

rities did not think it proper to suggest that a boy could be king. The above are actual cases, but they have given rise to jokes that go a little farther. For instance, they say that dynamos are not allowed in Turkey because the name sounds like dynamite and that chemistries have been excluded because the formula for water, "H<sub>2</sub>O," is suspected of meaning, "Hamud II. is a cypher."

I have had a little experience with a censor myself. At Beyrout, one of the Turkish ports, a copy of the Koran and a copy of the Life of Abbas Effendi were taken from me by the censor. I had no objection to his holding them during my stay in the country, but when he informed me that they would have to be sent to Constantinople I demurred and with the aid of our representative, Consul General Bergholz, not only secured the books, but secured a promise that the right of American citizens to carry books would not in the future be interfered with at that port.

In conclusion, I desire to add that we ought to have an ambassador instead of a minister at Constantinople. According to the custom prevailing in the sultan's realm, a minister is not on equal footing with ambassadors, and as other nations have ambassadors there American interests suffer. We have eighteen cases now awaiting adjustment. According to our law our appointment of an ambassador to any country depends upon that country's willingness to send an ambassador to us. This is a false basis. Our action should not depend upon what other nations do, but upon our diplomatic needs, and we need an ambassador at Constantinople whether Turkey needs one at Washington or not. I understand that the question is already being considered in congress and from observation I am satisfied that the time has come for the raising of our legation to the dignity of an embassy that American interests and the rights of American citizens may have proper protection in Turkey, for nowhere is there greater need for the introduction of American ideas.

Copyright.

#### JUST LIKE HAMILTON

The Boston Advertiser denies that there is any liability on the part of the republican party for the money taken from the policyholders and contributed to the republican campaign fund. The Advertiser says: "That money was paid by big corporations into campaign funds is also true and the fact was not denied at the time. But so long as the stockholders approved of such contributions—as they undoubtedly did, at the time of the Bryan scare, disposes of any charge that the money was 'stolen' or 'embezzled.'"

This defense is identical with that made by Andrew Hamilton, the insurance lobbyist who was employed to corrupt legislatures.

That money was paid by the big insurance companies into Andrew Hamilton's corruption fund is not denied; but Hamilton argued that so long as the stockholders approved of such contributions—as in Hamilton's opinion they undoubtedly did at the time when reform legislation on the insurance question was about to be enacted—disposed of any charge that the money was stolen or embezzled.

Of course, it was of no moment to Hamilton that the "stockholders" were not consulted. Guessing that the legislature should be corrupted, Hamilton guessed that the "stockholders" approved of the corruption fund.

Nor were the policyholders consulted when it came to the contribution of their money to the republican campaign fund. Guessing that the republican ticket should be elected the McCurdys and the Hydes guessed that the policyholders would approve the misuse of their money, although many of them were democrats, and were at the time working against the election of the ticket, for the success of which the money had been contributed.

If the money paid to Andrew Hamilton for lobby purposes was misappropriated then the money paid to the republican campaign fund was misappropriated. Yet some republicans who lose no opportunity to denounce the use of the insurance funds for lobby purposes, can see no evil in the misappropriation of the insurance funds for the use and benefit of the republican party.

#### A TEXAS IDEA

Writing in the Reader Magazine, Ethel Hutson says:

"I do not know another state in which the people so generally hold the views which produced both the Texas railroad commission and

the laws which it was created to enforce. These views may be stated briefly:

"1. A corporation is the creature of the state; it has, therefore, no natural rights as a person has, but only such privileges as the state may give it.

"2. It is created to serve the people; if, instead, it becomes strong and insolent, and oppresses them, it should be destroyed, not by violence and anarchy, but by legal action of the state which created it and can revoke its charter.

"3. The power which creates and which may destroy may also limit; and so the state may, and should, control corporate activity as the welfare of the people demands, subject only to the constitutional limitations which forbid confiscation or destruction of property.

"On these three propositions, to which few Texans, I believe, would refuse assent, are based the laws regulating transportation within the great state. The size of the state, and some other conditions peculiar to it, have made it possible to enforce these laws with a completeness which might not be achieved elsewhere."

The seeds sown by the late John H. Reagan, who was, in truth, the father of the inter-state commerce act, are responsible for these good results in the Lone Star state. The Reagan spirit dominating faithful public officials in Texas has given to that great state the signal honor of being foremost in the maintenance, so far as the enactment and execution of laws are concerned, of the democratic doctrine that a corporation being the creature of the state must be the servant rather than the master of the people.

The Texas idea is spreading. Let us hope that it will take as firm hold upon the people of all other states as it has upon the old neighbors of John H. Reagan.

#### THE FARMER AND THE TARIFF

The Kansas City Journal (Rep.) is greatly exercised. As the Journal puts it, "the editor of an Indian Territory paper can not see how the tariff protects the farmer." Concerning the Indian Territory editor the Journal says: "He is very probably honest in his position, though he is putting charity to somewhat of a strain when he declares that 'a farmer who can be a republican is one of the curiosities of the political situation.'"

That reminds us of a story which Judge Joseph E. Ong, formerly of Nebraska, but now of Colorado, was wont to tell.

A democratic orator was addressing a crowd in Indiana and said: "Now I am going to put to you farmers a question which I want you to think over for several days, and then if you can give an answer write to me at my home. The question is: 'What is there a farmer sells which he gets more for, and what is there a farmer buys which he gets for less, on account of a high protective tariff?' Think of this and answer at your leisure."

Several weeks later this democratic orator received a letter from an old farmer, who had been one of his audience, and the letter was about as follows: "Dear Sir: When you were down in Indiana several weeks ago, you asked 'what is there a farmer sells that he gets more for, and what is there a farmer buys that he gets for less, on account of a high protective tariff?' Well, sir, I have been thinking about that question ever since, and I have come to the conclusion that there isn't a dar-darned thing."

#### "THE SMALL AND PETTY PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY"

The New York Sun, in its issue of August 18, printed a letter from one James Watts, of Trenton, N. J., which letter concluded in these words: "The small and petty people in this country have too much to say, and that's the whole trouble."

It is true that "the small and petty people in this country" have altogether too much power, but evidently there is a difference between the Sun's correspondent and most people, as to who constitute "the small and petty people." Evidently Mr. Watts means the masses for whom, plainly, he has a very poor opinion, but our form of government was instituted for the purpose of giving the masses not only a "say," but absolute control. The trouble is that the masses have too often neglected their duty and their opportunity, and have permitted "the small and petty people in this country"—those mediocre men who, while being "long" on the genius for accumulating gold, are "short" on the gifts that make a

man a man for a' that and a' that. "The small and petty people in this country" whose brain and conscience are not commensurate with the power they wield are the men who, through the purchase of elections, obtain dominating control in politics, secure monopolies in food and fuel and while conspiring against the very lives of the people are all the while vociferously protesting that they have a monopoly upon the virtue, the patriotism and the intelligence of the country. It is the power wielded by these "small and petty people" that must be destroyed, if popular government is to be preserved. Mr. Watts need not be alarmed concerning the masses in America; they have often been deceived, but their hearts beat true.

#### DON'T FORGET IT

The Chicago Record-Herald says: "But 'stand-patism' as to the tariff would mean glorying in confessions of impotence, the apotheosis of political cowardice. The president's message and speeches preclude the supposition that this is the kind of 'stand patism' he has examined and pronounced good. It will not look good to Iowans or middle west republicans generally, and it will not make votes in New England or New York. As to the alleged obligato addendum to the 'stand pat' gospel, namely, the earnest suggestion that when the sacred schedules are revised they should be revised by the friends of protection, it may possibly occur to the voter that he has heard it before. Some irreverent heretics, poisoned by the Cumminses and Fosses and other disturbers of the peace, may even indulge in in-elegant ejaculations. The best service the 'stand patters' can render is to go to the rear and sit down."

This is very good, and is a fit companion piece for that brief and complete definition given by the Lincoln (Neb.) Journal, a republican paper, when it said: "Thus it comes to pass that a 'standpatter' in Iowa and in other states as well is now generally understood to be a man who opposes any radical change in existing institutions. Because of inertia, or ingrained conservatism, or his personal relations, he is willing to allow interests with a cinch to hold on to their advantage indefinitely."

#### LOOK OUT!

The Kansas City Journal (Rep.) says: "The price of the white metal has advanced materially within the past year or more, and for this there are excellent business reasons. The Japanese war increased the demand for silver as money; the British government has bought large quantities for use in India; the expansion of Chinese trade has added to the demand, and the use of silver in the arts has steadily increased during successive years of prosperity."

The Journal also says: "It is noteworthy that on the day when the announcement of the government's intention was made, the price of silver was quoted at 65%, an appreciable advance over the figures which had ruled for some time previously."

The Journal must be careful lest it get itself in a position where it can no longer contend that the opening of the mints to silver would not have an appreciable effect upon the price of the metal.

#### WHAT IT "TAKES"

Senator Dubois denounces the republican party as in league with the Mormon church. Bryan sees it as an ally of Wall street. Gompers is sure it is lined up against the oppressed laboring man, and the prohibitionists are of the opinion that it is wholly given over to the devil. It takes a courageous man to be a republican at the present stage of the game.—Sioux City Journal.

When we review the recent careers of the many eminent financiers who so loudly and so insistently stood up for the "national honor" in 1896 by leaguing themselves with the republican party, we are inclined to believe that it takes a regular Pittsburg millionaire sort of a man to be a republican in these days.

#### GREAT IS HARRIMAN

William Nelson Cromwell, "the mysterious stranger," who hangs about the Panama canal work, paid a high tribute to E. H. Harriman, the railroad magnate, when he said: "He can not be replaced, as he moves in a higher world into which we may not enter."

And they say that Mr. Cromwell passes among his acquaintances for a man of more than ordinary intelligence! But, judging from his foolis-eulogy of Harriman, "he don't look it."