

Territory, are ready for admission. It is to be hoped that the controversy over single or double statehood will not prevent the admission of Oklahoma. If Oklahoma and the Indian Territory cannot agree upon a name, why not drop "Indian Territory" and "Oklahoma" and substitute the name of "Jefferson" for both? The state of Indiana preserves the Indian name, and the name of Oklahoma can be preserved in some local way. The land embraced in the Indian and Oklahoma territories is the last of the Louisiana Purchase to be incorporated into a state. It would be a fitting tribute to Jefferson to thus give his name to a part of the territory purchased under his administration. It would probably require a year for the necessary formalities, so that the admission of the state and the adoption of the name would be a fitting celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the great trans-Mississippi region.

Washington's name has already been given to a state, and Jefferson stands next to Washington among the presidents and beside him in services rendered to the American people.

MANIFEST DESTINY.

One of the most interesting of the books published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., is Theodore Roosevelt's book on Thomas Benton. It appeared in the Statesman's Series and was copyrighted in 1886. In this book the president of the United States gave special attention to a phrase which was much used just before the civil war, but not much used afterwards until it was employed as an excuse for the exploitation of the Philippines. On page 40, Mr. Roosevelt said:

Among such people Benton's views and habits of thought became more markedly western and ultra-American than ever, especially in regard to our encroachments upon the territory of neighboring powers. The general feeling in the West upon this last subject afterwards crystallized into what became known as the "Manifest Destiny" idea, which, reduced to its simplest terms, was: that it was our manifest destiny to swallow up the land of all adjoining nations who were too weak to withstand us; a theory that forthwith obtained immense popularity among all statesmen of easy international morality.

At that time the author did not like the doctrine of "manifest destiny"; his conscience would not permit him to indorse a policy of swallowing up even adjoining nations merely because they were too weak to withstand us. How could he have condemned the doctrine more severely than he did when he suggested that it became immensely popular among "all statesmen of easy international morality"?

It will be seen that it contained a moral question as well as a political one. If it was then immoral to swallow up the land of adjoining nations who were too weak to withstand us, is it now moral to cross an ocean seven thousand miles wide and swallow up the land of nations that do not adjoin us, merely because they were too weak to withstand us?

On another page he spoke of this method of securing land by conquest in even harsher terms. He said: "This belligerent, or, more properly speaking, piratical way of looking at neighboring territory, was very characteristic of the West, and was at the root of the doctrine of 'manifest destiny.'" "Manifest destiny" at that time was a belligerent and piratical doctrine; can it be Christian and benevolent now? On page 266 of Mr. Roosevelt's book the author very clearly outlined the difference between the American method of expansion and the European policy of imperialism. He said:

Of course no one would wish to see these or any other settled communities now added to our domain by force; we want no unwilling citizens to enter our union; the time to have taken the lands was before settlers came into them. European nations war for the possession of thickly settled districts which, if conquered, will for centuries remain alien and hostile to the conquerors; we, wiser in our generation, have seized the waste solitude that lay near us, the limitless forests and never ending plains, and the valleys of the great, lonely rivers; and have thrust our own sons into them to take possession; and a score of years after each conquest we see the conquered land teeming with a people that is one with ourselves.

He recognized that it was contrary to the principles of a republic to incorporate unwilling citizens into the union; he recognized that people taken by conquest would "for centuries remain alien and hostile to the conquerors." If he knew this then how could he so forget his knowledge of history as to think that

the Filipinos would soon be friends to their conquerors? Are we less "wise" now than when he wrote?

Attention is called to the change that has come over the president merely as an illustration of the fact that republican policies to-day are in violation of history and of human nature, as well as in violation of the doctrines promulgated by the very same republicans before the thirst for empire overcame them?

When Mr. Roosevelt discussed the subject of imperialism seventeen years ago he used American language to defend American principles; when Mr. Roosevelt speaks as a republican president of the United States exercising in the Philippines the same power that the king of England exercises in India, he uses European language to defend European principles.

The doctrine of "manifest destiny" is merely a piece of hypocrisy used to excuse a policy which cannot be defended on principle. It would be better and more candid for the republican leaders to defend imperialism as the habitual drunkard defends his intoxication, by saying that the appetite is stronger than the will.

TRUSTS RETARD PROGRESS.

The above heading was suggested by a travelling man (and THE COMMONER entertains a high opinion of the energy and intelligence of travelling men) who gave some illustrations in support of the proposition. He called attention to a certain manufacturer who, while he was engaged in an independent industry, made great improvements in the product of his factory, and thus gave his wares a high standing among dealers. When he joined with others in forming a trust for the control of that industry, improvement stopped. After awhile this particular factory was shut down, and the trust no longer felt it necessary to improve the quality of the goods. Meanwhile, the trust raised the price of the goods about 33 per cent., thus lessening the demand for them and reducing the labor necessary to produce them. After awhile some independent factories started up, and, spurred on by the necessity which competition creates, they began improving the quality of their product. The trust reduced prices more than 25 per cent. in order to kill off the new enterprises. What the result will be remains to be seen. Whether the independent factories will be able to survive