

trial freedom, of equal rights and no special privilege. If the presence of Negro slavery, until the civil war, created dismal exceptions—and if the presence together in the South of a great or equal or even outnumbering mass of a colored race with profoundly different characteristics and as yet vastly behind the white race in the faculties of disciplined industry and high-class government, gave, and even now gives, rise to anomalies and inconsistencies—they have made only clearer the wisdom and beneficence of our fundamental policy. We Democrats point out that during this period of splendid growth, there was systematic hostility to a large military or naval expenditure, there was systematic preference for simple and inexpensive administration, there was systematic dislike of personal and sumptuary restraints. Democrats do not, like Republicans, forget how vast during our wonderful economic progress has been the American area of free trade between our 45 States, an extent of free trade far beyond anything ever before or now elsewhere known. For that area has included the widest difference of climate and soil and human labor, and also far differing conditions in organized society, ranging from settlements nearly three centuries old to frontiers occupied but a few years. They remember that the internal trade of this truly imperial domain which is free of all tariff is in volume and amount vastly, very many times, more important than its foreign trade which is subject to tariff.\* They point out that for more than a century the American nation scrupulously refrained from foreign entanglements and made no forcible conquest except as it took from Mexico as a war indemnity the practically uninhabited country on the Pacific slope and the Rio Grande. They point out that, although the conditions of American life have, to a large extent, been those of a new and frontier country, the public men and the official life of our country have been so dominated by love of law as to command the just tribute of every intelligent foreign visitor, and that the very "lynch law" which has now and then in thinly settled parts of this vast domain disgraced portions of our population, has often been mere reaction against technical administration of law—that is to say, against misdirected respect for law on the part of those in authority.

From all these conditions and from

\*Senator Hoar, in his speech on Trust Legislation in the Senate on January 6, 1903, states that "our domestic commerce is . . . more than twenty times as great as that with foreign nations."

these institutions—and in spite of their faults—has come—so the Democrats say—the industrial productivity and triumph of the American citizen. After praise to God for His gifts to us of land and water and climate, it is to these deep lying and truly dynamic causes, and above all to the American devotion to liberty and law, that the Democratic party assigns our splendid results in agriculture and mining, our vast treasure houses, our enormous increase in railroad and manufacturing plants, and all other material as well as political glory of our land. Democrats know, nor would they have any American forget, that the most stupendous force the world has known, is the free, self-governing, law-abiding, self-respecting citizen, regardful of the rights of other men and therefore justly insistent upon his own. From the marvelous success of our country summed up in the census of 1900 and its tables of comparisons with the results of other censuses, the Democrats draw the conclusion, not that the general and broad principles of the American people should be reversed, or their sacred traditions undone—but that they should be continued; that only faults and exceptions and inconsistencies should be eliminated. They would not have less respect for law but more respect; not less freedom of trade but more freedom; not less respect for the rights of other countries and races, however inferior to us, but more respect; not more foreign entanglements but fewer; not increase, but decrease in the proportion of military and naval and general government expenditure to the ability of the people.

Such is the general creed of the Democratic party; and such must and will be its practice when it returns to power.

#### THE NATURAL SENSE OF JUSTICE.

I have lived with communities of savages in South America and in the East, who have no laws or law-courts, but the public opinion of the village freely expressed. Each man scrupulously respects the rights of his fellow, and any infraction of those rights rarely or never takes place. In such a community all are nearly equal. There are none of those wide distinctions of education and ignorance, wealth and poverty, master and servant which are the product of our civilization. There is none of that widespread division of labor, which while it increases wealth, produces also conflicting interests. There is not that severe competition and struggle for existence or for wealth which the dense population of civilized countries inevitably creates. All incitements to great

crimes are thus wanting, and petty ones are suppressed partly by the influence of public opinion, but chiefly by that natural sense of justice and his neighbor's right which seem to be in some degree inherent in every race of men.—Alfred Russell Wallace, in "Malay Archipelago."

#### ECONOMIC RENT.

I had timber cut on Virginian tide-water rivers. A cord of pine wood at that time was selling at four dollars put aboard a schooner. Labor and capital obtained one dollar a cord to cut the wood and to put it aboard if the timber grew right at the landing; consequently for such timber the landowner netted three dollars a cord. As the trees grew without the application of any human work, this was economic rent which tenants would have been willing to pay to obtain permission to cut the wood. For that timber which grew away from the landing the hauling to the landing had to be paid before any rent could be collected. Let us say that at four miles distance this hauling cost three dollars a cord. The owners of the land at that distance just were paid for their labor and capital (use of tools, oxen and cart), but obtained no rent, whereas land on the shore was worth three dollars for each cord of wood which grew there. Why should James obtain a present of these three dollars for which William had to do the hard work of hauling?—Michael Fluerscheim, in Land and Labour.

"I'm afraid there is a great deal of dishonesty in some of these trusts," said Senator Sorghum, sadly.

"But you have always defended the trusts," exclaimed the friend.

"Yes. Of course, you expect a trust to take advantage of the public. But when the men who organize the deal get to taking advantage of one another—that's dishonesty."—Washington Star.

Brother to the Ox—Why is it that I work hard, and have nothing, while you don't work at all, and have more than you need?

Brother to the Fox—I vote for my interests, while you vote the same ticket I do.

"I don't understand why, if we vote the same ticket, I don't get half the benefits."

"I know you don't understand. That is the reason you don't get half the benefits."—Boone (Ia.) Independent.