

political opinion is concerned, a tyranny of the majority. Let me cite some instances: In 1893 it seemed to me vital to the interests of this country that the Sherman law should be repealed. Accordingly, I wrote an argument on the subject, which was to appear in one of the journals in my city. The day before its intended publication the vice-president of the bank of which I was a director invited me to his office, and, with all courtesy and consideration, told me that he had heard of my intention of publishing such an article; that he believed, more particularly on account of its necessary opposition to Senator Teller, that it would displease many depositors, and would thus injure the bank. Accordingly, he protested against my publishing such an article so long as I was a director. As soon as I reached my desk, I wrote to the said vice-president that if the price of my remaining a director of the bank was the sealing of my lips on questions of such great national import, I could not pay the price; and accordingly I at once forwarded my resignation. Late that very night I sat in the office of one of our papers, correcting the proof-sheets of my article, when a committee of three compositors waited on me. They stated that the owner of the paper had consented to the appearance of the article in the next morning's issue if I so desired; that, on the other hand, they believed its appearance would work a serious injury to them; that their work-room depended largely for its support on orders for county books throughout the state; that they felt sure the publication of my article would result in the cancellation of many county orders and that, in consequence, a number of them would be deprived of work. They said that they had no personal objection to the sentiments expressed; that, in fact, some of their number heartily agreed with them; but they felt sure that the county officials would take offense and withdraw their orders, thus entailing a great hardship on them. It is needless to say that I withheld the article from the newspaper, issuing it only in pamphlet form.

Let us now consider a contrasting picture. Mr. St. John was the president of a very flourishing bank in New York City. I knew him well. He was neither a profound student, nor a close logical reasoner. His acquaintance with economic history was limited, and his financial views consequently distorted; but he was bright, intelligent, a true gentleman, and honest to the core. His study of the financial question, prosecuted with conscientious devotion, had led him to the honest conviction that "free silver" coinage would be conducive to the best interests of the United States. Instead of concealing his views as a weak or calculating man would have done, he believed it his duty to express

himself publicly and boldly. His bank directors reasoned and pleaded with him, but they could neither change his views nor his public course. Finally, despite the fact that the bank was growing and prospering under his administration, the directors, swayed by excited public feeling, gave him to understand that his resignation from the presidency would be acceptable. He resigned, accordingly, and, in the face of the strongest local and social influences, threw himself into the silver campaign of 1896. The following year, overweighted with disappointment, chagrin and anxious strain, he died of a broken heart. I attended his funeral, and, although I had differed so widely from his financial conclusions, yet I deeply realized that St. John had passed away as a noble martyr to the spirit of political independence.

The tyranny of the majority will always manifest itself in a republic which is ruled by political machines; and its natural effect is to repress the formation and the expression of independent opinion. De Tocqueville, who visited the United States in Jackson's time, says in his famous work:

"In America the majority raises very formidable barriers to the liberty of opinion; within these barriers an author may write whatever he pleases, but he will repent it if he ever step beyond them. His political career is closed forever, since he has offended the only authority which is able to promote his success. I know no country in which there is so little true independence of mind as in America. In that immense crowd which throngs the avenues to power in the United States I found very few men who displayed any of that manly candour and that masculine independence of opinion which frequently distinguished the Americans in former times, and which constitutes the leading feature in distinguished characters, wheresoever they may be found."

What, then, we ask, can be done to assist the growth of political independence? And, as between the parties which appeal for support, what should be the attitude of the true lover of this republic? Let me call attention to the fact that the underlying principle of the nation is that a certain number of citizens will free themselves from the slavish subjection to party. If nobody changed from one party to another, all elections would practically be unnecessary. Another fact worthy of notice, and carrying with it a most valuable lesson, is that the greatest political independence prevails in those states which are supplied with independent newspapers. The circulation of independent papers like the New York Evening Post, the New York Herald, and the New York Times explains the independence of voting which characterizes the states of New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey.

Any thing that will weaken the power

and the influence of the political machine will, in the same ratio, increase the exercise of independent political action. "The spoils system" is the hideous mother from which the political machine, with its brood of self-seeking, clamorous, dangerous party henchmen, steadily draws its protection and its nourishment. Strangle the detestable beldame by thorough-going civil service reform, and her abominable offspring will speedily expire from inanition!

[CONCLUDED NEXT WEEK.]

In his second inaugural, delivered on the Fourth of March, 1901, Mr.

McKinley, referring to Cuba, said:

"I have been assisting its people in the successive steps necessary to the establishment of a free and independent government prepared to assume and perform the obligations of international law which now rest upon the United States under the treaty of Paris."

Again this eminent phrase-maker remarks in the same address:

"The principles which led to our intervention require that the fundamental law upon which the new government rests shall be adapted to secure a government capable of performing the duties and discharging the functions of a separate nation."

And yet this is the same McKinley who approved the resolutions attached to the army bill, which resolutions are diametrically opposed to the doctrines of his inaugural. These resolutions simply acknowledge Cuba as being under a protectorate of the United States. They declare that the government of Cuba shall execute the plans devised by the United States for certain purposes. They even provide that "the island of Pinas shall be omitted from the constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty."

Is this an acknowledgment of the capability of Cuba for "performing the duties and discharging the functions of a separate nation?" And after all our pretence of having interfered between Spain and Cuba from purely philanthropic motives, and after all our vehement declarations that our sole object was to release from tyrannous bondage the Cuban people, how does this part of the resolutions which McKinley approved sound:

"That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba and to protect the people thereof as well as for its own advancement, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coal-ing or naval stations at certain specified points to be agreed upon with the president of the United States."

There is certainly as much flavor of "criminal aggression" in this as there is aroma of "benevolent assimilation." No president of the United States has ever been so consistently inconsistent as William McKinley.