

reigned at Warsaw. The test of government is not in the outward mechanical display of order, but in the capacity to develop the best men, and we have lived in the faith that government by the consent of the governed develops the best men. We have not let the wise rule the ignorant, the learned the unlearned, the rich the poor, but we have appealed always to those whom Abraham Lincoln called "the plain people" as the ones in whose judgment to rely, and upon whose shoulders should rest the burden of government.

Ideas are, after all, the eternal forces. Human life and destiny are controlled by them. They may seem today of little significance, but around them gather material interests and tomorrow their power is disclosed.

It is a universal law that no family or nation will prosper whose foundation ideas are not harmonious and consistent. If conflicting, there is nothing more certain than that trouble will follow. Our own history furnishes a tremendous lesson in this direction. We commenced our national life declaring, as its foundation principle, that all men were created equal; that they possessed inalienable rights—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But we tolerated a conflicting thought. We attempted to limit our foundation principle to white men and deny it to black. It was a compromise. It seemed a small matter. The antagonism would disappear with time. But we forgot that ideas are living forces.

William H. Seward divined the whole situation when he affirmed an "irrepressible conflict." Abraham Lincoln saw the inevitable struggle when he declared that this nation could not endure half slave and half free. And after nearly a century we paid the penalty in the awful sacrifice of the civil war.

Shall we forget the lesson of the past? Shall we say it is a trifling matter to introduce into the life of this nation, which affirms that government derives all its powers from the consent of the governed, the thought that that is true of only one race and not of all? That the consent of the governed may be recognized for one portion and one race and repudiated for another portion and another race within the same dominion?

Government by consent and government by force, no matter how well the government may be administered, are two essentially antagonistic principles. Doubtless no immediate conflict will follow. We may see a large measure of prosperity; but are we not sowing the seeds which in the days to come will grow up into a harvest of trouble for our children and our children's children?

The possibility is not changed by the unquestioned fact that the Anglo-Saxon race has the capacity for governing other races, nor by the singular prosperity which has attended England in her col-

onial system. In comparing the two nations it must be remembered that England's colonial system commenced when the king was one in fact as well as in name. The consent of the governed was only a little factor in English life when she first reached out her hand to subdue and control other races. It was no more for the king to govern Canada and India than it was for him to govern England; and while the consent of the governed has been struggling and growing in England, it has not even yet become the single, dominant, controlling fact of that nation's life; so that the antagonism between the two ideas of government by consent and government by force has never, in that empire, been fully developed.

With us the case is different. We stand consecrated to the single political idea of government by the consent of the governed. To introduce into the life of the nation the other thought of government by force is, at the very outset, to precipitate a conflict which, sooner or later, must inevitably result in disaster.

Neither have we been so successful in our treatment of dependent races in the past as to justify any exalted expectations for the future. We have called the Indian tribes the wards of the nation, and our best citizens have striven from the beginning of the government to the present time to secure to them their just rights, and with what result? The eccentric congressman from New Hampshire is credited with the statement that the Puritans marched among the Indians with a Bible in one hand and a rifle in the other. They converted those they could with the one and disposed of the rest with the other. Helen Hunt has told the story of our dealings with these tribes in a book which she entitles "A Century of Dishonor." Are we entirely sure that a century of dishonor in respect to savages near at home will not be followed by a millennium of dishonor in respect to those beyond the seas?

To hear some talk you would think that all the influences going out from this Christian nation to the heathen have been Christian, purifying, elevating; but the fact is that even from Puritan New England there have gone more hogsheads of rum than missionaries, more gallons of whisky than Bibles. If anyone imagines that this will be changed when we come into control of the Philippines and attempt to rule them, that thereafter only missionaries and Bibles will pass thither from America, he sadly underrates the locomotive capacity of the devil.

Again, a necessity of colonial possessions is an increase in our regular army, and the first increase proposed is from 30,000 to 100,000 men. It is a strange commentary that at the close of the nineteenth century the head of the most

arbitrary government in the civilized world, the czar of the Russias, is inviting the nations of the world to a decrease in their arms, while this, the freest land, is proposing an increase in its. Yet such seems to be the imperative need, if we enter upon the system of colonial expansion. We have lived and prospered for 123 years with a handful of regular troops. We have preserved peace at home and have been respected abroad. Government by consent of the governed has little need of the soldier. So the world has come to believe, and so it is. Are we ready to forfeit this high position? Do we not endanger the very foundation principles of this government when we make the blare of the bugles and the tramp of the armed battalion the music which is heard on every side and the inspiration which attracts the ambition of our youth?

Another aspect of this question is worth noticing, and that is its relation to labor. We are facing in this country a difficult problem. The inventive spirit of our people is multiplying with marvelous rapidity labor-saving machines. By the use of them one or two skilled laborers will do the work heretofore done by many unskilled laborers. There is, therefore, a surplus of unemployed labor. The machine is supplanting the man. We are facing the fact of an increasing amount of unemployed and unskilled labor. What shall be done? China, with its enormous population, has sought to solve it by prohibiting the machine. Is that the best solution we can offer? It has not a few advocates in our midst. The boycott put on the Oxley Stave Company, which resulted in litigation, going up to the court of appeals, in the Eighth circuit, was founded on the fact that the company introduced machines into its manufactory for doing work which had theretofore been done by hand. The complaint indorsed by the Federation of Labor against the United States superintendent of printing and engraving is of the same nature. Everywhere we hear a claim that the cleaning of streets must be done by hand labor instead of by machine. More than one labor body has protested against the employment of women. I am not here to indorse all these but simply to note the fact that labor realizes that it has a surplus, and is seeking to reduce it. Now, the great economic problem in this country is not how can a few men make more money and pile up larger fortunes? But how can the great body of the people make a fair and comfortable living? The right to work is again and again insisted upon as more important than the right to vote, and the cry of the right to work is supplemented by the cry that the state furnish work to all who cannot obtain it elsewhere. But the furnishing of work by the state means more taxation, and that implies added burdens on the em-