

tion of the vast sums which the Amalgamated took from them and from which others took in lesser amounts, but by equally flagrant methods, but will demand the overthrow of the "system" itself.

It must be admitted that Mr. Lawson draws a terrible picture even in his brief introductory chapter; and yet, however terrible the picture may appear, it is no worse in appearance than a large number of people have suspected as to the real character of the "system" that is now preying upon them. It will, however, be advantageous to have the story told by one who seems to have had intimate dealings with the chiefs of the "system."

Mr. Lawson explains that the "system" is "a process or device for the incubation of wealth from the people's savings in banks, trust and public funds." He says that through the workings of this "system" during the last twenty years "there has grown up in this country a set of colossal corporations in which unmeasured success and continued immunity from punishment have bred an insolent disregard of law, of common morality, and of public and private right, together with a grim determination to hold onto, at all hazard, the great possessions they have gulped or captured." He declares that through this "system" billions of dollars have been taken from millions of people and these dollars have been given over to a "a score or two of men with power to use and enjoy them as absolutely as though these billions had been earned dollar by dollar by labor of their bodies and minds." He declares that because of Amalgamated alone, to his personal knowledge, more than \$100,000,000 were lost by the people; that more than thirty suicides resulted; that twenty previously reputable citizens were made prison convicts. Mr. Lawson pays a high tribute to the stories told by Henry D. Lloyd in his work "Wealth against Commonwealth" and to Miss Ida M. Tarbell in her recent sketches; but he says that however thorough these writers may have been in gathering the facts, however relentless their pens and vivid their pictures, they dealt but with things that are dead. Mr. Lawson proposes to deal with the living present and it is not at all difficult to believe that he is determined to be very thorough in dealing with this subject, because in his introductory chapter he lays out a wide range for himself. Unquestionably the reading public will await with great interest the disclosures of Mr. Lawson.

The people will undoubtedly be greatly interested in the chapter which Mr. Lawson describes in advance in this way:

I shall devote some space to pointing out the evils and dangers of the latter-day methods of corrupting law-makers, and show how one entire Massachusetts legislature, with the exception of a few members, were dealt with as openly as the fishmongers procure their stock-in-trade upon the wharves; how upon the last day of the legislature, because their deferred cash payments were not promptly forthcoming, they turned, and made necessary the hurried departure for foreign shores of a great lawyer and his secretary, with bags of quickly gathered gold, and all evidences of the crimes committed and attempted; how after the ship arrived at an island in foreign seas the great lawyer's dead body received hurried burial, and his secretary's was later dropped, with weights about his feet, to the ocean's depths; and how ever since the natives whisper among themselves their gruesome suspicions.

Another chapter that will unquestionably be awaited with interest is described by Mr. Lawson in this way:

I shall devote a chapter to the doings of certain financial reputation sandbaggers and blackmailers; show how through their agencies they hold up corporations and their managers for large sums, which upon being paid start into motion a perfected system for the false moulding of public opinion for the purpose of making more easy the plundering of the people. I shall photograph the men and draw accurate diagrams of the machinery through which their nefarious trade is carried on.

Even those who maintain that a court should be above criticism will be interested in the chapter described by Mr. Lawson in this way:

I shall draw a picture of two dress-suit cases of money being slipped across the table at the foot of a judge's bench in the court room, from its custodian to its new owners, upon the rendering of a court decision; and I shall show how the new owners frustrated

a plot whereby they were to be waylaid and the bags of money recovered.

Those who imagine that in supporting the republican party in 1896 they were in fact waging a battle in support of "national honor," as well as those who followed the democratic banner to defeat, will be interested in the chapter described by Mr. Lawson in this way:

I shall deal with a bit of the nation's history in which within a few days of the national election of 1896 a hurry-up call for additional funds to the extent of \$5,000,000 was so promptly met as to overturn the people in five states and thereby preserve the destinies of the republican party, of which I am and have always been a member.

There can be little doubt that the Boston financier is well informed as to the methods of the trust system and it may be that the disclosures he will make will serve to arouse the American people to the importance of protecting their government and their property from the iniquitous "system" that has grown up in this country and which unless checked at an early day, must result in the complete destruction of popular rule and the enthronement of a plutocracy that can be displaced only by revolution.

### Manifest Destiny.

One of the most interesting of the books published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., is Theodore Roosevelt's book on Thomas H. Benton. It appeared in the Statesman's Series and was copyrighted in 1886. In this book the president of the United States gave special attention to a phrase which was much used just before the civil war, but not much used afterwards until it was employed as an excuse for the exploitation of the Philippines. On page 40, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"Among such people Benton's views and habits of thought became more markedly western and ultra-American than ever, especially in regard to our encroachments upon the territory of neighboring powers. The general feeling in the west upon this last subject afterwards crystallized into what became known as the 'Manifest Destiny' idea, which, reduced to its simplest terms, was: that it was our manifest destiny to swallow up the land of all adjoining nations who were too weak to withstand us; a theory that forthwith obtained immense popularity among all statesmen of easy international morality."

At that time the author did not like the doctrine of "manifest destiny;" his conscience would not permit him to indorse a policy of swallowing up even adjoining nations merely because they were too weak to withstand us. How could he have condemned the doctrine more severely than he did when he suggested that it became immensely popular among "all statesmen of easy international morality"?

It will be seen that it contained a moral question as well as a political one. If it was then immoral to swallow up the land of adjoining nations who were too weak to withstand us, is it now moral to cross an ocean seven thousand miles wide and swallow up the land of nations that do not adjoin us, merely because they were too weak to withstand us?

On another page he spoke of this method of securing land by conquest in even harsher terms. He said: "This belligerent, or, more properly speaking, piratical way of looking at neighboring territory, was very characteristic of the west, and was at the root of the doctrine of 'manifest destiny'."

"Manifest destiny" at that time was a belligerent and piratical doctrine; can it be Christian and benevolent now?

On page 266 of Mr. Roosevelt's book the author very clearly outlined the difference between the American method of expansion and the European policy of imperialism. He said:

"Of course no one would wish to see these or any other settled communities now added to our domain by force; we want no unwilling citizens to enter our Union; the time to have taken the lands was before settlers came into them. European nations war for the possession of thickly settled districts which, if conquered, will for centuries remain alien and hostile to the conquerors; we, wiser in our generation, have seized the waste solitude that lay near us, the limitless forests and never ending plains, and the valleys of the great, lonely rivers; and have thrust our own sons into them to take possession; and a score of

years after each conquest we see the conquered land teeming with a people that is one with ourselves."

He recognized that it was contrary to the principles of a republic to incorporate unwilling citizens into the Union; he recognized that people taken by conquest would "for centuries remain alien and hostile to the conquerors." If he knew this then, how could he so forget his knowledge of history as to think that the Filipinos would soon be friends to their conquerors? Are we less "wise" now than when he wrote?

Attention is called to the change that has come over the president merely as an illustration of the fact that republican policies today are in violation of history and of human nature, as well as in violation of the doctrines promulgated by the very same republicans before the thirst for empire overcame them?

When Mr. Roosevelt discussed the subject of imperialism eighteen years ago he used American language to defend American principles; when Mr. Roosevelt speaks as a republican president of the United States, exercising in the Philippines the same power that the king of England exercises in India, he uses European language to defend European principles.

### The President's Power.

The Lincoln, (Neb.) Journal, a republican paper, declares that the big strike in the packing houses "is the result of a long contemplated effort on the part of the big men controlling the packing houses to defeat President Roosevelt for election." The Journal says that the beef trust magnates have discovered that Mr. Roosevelt has issued, through the department of justice, an order that the case against the beef trust be taken up by the supreme court immediately after that court convenes for the October term. Therefore, according to The Journal, the beef trust magnates determined to punish Mr. Roosevelt by bringing on this great strike during the presidential campaign.

Of course, this statement will be taken with several grains of salt. Whatever may be said about Mr. Roosevelt, he is not "a man of mush." It is not at all likely that he will permit the beef trust magnates to thus organize against him without his resentment; and Mr. Roosevelt as president of the United States, holds considerably more power than all the trust magnates of the country put together.

If it be true that the beef trust magnates are so seriously opposed to his election that they would deliberately bring on a strike in their own establishments, for the purpose of defeating Mr. Roosevelt, then, Mr. Roosevelt—unless he be, as Bismarck said of Salisbury, "a wooden lath painted to look like iron"—will very speedily call these trust magnates to time.

There remains upon the statute books an unenforced law providing for the criminal prosecution of men who conspire in restraint of trade. No administration that fails to enforce the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law can be said to be waging a serious campaign against the trust system.

If, however, the report made by the Lincoln Journal be true, then Mr. Roosevelt will certainly defend himself. He can defend himself by appealing to the criminal clause of the anti-trust law. If it be true that the beef trust magnates have conspired to prevent the election of Mr. Roosevelt, then Mr. Roosevelt has it in his power to immediately call every one of these magnates to time. He has it in his power to place every one of these men behind the bars.

The beef trust magnates care nothing for civil proceedings. They care nothing for the injunction process. Like every human being, however, they are afraid of the criminal process.

Republican editors need not expect that they will be able to make the people believe that this packing house strike was brought about by the beef trust magnates in the hope of defeating Mr. Roosevelt, unless Mr. Roosevelt shall at a very early day, proceed against these trust magnates through the criminal indictment.

It is a very pretty story, as the Lincoln Journal and other republican organs tell it; but the story will not be accepted by an intelligent public, unless Mr. Roosevelt shall show signs of resentment.

The difference between Mr. Roosevelt the expectant nominee, and Mr. Roosevelt the nominee in fact, is very plain. As nominee in fact he has lost a great deal of that bubbling effusiveness that characterized him in the days of old.