

Would we not rather have interpreted it as an act of almost malignant cruelty? Would we have paid those claims, save as we were actually coerced by the muzzles of shotted cannon? Yet Great Britain and Germany are now doing exactly this toward little Venezuela, a nation feeble at best, whose government has spent its last dollar and its last ounce of strength against a formidable insurrection. Great Britain and Germany can crush and humiliate such a government, but they cannot force it to pay gold when it has none. These European powers have nobody but themselves to blame if the belief swiftly strengthens among the American people that London and Berlin are guilty of an act of cowardice and dishonor.

Another weekly paper of the order of the democratic Democracy has proved its right to a place in the growing list. We refer to the Press, of Helena, Montana. Edited with distinctive ability by W. E. Eggleston, the Helena Press is trying to do for Montana what John Stone Pardee's Red Wing Argus is doing for Minnesota, what Warren Worth Bailey's Johnstown Democrat (daily as well as weekly) is doing for western Pennsylvania, what Herbert Welsh's City and State of Philadelphia is doing for eastern Pennsylvania, what the Springfield Republican (daily and weekly) has long been doing for New England, what the San Francisco Star does for the Pacific coast, and what Bryan's Commoner is doing for the country at large. All these papers ring true democratic notes. Against an expanding force like that, the subsidized and shackled press of both parties will not long be able to make headway with public opinion. We are living in stirring times, when democracy and plutocracy are gathering for a terrific struggle, and papers such as these are marshalling the democratic hosts.

Dr. John Bascom, formerly president of the University of Wisconsin, injected into his address before the Wisconsin teachers' association at Milwaukee on the 29th an observation which has drawn from him in a newspaper interview an explanation that is both acute and commendable.

He puts into words a distinction which many thoughtful persons must have felt without being quite able to express it sharply. It is the distinction between the acceptance by educational and religious institutions of gifts on the one hand of unearned money unlawfully obtained and on the other of unearned money lawfully obtained. John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie were his examples. Being questioned about his address in this particular Dr. Bascom said:

I meant the University of Chicago and its acceptance of the gifts from John D. Rockefeller. When an institution, founded and maintained for the benefit and education of the youth of the public, accepts money which has been gained in direct defiance of the laws and principles laid down by that public, it vitiates its influence on the minds of those students upon whom it is its duty to exert a good and moral influence.

I do not feel the same about Andrew Carnegie's gifts to the colleges and communities at large. He gained his money according to rules which were recognized by the public and by a protection which the public afforded him with its full consent, and though I do not believe it ought to have given that protection, still it made his gains perfectly lawful. Therefore the same stigma cannot be attached to them as to the enormous gains made by the Standard Oil Company.

That distinction is perfectly sound. When men get unearned fortunes as Carnegie has, and as the Astors have, and as every rich man with a legal or institutional privilege has, then fortunes are not stolen by them from the public but are given to them by the public. The public has the power and the right at any time to stop this diversion of its property. If it does not stop it, it is as guilty as the beneficiary if not even more guilty. Of course the beneficiaries can make themselves specially guilty by using their influence to perpetuate the laws and institutions that thus enrich them at the expense of their brethren. But even then the public itself sanctions the wrong, and the profits from it have not the moral foulness they would have if they were extorted from the public against its will by

superior force or abstracted from it by secret fraud.

Not all advice from the old to the young is sound. This is especially so of advice from old and rich philanthropists to ambitious youth on how to succeed in the world. Usually such advice consists of solemn admonitions on the miraculous effects of hard work and honest living, when the cunning sage knows perfectly well that however hard he may have worked and however honestly he may have lived, he owes his fortune neither to his work nor his honesty. He knows, and everyone else knows, that no amount of work and no degree of honesty would have made him rich if he had not become the owner of some kind of "cinch" whereby he could shave the earnings of other people. It is refreshing, therefore, to listen to advice to youth which makes no cunning concealment of the true secret of worldly success. Such advice is given by Dr. D. K. Pearsons, who is editorially described by a Chicago paper as "the sage of Hinsdale." Asked what course he would recommend to a young man starting in life this venerable philanthropist replied:

Get land! Get land! Go out into the northwest corner of Colorado. There are snow-topped mountains spread with tall pines, and there are green valleys and swift-running water. Get land with coal under it. Get pasture land where cattle can be grazed. Get meadow land and tillable land. Buy all you can and hang on to it. Then go to work. Go to stay and do not be disheartened by hardships. Go where there is not a railroad for 60 miles and you have to enter on horseback. The railroad will follow soon, and those who fight hard will come out on top. Another inviting region is in the State of Washington. Avoid the cities and go to the back country and get land. Get tracts up on the mountain side that are heavy with timber and accessible to running water. Take acquisitions in valleys. Mining, agriculture, lumbering, grazing — all branches are full of promise.

For its purpose that is the best advice we have ever seen quoted. It is marred by only one thing. Why the admonition to "go to work"? If work is necessary in order to get or to keep