

and, as one Commoner reader well said, he will find that even though he may have regularly participated in the primaries, the very fact that he has formally given a pledge will do much to aid him in maintaining his good record. The record of every man who aspires to be a delegate to democratic conventions should be carefully scrutinized and democrats should see to it that no man is sent to a democratic convention, county, state or national, who can not be depended upon to faithfully represent and defend the opinions of the rank and file.

Those who call it wisdom to accept as final the insolent boastings of commercialism and plutocracy and who regard it as "conservatism" to permit the representatives of those influences to frame the policies of parties and dictate the course of nations will find food for thought in Carlisle's testimony to the omnipotence of truth: "Hast thou considered how thought is stronger than artillery-parks, and (were it fifty years after death and martyrdom, or were it two thousand years) writes and unwrites acts of parliament, removes mountains, models the world like soft clay? Also how the beginning of all thought worth the name is love; and the wise head never yet was, without first the generous heart? The heavens cease not their bounty; they send us generous hearts into every generation. And now what generous heart can pretend to itself, or be hoodwinked into believing, that loyalty to the money bag is a noble loyalty? Mammon, cries the generous heart out of all ages and countries, is the basest of known gods, even of known devils. In him what glory is there, that he should worship him? No glory discernible; not even terror; at best, detestability, ill-matched with despicability!"

If the democratic party is to build upon a permanent foundation, it must recognize the fact that truth alone can give to the party hope of perpetuity; and that back of all thought must be love. Deep love for the common people and belief in human brotherhood will make the democratic party an invincible force. Unless the party is an exponent of thought and truth; unless it is built upon love—not self-love, but brotherly love—it can not hope for more than temporary and trifling success. Democracy when rightly understood is a religion, for it is founded upon the doctrine of equal and inalienable rights. A party founded upon that doctrine is entitled to the best service of its members.

THE REFERENDUM MOVEMENT

The referendum movement is growing. The Montana legislature has decided to submit to the people of that state a constitutional amendment providing for the initiative and referendum. This has been the result of a contest which began with the people and has finally resulted in the capture of the legislature. Montana will be the fifth state to vote on this subject. The other states are South Dakota, Utah, Oregon and Illinois. The last Nevada legislature voted to submit a constitutional amendment providing for a direct initiative, but as it requires two legislatures to act favorably on such an amendment it goes over to the next legislature. In Utah two republican legislatures have refused to put a constitutional amendment into operation. In South Dakota the republican legislature has shown a disposition to ignore the provisions of the referendum amendment, but the cause of direct legislation is growing. Those who believe in bringing the government nearer to the people will support it when they understand it.

THE MYSTERIOUS STRANGER

Major Wm. Warner, the new senator from Missouri starts out well. He is probably as good a republican as could have been selected. His speech at Kansas City, Kansas, would indicate that he may join the reform element in the republican party. He said:

"My fellow citizens, I have watched somewhat the fight in your municipality—the same that we are having across the line—the same that we are having in the nation today. Your present mayor has made the fight of the people against corporations. Will you stand by him? I am no political laiter. I do not envy the man that has wealth, only the envy that I do not possess it. But I want to say tonight that the great question before the American people that is consuming their interests and time is the conflict between the people and the encroachments of the corporations in their unlawful exercises of their aggregated wealth. Now, you, my fellow citizens in Kansas here today, will fire the first gun and let its echo reverberate and reach Washington and say to that Christian statesman, that ideal American citizen,

that you are with him in the fight. Do not be misled."

He recognizes that the great question before the American people is the conflict "between the people and the encroachments of the corporations." He has diagnosed the case properly and he has a great work before him if he tries to restore to the people their rights. He commends Kansas for its fight against the Standard Oil company and he will have a chance in Washington to make good his words. Let us hope that Missouri's "Mysterious Stranger" will earn a foremost place among republican reformers.

A TERRIBLE INDICTMENT

That fine old republican paper, the Chicago Chronicle, is indignant because the congregational ministers at Boston protested against the acceptance by the American board of commissioners for foreign missions of a gift of \$100,000 offered by John D. Rockefeller. The Chronicle is particularly indignant because these clergymen said:

The Standard Oil company, of which Mr. Rockefeller is the head, stands before the public under repeated and recent formidable indictments in specific terms for methods which are morally iniquitous and socially destructive, and the acceptance of such gift involves the constituents of the board in a relation implying honor toward the donor and subjects the board to the charge of ignoring the moral issues involved.

The Chronicle denounces these clergymen as "a lot of Pharisees" and declares that "Judas Iscariot would make a white mark on some of them."

Then the Chronicle rushes to the defense of the Rockefellers in this eloquent way:

The Standard Oil company does business on the same principles as any other business company or person has done it ever since the days of Adam, and the only reason that it attracts the attention and excites the hatred of pharisees is that it does business on such a large scale.

The complaint is just as illogical as would be a complaint against an oak tree on account of its bark when every rose bush has a bark also in proportion to its size, or against a great bakery on account of the smoke it makes when every private kitchen is making a smoke also in proportion to the amount of cooking it does. Nobody but a pharisee could be so inconsistent.

Admitting, as it must admit, that "the Standard Oil trust stands before the public under repeated and recent formidable indictments in specific terms for methods which are morally iniquitous and socially destructive," the Chronicle says that that great trust "does business on the same principles as any other business company or person has done it ever since the days of Adam."

According to the Chronicle, all business concerns and all individuals engaged in business employ the same iniquitous methods for which the Standard Oil trust has become notorious and the only reason that the iniquity of the Standard Oil trust "attracts the attention and excites the hatred of pharisees, is that it does business on such a large scale." That is a terrible indictment to bring against the business men of this country. Does any intelligent man believe for a moment that there is truth in the Chronicle's wholesale arraignment?

It is true that the methods of the Standard Oil trust are the methods of other trusts and only on a larger scale. But until we are prepared to admit that the majority of men are bad, we can not consent to the charge that "methods which are morally iniquitous" have characterized the transactions of business concerns or individuals engaged in commercial transactions.

The Chronicle's "oak tree" and "bakery" figure is interesting only because it indicates that the Chronicle's serious accusation against the business men of the country was carefully considered. It is, indeed, an interesting defense of perhaps the greatest of trusts and an interesting defense of the trust system generally. It would serve, also, as a defense for every crime in the world's history. It would serve as justification for every evil deed; and if that view should be generally adopted by the rising generation there would be small hope for the future of our country.

TEACHING MONARCHICAL DOCTRINE

Professor Munsterberg, a Harvard instructor, has created a sensation by delivering at Detroit, Mich., an address in which he made a veiled argument in favor of monarchical government as

against representative government. Ex-Congressman Lucking of the Detroit district was in the audience (the address was delivered at an open meeting of the Cosmopolitan club) and replied to the professor, pointing out that the address was really an attack upon our theory of government. The professor admitted this and attempted to justify himself by saying that President Roosevelt had said to him, "You will never hear me quoting from the Declaration of Independence." He also described a visit to the white house about Christmas time, when he declares he saw on the walls "a gift from the German emperor." According to the Detroit Tribune he describes the gift as follows: "There was a golden frame and within it was a crown, and during the several days after Christmas when I called upon the president he had entwined about the crown the American holly. It was a beautiful suggestion, the crown and the American holly."

If the president is correctly quoted, the Harvard professor can certainly feel that he has high authority to support him in his attack upon the Declaration of Independence and our theory of government, but let us hope that he did not correctly understand the president. He may have been overwhelmed by his reception at the white house, and so agitated as not to have comprehended the president's language. Let us even hope that his eyes deceived him when he saw what he describes as a crown entwined with holly. A crown, even in a frame, would hardly be regarded as the proper ornament for the white house, unless it was a captured crown.

But while the professor may have misrepresented the president's position, he certainly speaks with authority as to his own position, and what shall we think of the propriety of the employment by a great American college of a professor who feels it his duty to belittle our principles of government and to praise monarchy? Is it strange that our heiresses are seeking titles abroad, when American colleges employ exponents of European ideas to instruct American youths?

WASHINGTON AND ROOSEVELT

Several newspapers are giving Mr. Roosevelt considerable trouble just now with respect to his quotations. It does not seem exactly fair to hold to a strict accountability on this line one who is required to deliver as many addresses as are demanded of the president. It is true, however, that men should be very careful in using the language of others, particularly when that language is employed by way of justifying the orator's course.

A writer in Harper's Weekly directs attention to the interesting criticism made of Mr. Roosevelt on this line. Mr. Roosevelt said that among the maxims bequeathed by George Washington in his farewell address was the following: "To be prepared for war is the most effective means to promote peace."

The New York Sun points out that nothing of this kind appears in the farewell address and that no unqualified statement to the effect indicated by Mr. Roosevelt is discoverable in any of his extant utterances. The Sun says: "The nearest thing to it is the qualified assertion made in Washington's first annual address, or message, sent to congress on January 8, 1790. Then he suggested that 'to be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.'"

The Sun adds:

"Cautious as the statement is, it is scarcely consistent with the conviction at which Washington arrived near the close of his life, and which found earnest expression in the following words: 'My first wish is to see this plague to mankind [war] banished from the earth, and the sons and daughters of this world employed in more pleasing and innocent amusements than in preparing implements and exercising them for the destruction of mankind.'"

A Quaker correspondent of the Philadelphia Public Ledger directs attention to the fact that the modern battleship is clearly, nay, preeminently, one of the "implements" coming under the above category.

Mr. Roosevelt is also quoted as saying: "Never since the beginning of our country's history has the navy been used in an unjust war."

The New York Evening Post reminds the president that the navy was used in the Mexican war, which General Grant pronounced one of the most unjust ever waged by a stronger against a weaker nation. Assuming that Mr. Roosevelt may decline to take his opinions second-hand from General Grant, Harper's Weekly says that he cannot, with any show of consistency, dissent from the judgment rendered by himself in his "Life of Benton," when he spoke of the Mexican war as