

of Mr. Roosevelt's re-election. He says that these Wall street magnates, who have opposed Mr. Roosevelt, "do not know just what to base their antagonism upon." He adds that while some of these people flew into a rage when the Northern Securities case was ordered, in their calmer moments they have been compelled to admit "this was not such a revolutionary and radical action as they at first thought it." A great many people in this country have been at a loss to understand just what basis Wall street had for any opposition to Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Wellman further says, "I am credibly informed that the hostility to the president in Wall street is not as extensive or as bitter as it has been represented." A great many people have had the same impression.

Mr. Wellman tells us that "even the Rockefellers are coming round to take a more rational view of the president's character and policy, and that at least one of the Rockefellers is disposed to be more than fair and go so far as to be distinctly friendly."

Then this wonderfully frank republican correspondent says, "Those persons who imagine that Mr. Roosevelt is not a pretty good politician may soon have occasion to revise their judgment." In order to show what a good politician Mr. Roosevelt is, Mr. Wellman adds:

"It requires genius of a high order to carry on a little crusade against Wall street and through it gain immense popularity with the masses of the people as the foe of the trusts, and then to turn round and gain the approval, and possibly the help, of a considerable share of Wall street itself."

This is a very frank statement, indeed. It admits just what many democrats have said, that Mr. Roosevelt's "little crusade against Wall street" was begun in the hope that through it Mr. Roosevelt might "gain immense popularity with the masses of the people as the foe of the trusts," Mr. Roosevelt all the time intending to "turn round and gain the approval, and possibly the help, of a considerable share of Wall street itself."

The Walter Wellman dispatch here referred to should be reproduced in every newspaper throughout the United States. It will materially aid the American people in placing a proper estimate upon the words of the present occupant of the White house, which words, according to his own statement, are of little value because they are not "backed up by deeds."

### Oppose Popular Government

If the corporation bulletins which circulate as daily papers keep on they will convince even the blindest that the real objection to the Kansas City platform is not that it contains a silver plank, but that it contains a plea for popular government. The Commoner has already pointed out that the reorganizers, while pretending opposition to 16 to 1 only, are really against the greenbacks and in favor of everything demanded by Wall street. They also favor imperialism and have no intention of interfering with the trusts, but it is not often that they are indiscreet enough to admit their secret opposition to popular government.

The Nashville American has carried its boldness so far as to castigate Mr. Bryan for asserting the right of the people to have what they want in government. In his Nashville speech Mr. Bryan said: "The people have a right to have what they want. They have a right to have a high tariff if they want it and to raise it until they get tired of it, and then they have a right to lower it. They have a right to have the gold standard or the double standard. They have a right to have the trusts if they want them or to kill them if they desire to do so." The American, quoting this, says:

In his speech at the Tabernacle Saturday night, Mr. Bryan said:

"The people have the right to have what they want. They have a right to have the tariff if they want it and raise it until it is so high they will tire of it, and then they have the right to lower it. They have the right to have the gold standard, or the double standard. They have the right to have the trusts if they want them, or kill them, if they desire."

This is the usual plea of the demagogue, the man who is attempting to curry favor with the masses, the man who wishes to ride into public favor and when once there to stay there, buoyed up by the clamor of many voices.

It is the same speech that was made to the Roman populace 1,900 years ago, and it has been made ever since, in every country almost, by the seeker for public favor. It is

not the speech of the student or thinker or the man who unselfishly loves his fellowmen and would attempt, by his advice, to better their condition. It is the harangue of the flatterer, not the counsel of the true friend.

Who and what are the "people" of whom Mr. Bryan speaks so glibly? One would think, from the way in which he uses the term, that it is the mass—men, women and children—to whom he would refer any question, and if they want what is proposed they can have it, if the majority of them so hold.

Bismarck's objection to a democracy was that it was "like a household ruled by the children." It is such a household as Mr. Bryan, seemingly, from the loose manner in which he uses the term "people," would have this government. He would not place the counsel, the advice or the opinion of the matured, the educated and wise above that of the ignorant, the unenlightened the unrestrained. He would, it does not seem, place any value upon enlightenment and education.

This is a harsh rebuke and would be keenly felt but for the fact that the paragraph quoted from Mr. Bryan's speech contains no original sentiments. It is only a paraphrasing of what has been said by Jefferson, Jackson and every other public man with democratic instincts. It ought to be a revelation to the rank and file of the party to have this would-be leader of democratic thought seriously quoting Bismarck's argument against democracy.

The editor of the American wants a government of the "matured, the educated and the wise" and it is fair to assume that he considers himself as answering to that description—at least he would not suggest a suffrage qualification that would exclude himself—and yet whose rights would be safe in a government in which men of his opinion had absolute control? All the evils that afflict the body politic today grow out of the fact that such men have too much influence in shaping legislation. They are the champions of that theory of government which turns organized society over to exploiters and then countenances the debauching of elections to secure a continuance of governmental favors. The problems of government are not so difficult that they must be left to experts; they involve moral principles upon which the masses are competent to decide. The manufacturers claim to be "matured, educated and wise," but when they make tariff laws they sacrifice both consumers and employes to their own interests. The money changers claim to be "matured, educated and wise," but if put in charge of the temple they would again convert it into a den of thieves. The trust magnates claim to be "matured, educated and wise," but who would make them custodians of the people's right? The employers are "matured, educated and wise," according to the American's definition, but who would trust them to make laws for the wage-earners?

The American believes in an aristocracy—not in a democracy—and it would be an aristocracy in which wealth rather than intelligence or virtue would control.

It attempts to defend its position by citing the suffrage qualifications of the south, but it does the southern people injustice in assuming that these amendments prove a lack of faith in the principles of democracy. It is the race question that gives rise to those amendments. They recognize that the black man has been governed by prejudice against the white and have sought to protect themselves against that prejudice, but there is not a state in the south that would adopt an educational qualification if the race question were eliminated. The trouble with the papers that represent the reorganizers is that they do not trust the people, but, on the contrary, would first deceive them and then betray them.

### "Ideal Republicanism."

Congressman Cousins of Iowa delivered an address at Chicago recently on Abraham Lincoln. Newspaper dispatches say that Mr. Cousins eulogized Lincoln as "the greatest republican that ever lived," and "the ideal of republicanism."

Let us see about that.

Mr. Lincoln said: "Let us plant ourselves on the rock of the Declaration of Independence and the gates of hell shall not be able to prevail against us." Is this the ideal of the republican of today? How, then, will Mr. Cousins explain the fact that references to the Declaration of Independence are met with sneers in republican circles?

Mr. Lincoln protested against "any miserable picayune arguments addressed to the people's pockets or inflammatory appeal made to their passions and their prejudices," and yet, where the

republican orator or the republican organ of today does not address to the people's pockets "miserable picayune arguments," it indulges in inflammatory appeal to their passions and their prejudices.

Mr. Lincoln pleaded for a government that should express "the highest spirit of justice and liberty." The republican leader of today pleads for a government that will express the very reverse of this.

Mr. Lincoln pleaded for the express provisions of our national constitution. The republican leader of today pleads that the constitution be ignored whenever it suits the republican program to ignore it.

Mr. Lincoln declared that the people should never entrust to any hands but their own the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions. The position of the republican leader of today is well defined in the pompous declaration of the coal barons to the effect that God has designated certain men to act as His trustees for the control of the wealth and the government of the country.

Mr. Lincoln pleaded for "an open field and a fair chance for industry, enterprise and intelligence, that every individual may have equal privileges in the race of life with all its desirable human aspirations," and he said that "it is for this the struggle should be maintained, that we may not lose our birthrights." The republican leader of today, protesting against the proposition of the socialist to suspend the operation of what the republican calls natural law closes his eyes to the fact that the Rockefellers, the Carnegies and the Morgans have actually suspended the operation of natural laws and upholds these trust magnates in the destruction of "the open field," in the obliteration of "the fair chance" for industry, enterprise and intelligence.

Mr. Cousins, nor no other republican leader, dare quote from the speeches and the letters of Abraham Lincoln in support of the claim that Lincoln represented the ideal of present-day republicanism. Look, for instance, at the republican national platform for 1900, wherein it is promised for the Filipinos that "the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare, and our duties shall be secured to them by law." And then look at the speech delivered by Abraham Lincoln July 10, 1858, in the city of Chicago, wherein Mr. Lincoln said: "Those arguments that are made, that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying, that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow—what are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of king-craft were of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument. . . . Turn it whatever way you will—whether it come from the mouth of a king as an excuse for enslaving the people of his country, or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent."

### Railroad Bonds and Farm Mortgages.

Secretary Shaw has permitted the acceptance, as security for government deposits in the national banks, of all bonds which the savings bank law of the state of New York permits the savings banks to invest in. As a result, the secretary accepts first mortgage railroad bonds of companies which have paid dividends on their stocks for a period of ten years.

It will be remembered that the Aldrich bill introduced in the senate provided for the acceptance of railroad bonds. The Aldrich bill did not pass, and, indeed, received small encouragement outside of financial circles; and yet Secretary Shaw has undertaken to demonstrate that he is a law unto himself.

The Wall Street Journal does not approve of Secretary Shaw's action in this respect. The Journal says that it would not be inclined to enter serious objection if this were but a temporary expedient, and not to serve as a precedent. The Journal takes the pains to say that it has no intention of "casting discredit upon railroad bonds which constitute some of the best securities that the world presents;" but we find that the Journal fears the logical result of the acceptance of railroad bonds. It explains that in the light of Secretary Shaw's action "the farmers of the country may legitimately claim that if the government is to place its money on railroad bonds, it should not discriminate against their mortgages."

That would seem to be very natural; and yet,