotes his time to work that is beneficial to his fellows, such a man will find in America a congenial home, and a wide field for the employment of his energies. And, surely, if the experience of the race counts for anything there is more happiness to be secured by helpful service than by the greedy and grasping policy of those who live solely for themselves and then abuse all who condemn selfishness and indifference to the public weal.

### Another Argument Gone.

"I can stand it as long as I can get a good price for hogs," said a republican farmer in 1900 to a democrat who had pointed out the dangers of imperialism, the trusts and republican financiering; and this argument has been the main reliance of republican speakers. Instead of attempting to defend the policies of their party, republican orators and editors have seized upon every transient circumstance that could be turned to their party's advantage, regardless of its cause. When in 1897 wheat went to a dollar because of a short crop abroad, the republican leaders claimed credit for it; when the price of cattle went up they became cowboys and rode bronchos, and when porkers went up they took off their hats to every passing hog. But when wheat dropped, they dropped wheat; when cattle fell in price, they forgot how a steer looked, and now that hogs are "off" they

will no longer imitate the grunt and squeal. The following dispatch, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune, tells the story and ought to be interesting to those whose political opinions change with the market quotations:

"Lincoln, Neb., Oct. 11.—(Special.)—By reason of the slump in the price of hogs in the last week, Nebraska farmers stand to lose \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000. They figure their losses already at \$3,000,000, and if the prices continue to recede, as they believe they certainly will, \$2,000,000 more can be checked to the wrong side. According to reliable and conservative figures there are 3,000,000 marketable hogs in the state. Farmers have been fattening their swine on 30-cent corn, and the decline means that some hogs must be sold at an actual loss. The farmers are indignant, and charge the packers with causing the slump, at the same time keeping up the prices of the product. In Lincoln the price of pork at the butcher shops has not changed from a week ago."

### The Missouri Situation.

It seems that the democratic nomination for governor in Missouri has narrowed down to Reed and Folk, or Folk and Reed, whichever way the reader of The Commoner may desire to describe it. Editorials and paragraphs which have appeared in The Commoner have been quoted in support of each candidate, and sometimes an effort has been made to show that The Commoner, or its editor, favored the nomination of one or the other of these candidates.

Notices have appeared in this paper complimentary to both candidates. Mr. Folk's work in the prosecution of hoodlums had been referred to, and commented upon, and Mr. Reed's speech at the Nebraska state convention was complimented and quoted from. Nothing, however, has been said or done by The Commoner to indicate a preference for either one or to influence the judgment of the democrats of the state of Missouri.

Mr. Bryan has studiously avoided taking part in local contests, where, as in this case, both the candidates are supporters of the Kansas City platform. The democrats of Missouri are the ones most interested in the result of this contest, and they are also the ones best fitted to make the selection of the candidate. The Commoner, however, submits a word of caution. Each candidate should run upon his own merits, not upon the demerits of his opponent, and it is a great mistake for the friends of any candidate to attack the other in the hope of making political capital for his own choice. The campaign ought to be conducted on a high plane, and in such a way that the successful aspirant in the convention can have the hearty support of all the candidates at the polls. Where men differ in the principles they advocate it is not only natural, but right, that the principles advocated should be the subject of discussion and criticism, but where men represent the same principles bitter personalities are entirely out of place, and those who are wise will avoid them. It is some time before the convention and those who have the interest of their party at heart, however wedded to any particular man, ought to insist upon fair play between all who aspire to the place.

### "Non-Partisan" Republicans.

An association known as the Institute of Social Economics is sending out circulars and representing itself as "a permanent non-partisan institution for the education of the people along the lines conducive to public welfare," and it asserts that it is "indorsed by leading statesmen, educators, business men and philanthropists." On the board of counsellors are Senator Hanna, Senator Lodge, Senator Depew, ex-Secretary Bliss, ex-Vice President Morton, ex-Secretary Gage, ex-Secretary Long, ex-Bank President Hendricks, ex-Secretary Smith, and Senator Burrows. Two or three college presidents are thrown in, but no