

has been improvidently turned over to monopoly and speculation, through which tribute is levied on the industries of the people for the enrichment of a few; but because the bulk of our heritage has been squandered is no reason for letting the remnant go in the same way. The time for prodigality in public lands, regardless of their value, has gone by. What has been lost cannot be recovered, but what remains may be saved.

\* \* \*

#### IS STRENGTH "SUPERIOR" TO COURAGE?

The (New York) Nation (ind.), October 4.—Inferior races seem marvelously slow in recognizing their own inferiority. A recent dispatch tells of the capture, by Dutch troops, of a native capital in the East India island of Ball, under these gratifying circumstances: "The followers of the [native] princes, numbering in all 400 men, were killed in attempting a desperate sortie. The Dutch losses were four Europeans killed and ten wounded." This outcome shows clearly that the status of the natives of Badong, as compared with that of the Hollander, is only as 1 to 100. This record, of course, is not quite so creditable as the clean bag of 600 Moros that Gen. Wood placed to his credit some time ago, or the almost equally meritorious drive made lately by the British in Natal, where 575 Zulus were slain without the loss of a single white man. Germany, too, though young in colonial experience, has turned out a piece of work marked by the characteristic national thoroughness. In the course of a year's fighting in Southwest Africa, the Herero nation, we are told, was reduced from about 80,000 souls to 2,000, mostly women and children. That savage races, after being taught such wholesome lessons of obedience, should venture again and again to challenge the rights of their European masters, would indicate that primitive man is not only the slave of his medicine man, but that his memory is very short.

\* \* \*

#### THE UN-DEMOCRATIC DEMOCRAT.

Chicago Examiner (Dem.), Oct. 10.—The "old-time Democrat" who objects to democracy is a familiar figure. The country has become well acquainted with him during the past ten years. His fundamental objection to his party is that it is not Republican. Real democratic principles are highly objectionable to him. When his party declares for the welfare of the masses, as against the interests of the classes, he bolts. Hence it is that he has almost forgotten when he voted the Democratic ticket. He still calls himself a Democrat, and has himself interviewed as one, and wishes it to be understood by the public that his ballot, for this occasion only, is lost to the Democracy. As a matter of fact, he regards equal rights as a dangerous innovation. The country is going to the dogs if the masses are to be given a chance not merely to govern but to keep what belongs to them, either as small merchants, manufacturers or workmen. He is an instinctive believer in privilege—the privilege of the well-to-do and socially high placed to pouch what others produce. He is not a Democrat at all and never was, though he has labeled himself as one. Human society, it has been happily said, is made up of those who make things and those who take things. The "old-time Democrat" is with the latter always. He is in reality an old-time Tory. Ancestry, family habit, environment, or what not, has caused him to classify himself as a Democrat—but he takes to the Republican party as a duck does to water. When did the "old-time Democrat" side with his party when his party stood for things democratic? Not within the memory of men whose political activity reaches even as far back as 1896. The "old-time Democrat," in actual fact, is an active Republican, and as good a friend at the polls as the trusts and their allies can find anywhere. Politically, he is a humbug, and the best thing that can be said about him is that he doesn't know it. He is one of the best and most faithful friends of the Plunderbund.

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

#### "MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN."

Belshazzar had a letter,—  
He never had but one;  
Belshazzar's correspondent  
Concluded and begun  
In that immortal copy  
The conscience of us all  
Can read without its glasses  
On revelation's wall.

—Emily Dickinson.

\* \* \*

#### ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON MOB RULE.

Extracts from an Address by Abraham Lincoln, Delivered  
Before the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield, Ill.,  
Jan. 27, 1837—Reprinted from "Letters and  
Addresses of Abraham Lincoln," Unit  
Book Publishing Co. 1905.

I hope I am over wary; but if I am not, there is even now something of ill omen amongst us. I mean the increasing disregard for law which pervades the country—the growing disposition to substitute the wild and furious passions in lieu of the sober judgment of courts, and the worse than savage mobs for the executive ministers of justice. This disposition is awfully fearful in any community; and that it now exists in ours, though grating to our feelings to admit, it would be a violation of truth and an insult to our intelligence to deny. Accounts of outrages committed by mobs form the every-day news of the times. They have pervaded the country from New England to Louisiana; they are neither peculiar to the snows of the former nor the burning suns of the latter. . . . Whatever then their cause may be, it is common alike to the whole country. . . .

Your are perhaps ready to ask, "What has this to do with the perpetuation of our political institutions?" I answer, "It has much to do with it." Its direct consequences are, comparatively speaking, but a small evil, and much of its danger consists in the proneness of our minds to regard its direct as its only consequences. . . .

When men take it in their heads to-day to hang gamblers or burn murderers, they should recollect that in the confusion usually attending such transactions they will be as likely to hang or burn some one who is neither a gambler nor a murderer as one who is. . . .

By the operation of this mobocratic spirit which all must admit is now abroad in the land, the strongest bulwark of any government, and particularly of those constituted like ours, may effectually be broken down and destroyed—I mean the attachment of the people. . . .

At such a time, and under such circumstances, men of sufficient talent and ambition will not be wanting to seize the opportunity, strike the blow, and overturn that fair fabric which for the last half century has been the fondest hope of the lovers of freedom throughout the world. . . .

There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law.