

ducted "in a formal sense this war may never cease." Those who desire that by a spirit of conciliation on reasonable terms it may cease now and forever must look for that end in other paths and by other men.

#### ROOSEVELT ON VESTED WRONG.

Roosevelt got off a lot of good things in his message that were never appreciated.

"Now he's going to be satirical," said Mrs. Dillingham. "He never says anything nice about the republicans but that he follows it with something that he thinks is real smart. If you say anything mean about the president I shall never speak to you again."

However, I wasn't going to say anything nasty about Roosevelt. I admire him. He does things. He is not ashamed to be a tory. If he was he wouldn't be a tory. He is a positive sort of a man.

"Go on," said Mrs. Dillingham, with warning. "Be just as mean as you please."

His message had a lot of good things that were not appreciated, and I am going to be absolutely respectful. Cross my heart and hope to die.

"If you think it is so clever," she said, "it would be a pity not to let you say it."

He said in one place that a fellow couldn't make a fortune in legitimate business without conferring on society vastly greater benefits than what he reaped for himself.

He's right. He's dead right. I agree with him exactly. No better test of the justice of social arrangement could be devised than that. If a man heaps up a fortune without benefiting society, he didn't get it in legitimate business.

For example, there is a man who never did a tap of work. His father never did a tap of work. His grandfather the same. His great-grandfather left a fortune of \$1,000,000, some of which was earned and some was stolen, but so long as it was stolen honestly that doesn't matter. This man confers no benefit on society, nor his father before him nor his grandfather before him. Yet he has \$100,000,000.

One million dollars was left to his grandfather. The other \$99,000,000 was not got by any legitimate business.

Thrift? He wastes more every year than his grandfather had in all. They have always spent more than the income of what the old man left them.

A gift? Of course it is a gift. It is

given them by the people who earn what they enjoy.

It was never got in legitimate business.

"He means the Astors," she said. "He is always harping on the Astors."

Mrs. Dillingham has a few of my hobbies definitely located.

By the same token when I get started on one of my hobbies I am not easily dismounted.

Roosevelt says further that in the arid states the only right to water is the right to use, the only right that should be recognized.

According to that if a man claims to own the water by which alone the next man's farm may be made fruitful, the claim doesn't count. It doesn't matter how many deeds he has nor how many dead-and-forgotten men gave him title to the water. His claim to it need not be recognized. The only right is the right to use it.

One of these days, Roosevelt says, people will recognize that the community has no more right to give away water privileges than to give away municipal franchises for public utilities.

Some of the states already recognize, he says, that the state must have perpetual ownership of water rights. Claims to the contrary, he says, must give way to the paramount claims of the whole people.

The doctrine of private ownership of water, he says, cannot prevail without working enduring wrong.

He's right. He's dead right. So long as you allow private ownership of water in arid regions, no man can keep his own.

"I'll take half your crop, if you please—or if you don't please—it's all one."

"What for?" says the other fellow, "I raised it, I planted it, I tended it, I harvested it. What for must I give you half of it?"

"I furnished the water—give me half your crop."

"You—why, the water fell from heaven. You never touched it."

Roosevelt says such an absurd claim need not be recognized. If it is not to be recognized, it may be ignored. That is to say, if anybody claims such a right, we take it away from him.

That's in regard to water. The reason he holds that is because the man who controls the water owns the land. The man who owns the land owns the man who lives on it. He must pay blackmail to the owner of the water before he can get his living.

He's right. He's dead right. The same thing exactly is true of the ownership of land. The man who owns the land can make the other fellow pay him tribute before he gets himself a living. He has to pay the landlord half his crop for the privilege of living on his land.

According to Roosevelt's reasoning, nothing but perpetual state ownership is tolerable. We are not to recognize any right but the right to use.

The railroads control a man's earnings as much as irrigation ditches do. The man who owns the railroad can take all but a bare living and let the farmer have what's left. Some railroads have done this.

According to Roosevelt the community has not the right to give that power to any private citizen. Perpetual state ownership of the railroad monopoly is the only tolerable arrangement.

No claims to private rights over another man's earnings need be recognized. Men can't establish homes, he says, when such rights of exacting tribute are held over them.

He's right. He's dead right.

No fortune is legitimately earned, he says, unless the fellow gives society more than he takes from society. Private ownership of the means of subsistence, he says is intolerable and its claims need not be recognized.

Now have I said anything mean?

"No more than usual," she graciously admitted.

Well, I could. I could insist that Roosevelt should try to apply some of these truths he has uttered. Of course, that wouldn't be fair.

It would break up the republican party.—John Stone Pardee, in *The Argus*, of Red Wing, Minn.

#### AMERICAN IDEALS.

Portions of a speech delivered by Hon. John P. Altgeld before the Good Government club of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, December 14, 1901.

A century and a quarter ago there was established on this continent, not simply a new government, not simply an independent government, not simply a government free from the political control of foreign powers, but there was established a new theory of government. A new principle. The principle of the equality of men before the law. The principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

It was a government based upon liberty, based upon foundations of freedom. It was a recognition of the idea

that man is capable of self-government. A promulgation of the idea that when the oppressive hand of power is taken off the mind of man, he will aspire to higher things and will struggle to attain higher conditions.

It was a protest against the institutions that had prevailed in the by-gone centuries. It in substance said that the theories of government and the practice of repression that had prevailed in all the centuries of the past had proven to be failures; that instead of leading mankind to a higher and nobler civilization they seemed by their repressive measures to push the human race down to an ever lower and lower level of life.

These free institutions thus established in this country were themselves the product or crystallization of the ideas that had long prevailed in America, and to a limited extent on the other side of the Atlantic. Never before had a government embodied in its fundamental law such lofty sentiments and such high ideals. It was indeed a new departure. It was indeed the morning of a new time.

The hand of repression once removed the intellect of man leaped forward in all fields of human effort. Man being permitted to pursue the bent of his own mind so long as he did not injure his neighbor, drew new inspiration and went forth with new ardor, with new courage and with a higher purpose. The world went forward in invention, in discovery, in literature, in art, in the sciences, in politics, in government and even in military affairs. Men not only studied the heavens, but stole from nature her secrets and applied them to their use.

It was this new life, this new energy born of freedom, that made the wonderful nineteenth century—a century that did more for human progress, more for the elevation of the human race, more for the development of the earth than all of the centuries that had gone before. Should human progress end, the nineteenth century will stand in history forever as the child of liberty, the child that was born in the manger of human rights, and for that reason proved a benediction to mankind.

As we now look back beyond the nineteenth century, we find that wherever there is a green oasis in the great desert waste of the past, there was a partial recognition of the principles of democracy, a partial understanding of republican institutions. We find that the nations of the past grew great only in proportion as they recognized

human rights, and that the process of retrogression began and their glory departed when they proved recreant to the principles of democracy.

The intellectual activity that is born of freedom made Greece glorious; made Rome great; made some medieval European cities famous; has given England her power in the world and has placed America at the front of modern civilization. It is this intellectual activity drawing its inspiration from freedom that has spanned the continents with railroads; that has narrowed the Atlantic to a week's journey, that has brought the different parts of the earth together, that has built cities and given its progress to the world. . . .

Early in the century, after we began to reap the harvest that came from the intellectual activity that followed the declaration of independence, the world became possessed almost of a mania to manufacture, to make inventions, to build railroads, to build telegraph lines, to build steamships, to develop countries, to export goods, to make something—to make money. It became the absorbing thought with all classes, and this continued for many years, not only in our country but in a modified form in other lands. In time these ideas produced the commercialism that we see to-day. For ideas ultimately crystallize into things that have length, breadth and thickness; lofty ideas elevate a people, sordid ideas degrade and destroy it.

We find that the harvest is disappointing. True, in a material way the achievements have been far beyond what the wildest imagination had hoped for, and in a material sense the commercial ideas have added to the world's comforts, and if the achievements were made incidental to the progress of man, then indeed they could not be too highly valued. But we discover that this commercial momentum has carried us to a point where commercialism in itself has become an object and man is made incidental; material development has become an object instead of a means to an end, and the human hands that are to make it are looked upon merely as so many machines, so many means to an end. We discover that commercialism has no soul, and it has no sentiment, it cannot understand high ideals, it does not know of any high standards, it can see nothing but a dollar mark. It does not look towards the heavens, it is constantly looking toward the earth.

We find that instead of its building character, making broad, strong, noble men and women with high standards, high ideals and an appreciation of the rights of their fellow-men, commercialism tends to make men narrow. It dries up the more tender and more noble qualities of the soul and makes men fierce money-getters. Twenty-five years of such a life has a tendency to destroy everything that distinguishes man from the brute creation. . . .

Looking at it more closely, we find that it is disappointing even to the men who succeed. As a rule they are neither loving nor lovable men. It would be preposterous to say that as a rule they are examples of the highest moral and intellectual development. A man whose whole life is concentrated and absorbed in the getting of money does not furnish an example for the young men of the land to emulate. And what good do the millions do him? He cannot sleep in more than one bed at a time; if he eats more than three meals a day he must pay the penalty; if he dissipates in any other way, destruction and death overtake him. As a rule his house decays and his family goes down without waiting for the scriptural third generation.

We notice further that this commercialism tends to prevent the development of statesmen in our land. It does not want men who possess sturdy character and lofty independence and who will be guided by great principles of justice. It wants conveniences. It demands men who will do its bidding, demands men who are willing to betray their constituents while pretending to serve them. I need not tell you that such a man can never become great.

We all admire the captains of industry, great railroad men, great manufacturers and great merchants. They stand in place of the generals of the past; but they have no right to strangle free institutions. They did not make this continent. They did not make the fertile soil. They made neither the climate nor the sunshine. We are not indebted to them for the fact that our country is peopled by the most remarkable race the world has seen. A people educated and enterprising, and possessing power of consumption as well as of production which no man can estimate. These great captains sat down by the wayside of commerce and waxed rich and many of them used the government to exploit the peo-

ple. But it was the labor of the men and the women that were building houses, cultivating fields, slaving in factories, operating railroads, teaching school and doing the country's work that made it possible for these captains of industry to amass their gigantic fortunes. Early in its history commercialism was a creative force, but now it has changed in character and it simply grabs what other people have created.

I believe that the men and the women who in tears and in sorrow have worked and have waited, have planted and have watered, have sown and have watched and were not permitted to reap will sit nearer the head of the table at the great banquet of destiny than will the men who simply gathered the harvests.

Out of this commercialism has grown the spirit of imperialism that we have seen rise in Germany, in Russia, in England, in America. There is a temporary resurrection of medieval conditions based on the doctrine that might gives right, based on the doctrine that a dominant people have a right to eat the substance of a weaker people. No permanent good ever came to mankind from that doctrine, and the experience of the world in the past warrants us in saying that no permanent good will come to mankind from that doctrine in the future. It is at variance with the laws of human development; it rests on a foundation of injustice and wrong, it can be carried out only by brute force and instead of aiding progress it retards progress and debases man; it degrades alike the victor and the vanquished, the oppressor and the oppressed—the man that wields the lash and the slave upon whose back it falls.

It is this spirit that is responsible for the war in South Africa and for the outrages that are being perpetrated there, and is responsible for the war in the Philippines. . . .

The world is not going backward. Viewed from headland to headland the march of the human race is upward. True, every forward movement seems to be followed by a short reactionary step. The waves of the rising tide of civilization roll far up the bank, and they roll back again, but the next wave that comes will roll further up than the last, and I believe that the world is on the threshold of a new development, of a new industrial, economic and social existence based upon justice.

The commercialism of which we are now reaping the harvest will pass away, it will be seen by and by that it was only a link in the great chain of human progress creating industrial conditions which paved the way to other and further development. . . .

As religious freedom gave the world a new birth—as political freedom gave it a new development, so industrial freedom and social justice will lead mankind to the highest plain of human felicity. But if we would be harbingers of the new time we must not pull down our altars.

We must protect the rights of the citizen, we must maintain American standards, we must uphold the right of assembly, and we must preserve free speech and a free press. We are not ready to admit that the fathers were wrong—we are not ready to apologize for their immortal work—and we will not consent to hide their graves. All of our greatness was born of liberty, even our commercialism was rocked in the cradle of democracy, and we cannot strangle the mother without destroying her children.

#### MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

##### A MEASURE PROPOSED BY THE NEW HEALTH OFFICE.

If the present plan of Health Officer Friedrich goes through, individuals who are so unfortunate as to forget themselves and expectorate while in a street car will be publicly shamed, and then if they become angry they will be arrested.

But now arrests are rarely made under the ordinance which covers spitting upon the floors of street cars. This is not because the act is not noticed, but because the conductor has not the power of making any arrest. The only recourse the conductor has is to apply to the guilty person himself for his name. The guilty party either refuses to give his name at all or else gives a fictitious one. Accordingly, unless an officer happens to be in the car, the conductor is powerless.

Realizing all this, Dr. Friedrich has decided to urge a plan which is startling in its uniqueness as far as western cities are concerned, but which is said to now be in operation in effete Boston with a very marked degree of success.

The officials of the street railways in this city will be asked to furnish conductors with an abundant supply of flaming colored tickets. Upon these tickets the plan is to have print-

ed in bold letters the salient points of the anti-spitting ordinance.

Then, according to the plan, the conductors, armed with these "emblems of shame," will fairly lie in wait upon their cars for those who disobey the laws of politeness along with the city ordinance. If any individual expectorates and comes under the eye of the conductor the latter, according to the plan, will be supposed to pursue tactics as follows:

He must approach the luckless man with politeness, but with much gusto. The principal object desired being that the self-made victim should gain as much unpleasant notoriety as possible, the conductor will be coached to attract everybody's attention. Then he must slowly present the individual with one of the tickets and make his retreat.

Dr. Friedrich believes that if a man is compelled to go through such an experience once he will never run the risk of going through it again. In other words, the belief is that the introduction of the Boston system into Cleveland will serve as a means of effectually stopping a great nuisance.

In presenting the plan to the railway officials Dr. Friedrich may suggest that some small but appropriate expression be printed upon the ticket in addition to the city ordinance. The object of this is to make the humiliation of those caught as complete as possible.—Plain Dealer of December 8.

#### WHAT WILL THE OHIO LEGISLATURE DO IN THE MATTER OF TAXATION?

The bitterness and jealousy, which are bound to be the harvest of the factional fight among the republicans, may mean much to the Johnson forces. It may mean republican votes for their tax bills. It is more likely, however, that it won't. Any bill aimed at the railroads hits Foraker just as hard as it hits Hanna, and against such a measure they will probably be united.

There will be some tax bills adopted without doubt, but they will probably be republican measures. The one that the most noise is being made about is Gov. Nash's eleventh hour campaign cry to separate state from county taxes. Representative Price voiced the sentiments of a majority of the republicans, when he said to-night: "I don't know anything about Johnson's tax schemes, but anything that Johnson wants is a good thing to let alone. There'll be some tax legislation this