

that school than any outside people can be. They have not only the knowledge, but they have the deep personal interest that compels investigation of all the facts and the study of all the conditions that are to be met.

Senator Beveridge does not mention either of these race questions, and yet, according to the doctrine which he laid down, "the American people themselves acting in common," could deal with the subject as well as the American people acting independently in the several states.

The second proposition advanced by Senator Beveridge is that "the powerful interests which exploit the people and the nation's resources can more easily handle a smaller portion of the American people for their purposes than they can handle the entire eighty millions of the people for their purposes." I referred to the trust question in my article of last month and stated that the adoption of effective remedies did not compel the obliteration of state lines. I pointed out that the federal remedies should be supplemental to the state remedies, and not a substitute for state remedies. It is misleading to say, as Senator Beveridge says, that "every corporation so great that its business is nation-wide is championing state's rights;" that "every railroad that has felt the regulating hand of the nation's government is earnestly for state's rights;" that "every trust attorney is declaiming about the dangers of centralization." He should have said that the representatives of predatory wealth are advocates of state's rights when prosecuted by the national government and advocates of centralization whenever they are attacked by any state. If he will review the history of the last twenty-five years, he will find that the very corporations which he now charges with being friendly to state's rights have constantly defied the states and sought shelter in the federal courts. Whenever a state has attempted the regulation of rates, the railroads have at once invoked the power of the federal courts to enjoin and to suspend. The United States courts are now filled with suits that ought to be tried in the state courts, but which are dragged into the federal courts for two reasons—first, to get them so far away from the plaintiffs as to make litigation expensive, and second, to secure trial before judges who are appointed for life by federal authorities and often upon the recommendation of corporate representatives.

In practice, the railroad magnate is for local self-government or for centralization, according to the conditions which he has to meet. Jay Gould is quoted as having said that he was a republican in republican counties, and a democrat in democratic counties, but always for Erie; and so it may be said that the railroads are for state's rights whenever they are fighting a federal law and for centralization whenever they are fighting a state law, but that they are always, in any case, for themselves and for their own interests.

Senator Beveridge refers to a number of cases in which federal measures or the action of the national executive have been criticized on the ground that they interfered with the reserved rights of the states. But the cases cited do not support his own position or the arguments of those who would reduce the influence of the state to a minimum.

For instance, he says that the constitution forbids the president from sending national soldiers to a state to suppress disorder when neither the legislature nor the governor calls for them, and asserting that neither Governor Altgeld nor the Illinois legislature had called for the troops, he declares that this raised the issue whether the president has the right "to send troops to a state when both the governor and the legislature were in league with the mob, and the mob was burning property and destroying life." This is the issue which Senator Beveridge, according to his own statement, discussed in his Chicago speech in closing the campaign of 1896. But this was not the issue presented by President Cleveland. In his telegram to Governor Altgeld the president said, "Federal troops were sent to Chicago in strict accordance with the constitution and laws of the United States, upon the demand of the post-office department that obstruction of the mails should be removed, and upon the representations of the judicial officers of the United States that the process of the federal courts could not be executed through the ordinary means, and upon competent proof that conspiracies existed against commerce between the states. To meet these conditions, which are clearly within the province of federal authority, the presence of federal troops in the city of Chicago was deemed not only proper but necessary, and there has been no intention of thereby interfering with the plain duty of the local authorities to preserve the peace of the city."

It will be seen that the president did not excuse his action on the ground that "both the gov-

ernor and the legislature were in league with the mob," or that "the mob was burning property and destroying life," but on the ground that the mails were obstructed, that the processes of the federal court could not be executed through the ordinary means, and that conspiracies existed against interstate commerce. The president asserted that he acted "in strict accordance with the constitution and laws of the United States," and he expressly disclaimed any intention of thereby "interfering with the plain duty of the local authorities to preserve the peace of the city." It is a cruel libel upon Governor Altgeld to say that he was in league with the mob, and the president's statement above quoted makes no such insinuation. The president asserted the right to send troops when the mails were interfered with, when the processes of the federal court were obstructed or in cases of conspiracies against interstate commerce, and Governor Altgeld contested his right to do this until the state authorities had had an opportunity to act, affirming that he, the governor, was able and willing to suppress all disorder with state troops. There was no suggestion on the part of the federal authorities that they would have a right to interfere voluntarily in a local disturbance which did not involve the mails, the processes of the federal courts, interstate commerce or other federal agency.

WHY NOT LAFOLLETTE?

The press dispatches report that the president is quite openly supporting the candidacy of Secretary Taft, and this, too, on the theory that the secretary will carry out the president's reform ideas?

What has Secretary Taft done to indicate that he is a reformer? What assurance has the president that, as president, Secretary Taft would oppose predatory wealth? If Secretary Taft is put forward as the president's representative, who will give bond that, if elected, he will stand up bravely against the demands of Wall street? If President Roosevelt wants to leave the executive office in the hands of a republican reformer, why does he not throw his influence to Senator LaFollette? The Wisconsin senator has a record and that record ought to appeal to the president. Senator LaFollette has for years fought the same crowd that the president now finds conspiring against himself. This ought to touch the executive heart and awaken sympathy in the executive breast. Senator LaFollette is a reformer "from away back;" he is all wool and more than a yard wide, so to speak. When republican reform was, as it were, "without form and void," LaFollette appeared upon the scene and by the force of his own indomitable courage he has stayed on the scene. The national convention of 1904 which nominated the president threw him out, but like Mary's little lamb he "waited patiently about" and when election time came he was elected governor and then senator.

He has fought for reform and he has fought the republicans who opposed reform. He is in favor of railroad regulation and urges a measure empowering the interstate commerce commission to ascertain the value of the railroads. If the president will ask the railroad exploiter and the trust magnates he will find that they know LaFollette and fear him because he says what he thinks and means what he says. If the president wants a republican who is really a reformer he will find it difficult to explain why he passes by LaFollette and selects Taft.

THAT FIVE MILLION FUND

So the president has discovered the existence of a "Five Million Dollar Fund" raised to prevent the carrying out of his ideas! Good for the president! But what ideas of his have so aroused Wall street? His ship subsidy idea? No, Wall street does not object to that. His asset currency idea? No, Wall street does not object to that. His big navy idea? No, Wall street does not object to that. His idea of enlarging the powers of the federal government at the expense of the states? No, that is just what Wall street wants.

What ideas, then, is Wall street preparing to fight? Regulation of the railroads, prosecution of trusts and the income tax. And where did the president get these ideas? From the democratic platform. Wall street also objects to the inheritance tax and this was not taken from the democratic platform although in harmony with it.

But why is the president surprised that Wall street conspires to defeat these ideas? Did not Wall street conspire to defeat these same ideas in 1896 and 1900? Did not Wall street contribute more money than to defeat these same ideas than it is preparing to contribute now? The president took part in both of those campaigns and he was on the Wall street side! Did he understand the

nature of those contests and did he know that Wall street was then contributing more than five millions to defeat those same ideas? The answer must be no, for had he known then what he knows now how could he have joined in the conspiracy? Evidently, he has been studying, and now that he understands the irreconcilable contest between predatory wealth and the common people, will he forget it? Suppose Wall street controls the republican convention and nominates a candidate satisfactory to Wall street, will his administration support the Wall street candidate? The president was very bitter in his denunciation of democrats in 1896 and 1900; will he feel more kindly toward them now that he knows against what odds they made their fight for the people?—Let us hope so. And the republicans who are indignant at Wall street's opposition to the president, will they be more tolerant toward democratic reformers?

If the discovery of the "Five Million Dollar Fund" does nothing else it ought to make the president and other republican reformers sympathize with the democrats who have been fighting the corrupting influence which Wall street has exerted on American politics through its control of the republican party. Surely the stars are fighting with us when each new disclosure strengthens the democratic position, and when a republican president gives continued vindication to democratic principles.

THE "CONSERVATIVE" SOUTH

The corporation papers which are shouting that the south is the home of conservatism should publish the platform adopted by the democratic convention of Georgia on September 4 last. The attention of these papers is called especially to the following extracts:

"The great transportation companies have issued millions of dollars of stocks and bonds in excess of the money put into their properties, and they are taxing the industries of the people to pay dividends on fictitious securities."

"No man can serve two masters with equal fidelity to both. Those men who elect to represent special interests and owe their first fealty to them, do not deserve, and ought not to hold, party positions of dignity, influence and power."

"The party machinery and the government, state and national, should be completely purged of such men. In our own state, by the overwhelming verdict of the people, it has become the settled policy of the democratic party that representatives of special interests will not be permitted to hold positions of confidence and power in the counsels of the party. We earnestly commend this example to the democracy of the nation and to our democratic brethren in every state."

"We denounce in unqualified terms the use of money, liquor, free passes, telegraph, telephone and express franks and all other improper means, commonly called courtesies, by either individuals or corporations, for the purpose of influencing or buying votes, or in any way corrupting the purity of our elections."

"We demand the enactment of laws prohibiting the giving or acceptance of free passes of every character, and free service of every kind, by the transportation and public service corporations of this state, except to employees of such corporations and members of their families."

"We denounce as a crime against the public welfare, the practice of the corporations of the country in making contributions to campaign funds, and we demand the enactment of laws to prohibit and make criminal all such acts, and to provide suitable penalties for violation of the same."

"We denounce the crime of lobbying as one of the greatest offenses against the public welfare."

"We demand of the next general assembly the passage of a law clearly defining this offense, and prohibiting any employed agents or attorneys from addressing or speaking to members of the general assembly in regard to anticipated or pending legislation, except before the proper committees of said body in regular session."

"We condemn the system by which the great railroad corporations of the country have been permitted to issue fabulous amounts of fictitious or watered stocks and bonds, many times in excess of the value of the property upon which they are based. We look upon this great evil as the primary cause of excessive freight rates."

"We favor rigid government regulation of the issuance of stocks and bonds and other securities by all public service corporations, so that in future the total amount of such securities shall bear a just relation to the money actually invested in the property of such corporations."

"The constitution of Georgia imposes upon the general assembly the duty of passing laws, from time to time, to prohibit the various railroads of