

no better dependence than the navy whether that navy be large or small. In his message two years ago the president announced this astounding doctrine: "If the great civilized nations of the present day should completely disarm, the result would mean an immediate recrudescence of barbarism in one form or another." This passage in his former message can bear no other construction than that the president regards a warlike spirit as necessary to a nation's progress. If he is right, then the whole doctrine of the Christian religion is wrong; if he is right, then the peace movement is a movement toward barbarism and not toward civilization. The president challenges the idea that right is might. There is just now an effort in all the leading nations to increase the navy. Each new ship built by one country is used as a reason why other countries should build new ships, and there is no limit to this rivalry except the power of the people to pay the taxes. From a practical stand-

point this rivalry is inexcusable. From a moral standpoint it is astounding. The president was universally applauded when he was instrumental in bringing peace between Russia and Japan, but who has applauded his utterance of two years ago in regard to the evils of a reduction of armaments, and who but a military enthusiast will endorse his proposition that the navy is the best guarantor of peace?

In advising the establishment of shooting galleries and rifle ranges throughout the country, he is only applying to land what he has heretofore applied to water. If he is right in the one case, he is right in the other. If it is right to build up a great navy and to rely upon marksmanship for our nation's safety, then to be consistent we should establish Roosevelt shooting galleries not merely in the schools but throughout the country and turn our attention toward preparation for war. What a shocking spectacle this country will present when its youths have no higher ambition than to get ready to kill some-

body. By the time we have cultivated enough military spirit to make shooting galleries popular, we will have some excuse for making use of the marksmanship that we have cultivated. It is lamentable that the president of a nation possessing more altruism than any other nation in the world and offering higher ideals of citizenship and government than any other nation, should present so un-American and so un-Christian a doctrine. Our nation's prestige should be a moral prestige and not a physical prestige; our influence should rest upon high example, not upon brute force; the aim of our people should be to act righteously rather than to aim rifles accurately; our nation's security should be the spirit of justice that pervades its people, not in its ability to kill those who differ from us in opinion. War ought to be a last resort, not a first consideration. It is bad enough to have a few professional soldiers. It is not necessary that the whole nation shall be keyed up all the time to the fighting point.

## THE PRACTICAL VS. THE IDEAL

Secretary Root, Secretary Shaw and Mr. Bryan spoke at the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress which recently met at Kansas City. The Kansas City Journal, one of the strongest republican papers of the west, makes the following editorial comment upon their speeches:

"One of the most conspicuous features of the address at the sessions of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress is the clear line of cleavage between the methods and policies of the two big political parties in dealing with the great economic questions which press for settlement at the hands of the American people. The speeches of the republican spokesmen, Secretaries Root and Shaw, are meaty with practical plans based on the experience of the great nations in dealing with the same questions, while the speech of Mr. Bryan, the leading democratic statesman now living, is full of untried theories and moral sentiments, fine in their way but utterly inapplicable to the cold and inexorable laws of economics. The one side illustrates practical statesmanship which deals with things as they are and will always be as long as human nature remains as it is; the other illustrates the visionary philosophy which mistakes ideals for facts and proceeds on the theory that things are so because they ought to be so, according to the golden rule or the abstract principles of moral philosophy. Root and Shaw advocate ship subsidies, not on theoretical grounds, but because all the nations which are competing with us for the world's trade are using them successfully to build up their merchant marine and get their share of trade. Bryan, the dreamer, opposes the tremendous impetus which ship subsidies would give the whole country because a few men will get some direct benefit from them, and as a substitute remedy he offers the plan of building fewer battleships and of expending our money for a merchant marine that could be used in times of war."

The Journal editor, recognizing the impossibility of defending a ship subsidy upon theory promptly rejects theories and clamors for something practical. That has been the policy of the republican speakers whenever they are cornered. When asked to defend the principle involved in a pro-

ductive tariff, they answer: "This is not a theoretical question; it is a practical one." And then they proceed to attribute to protection all of the advantages that have come from a fruitful soil and generous climate and a free government. When asked to defend the principle that underlies the trust, they answer: "We are not dealing with ideals; we are practical statesmen and the trusts have helped to develop the country." And then they put to the credit of the trusts every reduction in price which has come from improved machinery or from any other source. And now they are defending the ship subsidy with the same set of arguments. Finding that other nations give subsidies, they rush to the conclusion that ship subsidies and ship subsidies alone will rebuild the merchant marine, and they propose to enter into competition with other nations in the giving of subsidies.

Secretary Root estimates the subsidies given by other nations at twenty-eight millions, and yet, according to the figures which he gives, our nation will have to pay more than that to put our vessel owners upon an equal footing with other nations. Secretary Root gives two reasons why our ships can not compete with foreign ships—first, that the tariff has increased the cost of living in our country, and second, that the wages paid upon American ships are higher than the wages paid on foreign ships. If, therefore, we must not only pay a subsidy equal to the subsidy paid by foreign ships but enough more to overcome the increased cost of living and the increased wages, the ship subsidy means a very large annual drain. And that is not all. If foreign nations have been willing to pay twenty-eight millions to secure trade when we paid no subsidies, they were unable to compete with subsidized American ships. Might we not expect an increase in foreign subsidies, and would this not have to be counteracted by an increase in our subsidies? What limit except the willingness of the people to tax themselves would there be to the subsidy policy? No wonder the Journal does not attempt to defend a subsidy upon theory. But as a practical proposition can it commend itself to the American people? Is our trade to be a one-sided trade? Are we to carry American goods away only and not bring foreign goods back? Or if we are to bring goods to the United States as well as carry them away, what folly

to subsidize ships to bring merchandise to our ports and then raise the tariff to keep it out!

If we desire to encourage shipping, why not discriminate in favor of goods brought into the United States in American ships? This would give to the ship owners a part of the advantage which the tariff-protected manufacturers now enjoy. But this would not be acceptable to the republican leaders. They have insisted upon taxing the whole country to build up our manufactures, and now they want to place an additional tax upon the country to build up American lines for the purpose of carrying our manufactures to other countries. According to the republican leaders the practical policy must have two characteristics; first, it must lay the tax on all the people; and second, it must confine the benefits to a few of the people. If one advocates any other policy, he subjects himself to the charge of being visionary and idealistic. Within the last eight years the appropriations for two departments of government—war and navy—have increased over one hundred millions of dollars. The people are required to bear this additional annual burden as a preparation for war that ought never to come. The benefits of this policy are enjoyed by the shipbuilders or contractors for supplies, and a comparatively few secure a life position. There is no suggestion of a reduction in unnecessary expenses—only a clamor for more appropriations and bigger profits for the few who will be favored.

The democratic party can afford to stand for ideals rather than for such practical statesmanship. It can afford to protect the rights of the many. If public necessity requires the establishment of steamship lines, let the government build and own the ships and establish the lines on conditions which will bring the benefit to the entire country and not to a few favorites. Whatever is important enough for the government to spend money on is important enough for the government to control. It is a favorite device of the practical politicians who control the republican party to plead a public necessity in order to get a public appropriation and then insist upon the appropriation being spent for private interests. The ship subsidy means an indefinite increase in the taxes; it means great rich picking for a few financiers and a large fund to draw on for campaign expenses.

### THAT LITTLE BROWN BABY

Secretary Shaw is still illustrating the Philippine question as he views it by the story of the little brown baby. He pictures himself going across the street to settle a row in a neighboring family, and when he returns he is carrying a little brown baby. His daughter wants to adopt it. His son wants to put it out in the street, but his wife advises him to keep it until it has grown and then decide what to do with it, and he follows his wife's advice. Beautiful picture, but incomplete and not to the point. What about the other little brown baby? We found Cuba as well as the Philippines. Both were fighting for liberty. We let Cuba set up for herself, "because we promised to," and kept the Philippines because we did not promise and because we thought that we could use them in our business. The little brown baby in the Orient was to help us extend our trade among the Chinese. It was not philanthropy, but cold "practical business" that led to the adoption of a different course in regard

to the two. Secretary Shaw would have it appear a philanthropic undertaking, but that would not account for the difference in treatment. More than that, he regards the Filipinos as children when they are not children. No one who has intelligence enough to be secretary of the treasury ought to be so ignorant of the human race as to compare grown-up people with children. You can not deal with the adult as with a child no matter how inferior. Fact as well as theory contradicts Secretary Shaw's picture. The Filipino would not be able to conduct as good a government in the Philippines as we conduct in the United States, but what of it? We do not conduct as good a government for them as we conduct for ourselves. We refuse them the constitutional guarantees which we regard as essential to us, and we sacrifice them to the interests of Americans. A republican congress refused amendment after amendment offered for the protection of the Filipinos when the Philippine bill was under consideration. A republican congress refused to give

to the resident Filipino the first chance to buy public land, and it sanctioned a perpetual franchise which would not be tolerated in this country.

Secretary Shaw does not know what to do with the Philippines. If he would study the principles of government laid down by the fathers, he would not find it difficult to make up his mind on the subject. He would recognize that people who are not desired as citizens should not be held as subjects.

There is one consolation in the thought of an asset currency. It will keep banks from talking about a fifty cent dollar, for an asset currency has not as much back of it as the silver dollar had when it was subjected to the most criticism.

There is an old saying that oil and water will not mix, but it is evident from the drop in the price of oil stock that there was more or less of water in it before the squeeze began.