

disarmament took place, there would be no opportunity for Russia to strengthen herself as a military power secretly. But with the press strangled, disarmament might very well be but a prelude to the fruition of Russia's long-cherished plans for the conquest of the world.

It need not be supposed that treachery is contemplated by the Czar. He is probably too unsophisticated for that. But the Czar of Russia is only a puppet in the hands of an oligarchy. He could no more have made the disarmament proposition without the consent of his nobles, than the Emperor of China could carry out his reforms against the will of the dowager and her party. The Czar's proposition, therefore, is the proposition of the nobles, and such a proposition from them is suspicious. Let Russia free the press, so that her movements at home may be known to the world, if she wishes to be taken seriously. He who looks for universal peace from this source, under these circumstances, must be credulous indeed if he means the peace of brotherhood. The peace that the Russian oligarchy would give mankind is the peace that reigned in Warsaw under the same auspices.

At an immense gathering of the supporters of James G. Maguire, at Los Angeles, Cal., last month, a Maguire club of colored men from the neighboring town of Pasadena joined the procession, carrying a banner with this device: "We are Lincoln republicans, not Hanna republicans." These colored men might teach their brother republicans a valuable lesson. It is impossible, upon considering the career of Abraham Lincoln, to think of him as a confederate of Mark Hanna. He would have seemed so out of place. Sincere republicans should know, and thoughtful ones will understand, that when their party is attacked it is not because of its underlying principles nor of its history, but because in its later days it has experi-

enced the misfortune of the man whom the Samaritan succored on the Jericho road.

In opposing Maguire's candidacy in California, the monopolists have resorted to their now familiar trick of organizing their employes so as to vote them in blocks for monopoly interests. Here is an extract from the circular of the railroad clubs that are being organized:

If we, as railway employes, do not unite for our common defense, and the day should come when our wages are reduced, as a result of our indifference to the material welfare of our employers and ourselves, the responsibility will rest largely with ourselves." Circulars of this kind are calculated to intimidate, and they often succeed. They did in 1896. But they will fail as soon as railway employes begin to reflect.

Railroad corporations have two kinds of incomes—earnings and stealings. It is only out of the former that employes are paid. They never get any share in the stealings. Monopoly politicians are the only outsiders who share in that fund. Consequently, no matter how great the stealings of railroad corporations, employes get no better wages; and no matter to what extent the stealings are cut down, employes get no lower wages. The stealings of railroad corporations might be reduced to zero, and yet wages would not fall a penny's worth. Then why should railway employes vote in favor of railway stealing? Why not confine the income of railroad corporations to what the railroads earn?

In one of his speeches while en route to Omaha, President McKinley declared that "we have gone from labor seeking employment to employment seeking labor." Employment seeking labor! Where is employment seeking labor, except at reduced wages? Has not one of Mr. McKinley's own organs, the Iron Trade Review, said that "wage reductions are certainly a feature of the new prosperity"? and is it not obvious that this

is true. Had he been perfectly candid, Mr. McKinley would have said that "we have gone from labor seeking employment at old wages to employment seeking labor at lower wages?"

In an editorial in his paper, the Lewiston Journal, Mr. Dingley predicts that in consequence of the Dingley bill, the next 12 months will be a veritable marvel of prosperity. This remarkable editorial, which appeared as late as September 10, 1898, closes with a cheerful admonition to everybody to "prepare for the return of business." But didn't Mr. Dingley and his crowd tell everybody to prepare for the return of business immediately upon Mr. McKinley's election, and didn't those who prepared find themselves egregiously sold? Didn't the Dingley crowd then say that the return of business would take place upon Mr. McKinley's inauguration, and didn't they then have to postpone the date until the signing of the Dingley bill? The Dingley bill was signed more than a year ago, and yet again Mr. Dingley urges everybody to "prepare for the return of business." How long is this farce to be kept up? For two years all who have said from time to time that business hadn't returned, have been denounced as calamity howlers; but from time to time admissions like this of Mr. Dingley's, testify that the "calamity howlers" have told the truth. Even Mr. Dingley's latest prediction has yet to show indications of verification. Business is worse now, if the business journals are to be trusted, than it was when that prediction was made.

From Wilson's Financial Catechism, a book intended to instruct farmers in the mysteries of finance, we learn that wealth consists of "the soil and its natural resources as furnished by the hand of the Creator, with the accumulation of its products developed, improved and made useful and valuable by the ingenuity, skill and industry of mankind." If Mr. Wilson's analytical powers play