

"IF THE PEOPLE RULE WHY DON'T THEY GET WHAT THEY WANT?"

Answer of Daniel Kiefer in Bryan's Commoner of July 15, 1910.

It is not quite correct to say in answer that the people do not rule, but it is very nearly so.

Popular rule in the United States is subjected to so many restrictions and limitations that it can only be exercised with great difficulty. That is one reason why the people do not get what they want.

Another is that many of their desires are contradictory. They want the trusts abolished and cost of living reduced; at the same time, they want the protective tariff retained. They want transportation charges to be fair and reasonable; but they also want railroads to remain in the hands of private corporations. They want good times and high wages; but they also want natural resources to remain private property, and they furthermore favor the taxation of industry and its products. They want freedom; but they also want a lot of restrictive laws arbitrarily regulating nearly everything under the sun. They want graft eliminated from the government; but at the same time they want all kinds of opportunities for graft to remain in official hands, and even demand the creation of new opportunities of the same kind.

To get what they want, the people must not only discard all restrictions from the free exercise of their will, but they must also cease to harbor desires which can not be fulfilled without interfering with the fulfillment of other desires.

* * *

SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY.

Rev. Charles H. Mann in the Christian Socialist (Chicago) of June 16, 1910.

It is generally imagined that to be philosophical one must be visionary, and the subject he presents must be obscure and abstract, and especially speculative and useless. Only those who are very learned, it is opined, can presume to treat of philosophy, and then provided they be unemployed in any undertaking worth while, and are of an impractical genius.

On the contrary, philosophy is man's conception of the reality of things; and man is compelled by the very nature of human thought to have such a conception behind, or within, all his ideas, his words and actions. But he may not so call it; and indeed he may not suspect that he is philosophizing at the moment he is doing that very thing.

The difference between the philosopher, so-called, and the non-philosophical person, is that the former knows when he is philosophizing, and that the latter does not. The practical man, who entertains a contempt for all philosophizing, who declares that he does not think much of this spec-

ulative hair-splitting; who believes, he says, in calling a brick a brick, does not realize that in this simple declaration he is uttering a most pronounced philosophical dictum, for he is in effect saying that the reality of things is according to their sense-appearance. This the most venturesome philosopher would not presume to affirm.

What philosophy is may be clearly understood by comparing it with science, for science and philosophy occupy two great and complementary fields for exploring and judging the experiences of life. The former observes and examines the objects of the senses. It analyzes, classifies and organizes the facts in this way gathered, and thus develops what is called a science. Philosophy, on the other hand, treats of the realities behind these things. The one devotes itself to the consideration of sense-impressions, and the other investigates the life they represent, or that mysterious impulse from which they have existence.

The reality of any order of life among men, and thus its philosophy, is to be found in the attribute of human nature to which it ministers, and which it represents. All institutions, thus all human social organizations, if they are real, have an anchorage in the nature of man as the very source of their substance; the sole foundation of their realism.

* * *

EASY ENIGMAS FOR EASY CITIZENS.

My first is in Washington, but not in virtue.
 My second is in Protection, but not in justice.
 My third is in party, but not in principle.
 My fourth is in deficit, but not in economy.
 My fifth is in magnate, but not in morals.
 My whole rhymes with Taft, and is one of our chief national products.

My first is in politics, but not in statesmanship.
 My second is in favoritism, but not in equity.
 My third is in officeholder, but not in servant.
 My fourth is in Treasury, but not in surplus.
 My whole rhymes with Root, and is very popular in Washington.

My first is in material, but not in spirit.
 My second is in arrogance, but not in meekness.
 My third is in millionaire, but not in pauper.
 My fourth is in munificence, but not in penury.
 My fifth is in opulence, but not in humble.
 My sixth is in nerve, but not in wisdom.
 My whole sounds very much like Cannon, and is the ruling power of the nation.

My first is in crooked, but not in straight.
 My second is in platform, but not in earnest.
 My third is in duplicity, but not in patriotism.
 My fourth is in intrigue, but not in candor.
 My fifth is in promise, but not in fulfill.
 My whole rhymes with Lodge, and is much used by politicians.

—Ellis O. Jones, in Puck.