

Bell boastfully proclaim that they are proceeding within the law as declared by the Supreme Court, and who will say they are not? . . .

Sherman Bell issued a proclamation charging that the Portland mine was harboring lawless and insurrectionary persons and ordered his troops to close down and take possession of the mine. This they promptly did, and the mine is now in possession of Bell. All this has been done under the authority of the Moyer decision.

The News is quite willing to admit that Bell is not what a good many charge him with being—a lawless, free-booting, roughriding, tyrannical swashbuckling militiaman. He is doing what he has a right to do under the decision of the Supreme Court. It is true, his judgment may be at fault and he may abuse his discretion, but that is not a matter that the courts can in any way control. So long as he maintains that what he does is necessary to put down the "insurrection" no court in Colorado can obstruct his course.

#### BEFORE THE PANAMA LARCENY. AMERICAN NATIONS MUST RESPECT EACH OTHER'S RIGHTS.

An extract from the speech delivered by Theodore Roosevelt, then Vice-President of the United States, at the formal opening of the Pan-American exposition, Buffalo, May 20, 1901, as found at pp. 233-235 of "The Strenuous Life: Essays and Addresses," by Theodore Roosevelt. New York: The Century Co., 1902.

To-day on behalf of the United States I welcome you here—you, our brothers of the North, and you, our brothers of the South; we wish you well; we wish you all prosperity; and we say to you that we earnestly hope for your well-being, not only for your own sakes, but also for our own, for it is a benefit to each of us to have the others do well. The relations between us now are those of cordial friendship, and it is to the interest of all alike that this friendship should ever remain unbroken. Nor is there the least chance of its being broken, provided only that all of us alike act with full recognition of the vital need that each should realize that his own interests can best be served by serving the interests of others.

You, men of Canada, are doing substantially the same work that we of this republic are doing, and face substantially the same problems that we also face. Yours is the world of the merchant, the manufacturer and mechanic, the farmer, the ranchman and the miner; you are subduing the prairie and the forest, tilling farm land, building cities, striving to raise ever higher the standard

of right, to bring ever nearer the day when true justice shall obtain between man and man; and we wish god-speed to you and yours, and may the kindest ties of good will always exist between us.

To you of the republics south of us, I wish to say a special word. I believe with all my heart in the Monroe doctrine. This doctrine is not to be invoked for the aggrandizement of any one of us here on this continent at the expense of anyone else on this continent. It should be regarded simply as a great international Pan-American policy, vital to the interests of all of us. The United States has, and ought to have, and must ever have, only the desire to see her sister commonwealths in the western hemisphere continue to flourish, and the determination that no Old World power shall acquire new territory here on this western continent. We of the two Americas must be left to work out our own salvation along our own lines; and if we are wise we will make it understood as a cardinal feature of our joint foreign policy that, on the one hand, we will not submit to territorial aggrandizement on this continent by any Old World power, and that, on the other hand, among ourselves each nation must scrupulously regard the rights and interests of the others, so that, instead of any one of us committing the criminal folly of trying to rise at the expense of our neighbors, we shall all strive upward in honest and manly brotherhood, shoulder to shoulder.

#### THE MONROE DOCTRINE DOES NOT SANCTION ACTS OF AGGRESSION BETWEEN AMERICAN NATIONS.

An extract from the speech delivered by Mr. Roosevelt, then Vice-President, at the Minnesota state fair, September 2, 1901, as found at pp. 289-290 of the above cited work.

There is not the least need of blustering about [the Monroe Doctrine]. Still less should it be used as a pretext for our own aggrandizement at the expense of any other American state. But, most emphatically, we must make it evident that we intend on this point ever to maintain the old American position. Indeed, it is hard to understand how any man can take any other position, now that we are all looking forward to the building of the Isthmian canal. The Monroe Doctrine is not international law; but there is no necessity that it should be. All that is needful is that it should continue to be a cardinal feature of American policy on this continent; and the Spanish-American states should, in their own interests, champion it as strongly as we do. We do not by this doctrine intend to sanction

any policy of aggression by one American commonwealth at the expense of any other.

#### A REPORT FROM THE SEAT OF WAR.

An interview with Mr. Loftin Johnson, of Cleveland, published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 8, 1904.

A sojourn of three months in the Orient as a special war correspondent gave Loftin Johnson opportunity for a careful study of the conditions existing among the Russian and Japanese armies that are engaged in a struggle to the death over Manchurian territory. Mr. Johnson has just returned to his home in this city after a half year in the East, three months of which time he was with the Russian army.

"You people at home," he said last night, "really know about as much about the war as we did on the other side. The press censorship is so strict and the limitations placed upon a correspondent are so numerous that it is only by the exercise of unusual ingenuity and physical bravery that a news writer is able to secure the 'copy' his editor at home demands.

"When I arrived in the East, I went at once to Tokio where I hoped to be able to attach myself with some column bound for the front. The Japanese placed a positive prohibition on correspondents, so our party did the next best thing and crossed over the channel to join the Russian forces. We were permitted to travel as far as Newchwang where we were bottled. Twelve correspondents were in the party and on only one condition would the Russians permit us to join the army bound for the seat of war. That condition was that we would stay with the army until the conclusion of the war, whether that lasted two years or ten. Three of the American correspondents, including Middleton, of the Associated Press, and three foreign correspondents assented to those terms and are now with the Russian forces in the field.

"In my opinion, there is little hope for ultimate Japanese victory. They have neither the wealth nor the resources in men to prolong the struggle for many years. On the other side, the Russians have unlimited resources and they are capable of prosecuting the war for 50 years if necessary. The men they have lost up to date are but a drop in a bucket to those that could be put into the field.

"Probably three things are operating against Russian success at this

time. The first of these is the little preparation they seem to make to meet any contingency. The second is the meager patriotism that is displayed among the Russian masses and the enlistment of half-breed Chinese in their ranks. The third, but one that will be soon remedied, is their tendency to consider the Japs and the Japanese army a huge joke. They have not yet learned that this war is serious business.

"On the other side, the Japs have been prepared for this fight for years. Even the children in the streets are imbued with the war spirit. In the schools, children of six years are taught the regulation drills and the manner of handling firearms. On every occasion of Jap victory, the entire populace of the Japanese cities turn out for a celebration. Women with children in their arms parade the streets singing patriotic songs and shouting for their army. Boys of 12 and 15 years, just old enough to carry a rifle, fight for an opportunity to enter the ranks and become one of their emperor's soldiers.

"Such a spirit as the Japs display will be hard to conquer. The Russian army is made up, if anything, of men on a lower order of civilization than the Japs. They are brave, with the bravery of ignorance. Of patriotism they know little or nothing. The Russian officers are a good lot of fellows. As a rule they are well educated and they treated the correspondents as leniently as possible under the circumstances. They are all suspicious of each other, however, and for that reason their operations are seldom marked with success. The war will be a long and a hard one, but in the end the superior natural resources of Russia will be victorious."

#### MR. BAER AND THE PRICE OF COAL.

Editorial in the Dubuque Telegraph of May 27.

"Testifying before the interstate commerce commission Mr. George E. Baer, head of the coal trust," say the press dispatches, "smilingly declared that the price of coal was not fixed so much by the cost of mining and transportation as by the willingness of the consumer to pay what is asked. 'We don't reduce the price of coal because we are good merchants. As long as there is a demand for all the coal we can mine at the price we ask there will be no reduction in the cost to the consumer.'"

This expressed attitude of the coal

trust toward the public has been evidenced before this. The graduated increase of ten cents a ton during periods of normal conditions is proof of all that Mr. Baer says.

The head of the coal trust speaks as a business man, not, presumably, in the present instance, as one of the men whom God in His infinite wisdom has made custodians of the wealth of the world. God probably never directly or indirectly communicated to Mr. Baer the suggestion that it would be suiting divine favor to turn the screws on the coal consumer until there was a squeal of protest.

Stripped of all else, Mr. Baer's statement amounts to this, that the policy of the coal trust is to charge all that the traffic will bear, regardless of cost of production. If the public had an alternative, there would be a minimum of objection to the policy of the coal trust. Having none, there is great objection. Coal is a necessary of life. The body must be kept warm, food must be cooked or sickness and death will follow; sickness and death and great privation did result from the dearth of coal and the high prices incident to the great strike.

Mr. Baer's statement will appeal as a rational one to the men of business who disregard the equitable view point. Probably anyone engaged in business would charge, all that the traffic would bear. The great point is that when one controls a necessary of life—and the coal trust absolutely controls the anthracite coal supply, we should not in justice to our million fellows permit him to extort unfair return for the product.

The American people are apparently insensible to their rights as conferred by the plan of the universe, and to their rights as expressed in their necessities, or they would end the iniquitous system that permits a few dollar worshipers to capitalize their necessities and to hold the health of all the people in their grasp.

The coal which Mr. Baer and his trust owns was put in the earth for the benefit of all the people. It would be sacrilegious—an impeachment of His infinite justice—to assume that the Maker of the universe intended that the necessities of life should be cornered by a few men. Why should the man of virtuous life and industrious habits, and seeking to discharge his full duty to society, be handicapped in the struggle for existence because his father left him without means enough to become a party to a syndicate or trust controlling one of the

necessaries of life? a trust that men whose fathers happened to leave them enough money to become such are the guiding geniuses of? Why, because we must have coal, should we permit a few rich men banded together in conspiracy against us, to control a necessary of life and charge a price for it that only the best to do of us can afford to pay? Why should we ourselves—the millions of unprivileged who must have our necessities supplied—not own and control the natural sources of supply of this necessary of life?

The condemnation is not of the men who are charging all that the traffic will bear. It is of the laws that admit private ownership, synonymous with private monopoly, of the natural sources of supply of the necessities of life.

Mr. Baer is simply a product of monopolistic conditions. There have been men of his type throughout the world—the slave master in Rome and the slave master in America were prototypes. The laws that make their development possible supply the mainspring of their selfishness. Until these laws are changed the best we can hope for is to prescribe the limits of the ills they may inflict.

Hillite—Is your friend deaf?

Hearstler—Yes, he is deaf and Parker.

G. T. E.

Domley—What sent the nunny to the Philippines to dredge for gold?

Holmes—Oh, he read in some fool paper that the government had sunk \$520,000,000 there.

G. T. E.

Little Charlie—"Is honesty always the best policy, papa?"

Mr. Kabinet—"Yes, my boy—that is, unless the other fellow has no navy."

G. T. E.

"I dreamed that all traces of Bryanism were removed from the Democratic party."

"What was left?"

"Cambric tea."

G. T. E.

#### BOOKS

##### DOLLARS AND DEMOCRACY—AN ENGLISHMAN'S VIEW OF AMERICA.

This is the title of a new book by Sir Philip Burne-Jones, published by Appleton & Co., at \$1.25. This Sir Philip is not to be confounded with the more famous artist, Edward, his