

wash, to rest, to converse, or to see their families.

Some can read four languages, and daily amuse themselves with the most varied pastimes; others do not even know their letters and have no pleasure but drink. Some know all and believe nothing; others know nothing and believe all the absurdities they are told. Some, when they fall ill, besides all manner of watering places, all possible care, cleanliness and medicines, go about from place to place seeking for the most healing climate; others lie down on the stove in a chimneyless hut, and with unwashed wounds, without any food except dry bread, or any air besides an atmosphere tainted by the members of the family, by calves and sheep, rot alive and die before their time.

Is this as it should be?

If there exists a Supreme Wisdom and Love guiding the world, if there is a God, he cannot sanction such a division among men: that some should not know what to do with their superfluous wealth, and should squander aimlessly the fruits of other men's toil; and that others should sicken and die prematurely, or live a miserable life of exhausting labor.

If there is a God, this cannot and must not be. If there is no God, then even from the simplest human standpoint, a system by which the majority of men are forced to ruin their lives in order that a small minority may possess superfluous wealth—a wealth which only hinders and perverts them—such a system of life is absurd, because it is detrimental to all men.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

On the second day of April, 1743, Thomas Jefferson was born, and his life of 83 years spanned an important epoch in the nation's history.

At the age of 31 he drafted the address to the king, setting forth the rights of the colonists. Two years later, at the age of 33, he wrote the Declaration of Independence, and for 50 years thereafter, until his death on July 4, 1825, he was the greatest champion of human rights in all the world.

His service as a representative in state and federal legislatures, as governor of Virginia, ambassador to France, secretary of state under Washington, vice president under Adams, and president, together with his service in minor offices, covered more than 40 years of his eventful career. But the work which he did for mankind was so far reaching in its effect and so enduring in its character that he is remembered for his ideas,

rather than for the positions which he held.

He was the greatest constructive statesman known to history. His birth and surroundings were such as might naturally have made him an aristocrat, but he became the greatest democrat; his wealth, considerable for that day, might naturally have made him partial to the rich, but he cast his lot with the common people. Many with less education have from a feeling of superiority held aloof from their fellows, but he employed his knowledge of history, of law, of science and of art for the defense and protection of the masses.

He believed in the right of the people to govern themselves, and in their capacity for self-government. When near the end of life, fortified by an experience and observation such as few men have had, he wrote:

I am not among those who fear the people. They, and not the rich, are our dependence for continued freedom.

Only four years before his death he said:

Independence can be trusted nowhere but with the people in mass. They are inherently independent of all but moral law.

At another time he said:

No other depositaries of power than the people themselves have ever been found, which did not end in converting to their own profit the earnings of those committed to their charge.

And, to add still another extract from his writings:

The people are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty.

He not only believed in the people, but he understood the people and recognized the distinctions which everywhere exist, however much concealed or denied. Read the analysis which he gave of parties and see how completely it has been borne out by the history of the last hundred years:

Men, by their constitutions, are naturally divided into two parties: 1. Those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes. 2. Those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish them and consider them as the most honest and safe, although not the most wise depositary of the public interest. In every country these two parties exist, and in every one where they are free to think, speak and write, they will declare themselves. Call them, therefore, liberals and serviles, Jacobins and ultras, whigs and tories, republicans and federalists, aristocrats and democrats, or by whatever name you please, they are the same parties still, and pursue the same object. The last appellation of aristocrats and democrats is the true one expressing the essence of all.

Jefferson not only announced great fundamental principles, but he ap-

plied them to so many different questions that he can be read as an authority on all questions of to-day. He was opposed to imperialism, and believed in self-government; he was for a republic composed of equal and self-governing states and entirely opposed to the colonial idea.

He was opposed to a large army, and believed that a government was stronger when resting upon the love of the people than when tolerated only because of fear.

He was so opposed to the principle of monopoly that he only excepted copyrights and patents. Here is the amendment which he suggested to the constitution:

Monopolies may be allowed to persons for their own productions in literature, and their own inventions in the arts, for a term not exceeding — years, for no longer term, and for no other purpose.

At another time he suggested 14 years as the limit for patents.

His hostility to monopoly was exemplified in 1787, in a communication to John Jay, in which he said:

A company had silently and by unfair means obtained a monopoly for the making and selling of spermaceti candles (in France). As soon as we (Lafayette assisted him) discovered it we solicited its suppression which is effected by a clause in the *Arret*.

He denounced as a fatal fallacy the doctrine that a national debt is a blessing.

He was the relentless enemy of banks of issue. At one time he declared that banks of issue were more dangerous than standing armies. At another time he said:

I hope we shall crush in its birth the aristocracy of our monied corporations, which dare already to challenge our government to a trial of strength, and bid defiance to the laws of our country.

In 1819 he said:

Interdict forever to both the state and national government the power of establishing any paper bank; for without this interdiction we shall have the same ebbs and flows of medium, and the same revolution of property to go through every 20 or 30 years.

He was a believer in bimetallism, and no one who understands his principles can for a moment conceive of him as yielding to the financial influences which controlled Mr. Cleveland's administration and the republican administrations which preceded and followed it.

He warned his countrymen against the dangers of an appointive judiciary holding office for life.

Of the freedom of speech he said:

The liberty of speaking and writing guards our other liberties.

Of the freedom of the press he wrote:

Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press and that cannot be limited without being lost.

He was the author of the statute of Virginia guaranteeing religious liberty and was also the father of the University of Virginia. He favored a free school system which would bring to every child an opportunity to secure an education.

He was an advocate of the jury system; and he argued in favor of freeing the slaves three-quarters of a century before Lincoln issued his emancipation proclamation.

His writings fill many volumes and cover almost every conceivable subject, but through all that he said there runs the evidence of a great heart as well as a great intellect.

There is need to-day of a revival of Jeffersonian principles. He was not an enemy of honestly acquired wealth, but he believed that the government had no right to exaggerate by favoritism the differences between individuals. He believed that all should stand equal before the law and that every department of government, executive, legislative and judicial, should recognize and protect the rights of the humblest citizen as carefully as it would the rights of the greatest and most influential.

Jefferson's principles, applied to the problems of the twentieth century, would restore the republic to its old foundations and make it the supreme moral factor in the world's progress. The application of his principles to-day would restore industrial independence and annihilate trusts. The application of his principles to-day would drive the money changers out of the temple, insure to the people a stable currency and harmonize labor and capital by compelling justice to both.

Society to-day has its aristocratic and its democratic elements; whether Jefferson's principles are applied depends upon which element controls the government.—The Commoner of Apr. 5.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF THE REPUBLIC.

Speech of George Gluyas Mercer, president of the American League, of Philadelphia, at the liberty meeting, Faneuil hall, Boston, Saturday evening, March 30, 1901.

"When liberty is in danger, Faneuil hall has the right, it is her duty, to strike the keynote for these United States." These, citizens of Boston, were the words uttered in this hall by your son, Wendell Phillips, some three and sixty years ago, in the first speech he ever made here

—a speech to be followed by many others made by the same champion of human freedom in this same sacred place. Two generations before that these walls had answered to the appeals of revolutionary patriots, and in those days Philadelphia and Boston stood side by side in the struggle for independent self-government, and I deem it a high honor to-night to have the privilege of standing here to bring you greeting from Independence hall.

It is my conviction that the fathers of our republic proclaimed to the world, not only a profound principle of political philosophy, but also a fundamental principle of social evolution, when they declared that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. All political and social progress since that time has been in accordance with that principle, and we are here to-night to demand that wherever our flag goes that principle shall go with it, to distinguish our republic from the empires of Europe. Gov. Boutwell has adverted to the criticism sometimes made that we have not been faithful to that principle in the cases of women and negroes and Indians. As for the women, they give submissive assent to the present government. When they unite in demanding rights equal to those of men, which I, for one, believe they ought to have, they will get those rights. As for the negroes, our civil war lifted them to the plane of citizenship and any attempt now made to deprive them of their constitutional rights is wrong. As for the Indians, our treatment of them has properly been called "a century of dishonor," but we have never treated them as badly as we are now treating the Filipinos. We have recognized their nationality and made treaties with them and have behaved toward them far more nobly than toward our former allies in Luzon. But granting that we have not done our duty in these cases, is that any argument for a continuance of the wrong-doing? Because a man breaks one commandment, shall he disregard the entire decalogue? "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." What did Christ mean by that? Not, I take it, that perfection was attainable by all, but rather that perfection was the ideal for which all should strive. When the American fathers declared that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, they set that up as a standard.

They believed that the nation that did most toward reaching that standard would attain the nearest degree to political perfection. Prior to the Philippine war, America kept ever before her this lofty ideal of the declaration. As the years went by we succeeded in making the ideal more and more nearly real. Did the constitution make an exception to the rule in its provision as to slavery? Are we always faithful to the principle to-day? As applied to the situation in the Philippines, I care not how these questions are answered. They are beside the mark. What we protest against is that the government has deliberately abandoned that ideal in the Philippines and set up another policy. This eighteenth century political philosophy which Jefferson embodied in the declaration of independence—is it true? Is it what Lincoln said its author meant it to be—"a stumbling block to all those who in after times might seek to turn a free people back into the paths of despotism?" Is it still an ideal for twentieth-century America, freer and more prosperous than in the days of her youth? Or has plutocracy bred tyrants, and must we give up our ancient faith? I see there are some who still believe in the principle. We believe it the highest duty to strive to bring the republic back to the ideals of her youth, and we shall not cease in our endeavor while life lasts.

When the administration first entered upon this imperialist policy, the man who taught me political economy at Yale college, Prof. William G. Sumner, published an article entitled "The Conquest of the United States by Spain." Prof. Sumner had no intention at that time of assuming the role of prophet. He meant merely to indicate that the administration had entered upon the path which had brought Spain to ruin. Subsequent events, however, have shown that no paper ever had a truer title. The Spanish conquest of our country has steadily continued. Beginning with the denial to the Filipinos of their independence, it has gone on step by step until the Filipinos have to-day toward us the same feeling of intense resentment that they formerly felt toward the Spaniards. We protested against the reconcentrado method of a Spanish general, who was called a butcher, in Cuba. We have adopted the same method in the Philippines. "He has transported us beyond the seas to be tried for pretended offenses." That was one of the counts in the indictment against George III., as made in