

fail in ambition, in energy and in both physical and mental strength when the spur of necessity is removed. This is not always true, but it is the rule rather than the exception in the homes where great wealth has had free hand.

Aside from those who are drawn to socialism by sentimental arguments, there are those who have turned to it because personal experience has embittered them against the present system—those who feel that the struggle is hopeless under present conditions.

The republican party, by creating abuses, by failing to remedy them, and by defending the principle and practices of private monopoly, has fostered and encouraged socialism—not intentionally, but actually. The democratic party is seeking to remedy the abuses that have given to the socialist his argument; it is seeking to restore and protect competition. It believes that competition is necessary to industrial progress, and it is trying to make that competition fair and just. The socialist leaders have very properly regarded the democratic party as the greatest obstacle in the way of socialism, and that is why these leaders were anxious for the defeat of the democratic ticket. This desire to get rid of the democratic party was a very natural one, although hardly a defensible one. However confident the socialist may be that worse conditions will hasten the adoption of socialism, he takes a great risk when he helps to make conditions worse, for he thus becomes responsible for the evils that follow without being certain of his ability to correct those evils. It is like a man killing another on the theory that he can afterwards restore his life. It is better to try the theory on a dead man than become responsible for the taking of a life, and so the socialist might more wisely have joined with the democratic party to bring such remedies as are possible. But, taking conditions as we find them, the democratic party stands as the only logical and intelligent champion of individualism, for it not only defends individualism, but seeks to strengthen it by freeing it from the odium that the abuses tolerated by the republican leaders have cast upon it.

The democratic party can not adopt the socialistic program; it can not accept the remedy which socialism presents. The democratic remedy is more nearly in accord with the plan upon which the universe was constructed. The Maker of the world might have supplied us with food, clothing and shelter without requiring labor on our part, but He did not. He gave us the rich resources of nature, and not only commanded us to work, but arranged that our rewards should be in proportion to our intelligence and our industry. Might has overturned this law in some cases, cunning has perverted it in others, and government has sometimes suspended it, but it should be the aim of the social man to restore this law and to make it operative. Man can not adjust the rewards of society as impartially or as equitably as they can be adjusted by competition where competition is free. Man has not the intelligence to parcel out the world's work by legislative act or by commission, nor have those in power the disinterestedness necessary to a wise distribution of the work to be done. Where competition is impossible, a government monopoly is necessary, but where individual competition is possible, competition is better than government ownership.

The republicans may boast of their victory, but they have a more formidable opponent than the democratic party to contend with. They have the irresistible forces of society to combat. If the republican leaders are deaf to the petitions of those who feel aggrieved by present injustice, the remonstrance will grow until the threat of punishment will compel the government to give heed. Just as the populist party grew until it compelled consideration of the abuses that led to its organization, so the socialist party will grow until it forces those at the head of the government to look into the wrongs that are done and to apply remedies. A democratic victory would have brought the reforms earlier, but even a republican victory can not permanently prevent them. The socialists, acting with the democrats might have hastened these reforms, but the socialists acting alone will still exert an influence in compelling a more careful consideration of the great economic question that has vexed the world from the beginning, namely, the equitable distribution of the joint product of human toil—a distribution which will give to each individual a share proportionate to his contribution to the world's welfare.

CARNEGIE'S BOMBSHELL

The "standpatters" are greatly exercised because of an article relating to the tariff written by Andrew Carnegie and printed in the December number of the Century Magazine. This article was entitled "My Experience with and Views Upon the Tariff." In this article Mr. Carnegie reviewed tariff history and boldly declared that conditions have changed so greatly that the tariff should now be viewed from a new standpoint.

Mr. Carnegie declared that a decided majority of voters are now agreed:

"One. That it is advisable for new countries to encourage capital by protective duties when seen to be necessary to develop new industries.

"Two. That after full and exhaustive trials, if success be not finally attained, such protection should cease, except as noted hereunder.

"Three. That should the experiment succeed, and protection becomes unnecessary, and should steadily but gradually be abolished, provided that the home supply of any article absolutely necessary for the national safety shall not thereby be endangered."

Following are extracts from the Carnegie article:

"We have already become by far the greatest of all manufacturing nations. Our 'infant industries' of the past have reached maturity, and, speaking generally, are now quite able to protect themselves. The plying infant in the nurse's arms that congress in 1871 nursed so tenderly will appear next year before its guardian as the stalwart champion who has conquered in many fields, thus proving himself worthy of the protection bestowed upon him in his youth and fully vindicating the protective policy pursued.

"While the tariff as a whole even today has ceased to be primarily beneficial as a measure of protection, it has become of vast importance from the standpoint of revenue.

"The next congress dealing with the tariff will probably be inclined at first to reduce duties all around, and perhaps to abolish some, but its first care should be to maintain present duties, and even in some cases to increase them, upon all articles used almost exclusively by the rich and this not for protection, but for revenue; not drawn from the workers, but from the rich. This is the first and prime duty of congress. We should not forget that government expenditures have increased enormously in recent years and that additional revenue is required.

"Its second duty is to reduce duties greatly upon manufactured articles and to abolish entirely those no longer needed.

"The writer has co-operated in making several reductions as steel manufacturers became able to bear reductions. Today they need no protection unless perhaps in some new specialties unknown to the writer, because steel is now produced cheaper here than anywhere else, notwithstanding the higher wages paid per man. Not a ton of steel is produced in the world at as small an outlay for labor as in our country. Our coke, coal and iron ores are much cheaper because more easily obtained and transported, and our output per man is so much greater, owing chiefly to the large standardized orders obtainable only upon our continent, the specialized rolling mills, machinery kept weeks upon uniform shapes without change of rolls and several other advantages.

"The day has passed when any foreign country can seriously affect our steel manufacturers, tariff or no tariff. The republic has become the home of steel, and this is the age of steel. It may probably be found that there exists the small manufacturer of some specialty in steel which still needs a measure of protection. The writer hopes, if such there be, the committee will give patient attention to such cases. It is better to err on the side of giving these too much rather than too little support. Every enterprise of this kind should be fostered. The writer speaks only of the ordinary articles and forms of steel as being able to stand without protection. He hopes there are today pioneers in several new lines requiring protection, which will be generously given temporarily. The committee should welcome such special cases."

Mr. Carnegie said that several other features of the tariff should be carefully looked into, more particularly illuminating oils, thread and cutlery. He added:

"The 'infant' we have nursed approaches the day when he should be weaned from tariff

milk and fed upon the stronger food of free competition. It needs little if any more nursing, but the change should not be made abruptly. It is better to err upon the safe side, if we err at all, but he is the best of protectionists who corrects all faults as they are revealed and positively declines to subject the nation to protection in any branch where it is not clearly needed, affording protection always with the resolve that it shall be temporary."

Some of the republican papers are saying very bitter things concerning the ironmaster, but Mr. Carnegie may have the consolation of knowing that none of them have gone farther than the Chicago Tribune did on one occasion. Several years ago it was reported that Andrew Carnegie had offered to pay \$20,000,000 for the Philippine Islands, provided he was permitted to assure the Filipinos that they would be given their independence.

Commenting upon this story, the Chicago Tribune said that the steel magnate "has tried the patience of his friends severely in some of his late bids for notoriety." It expressed the opinion that Mr. Carnegie is constantly posing, and said he has scattered libraries throughout the country, all of which are to be called for him, and every one of them is 'a contribution to the conscience fund.'" Then the Tribune said:

"Mr. Carnegie made his money in a magnificent way, but he should never forget that he made it through the undue favoritism of the government of the United States. Owing to the discrimination practiced in his favor by the tariff, he was enabled to amass a fortune of \$200,000,000, or more, most of which came out of the pockets of his countrymen through the operation of unequal laws. Much has been said of the benefit arising to the workingmen from the establishment of the Carnegie works. The beneficent tariff system permitted the works to survive and flourish, but there are some people who have not forgotten the Homestead strike, nor the outrageous manner in which the workingmen were treated at the time by employers whose brutality has seldom been exceeded in the history of labor agitations."

SPEAKER ROOSEVELT

Theodore Roosevelt for speaker of the house of representatives. That is the novel proposition implied in a statement recently made by Representative Hepburn of Iowa. Mr. Hepburn says that the house of representatives need not be restricted to its own membership in the election of a speaker. He says that the house could elect Theodore Roosevelt as its speaker for the next congress instead of "Uncle Joe" Cannon, Judge Smith of Iowa, or any other member of congress if it so desired, and it might be possible that the opponents of Cannon will hit upon this novel plan.

"The fact is" said Colonel Hepburn, "the speaker of the house is regarded as an officer of but little consequence by the constitution, which mentions him only in the clause providing that 'the house of representatives shall choose their speaker and other officers.' The 'other officers' chosen by the house are not members of congress, and I contend that we can as well elect a clerk or anyone outside of congress to the position of speaker. Of course, it never has been done, but the house could do so any time it chose."

Without having any reference to the possibility of President Roosevelt being elected speaker to succeed Cannon, Colonel Hepburn declared that the power of the speaker ought to be greatly curbed by revision of the rules of the house. In fact, Colonel Hepburn long has been a vigorous assailant of the house rules which have made it possible for the speaker to assume a power second only to that of the president.

The above is the substance of a dispatch from Des Moines, Iowa, printed in the Sioux City Journal.

Mr. Roosevelt is very susceptible to propositions having the merit of novelty. Doubtless he would be quite willing to postpone his African lion hunt for the great joy of presiding for a time over the house of representatives. And what an interesting picture would be provided with Theodore Roosevelt seated in the chair of the speaker of the American house of representatives!

By all means let it be Theodore Roosevelt for speaker. "On with the dance! Let joy be unconfined; no sleep till morn"—and "there'll be mounting in hot haste."