

House was obliged to adjourn (p. 523) for want of a quorum.

The bill (H. No. 15449) for increasing the efficiency of the army was taken up in committee of the whole (p. 544) on the 6th, and after brief debate was passed; as also was the bill (S. No. 1359) to increase pensions for total deafness (pp. 556, 558).

The bill (S. No. 2210) relating to Hawaiian silver coinage and silver certificates (p. 587) was passed with amendments (p. 594) on the 7th; and the Philippine constabulary bill (H. No. 15510) on the 8th (pp. 617, 634); but only private bills were considered on the 9th.

MISCELLANY

OUR FAITH AND OUR TRUSTS.

For The Public.

“There is rest from toil—Why work in vain?

Ease for struggle—Why longer strain?
Pleasures plenty—Why suffer pain?

“There's ease of mind when conscience quivers;

Heart's-ease for the soul that shivers;
For heart-ache, baths in Lethean rivers.

“For hunger, food—Snatch and eat!
Why starvest thou? Some have meat!
Thy table's spread in every street.”

Too soon; alas! Speak not to him
Who, agonized and visioned dim,
Unseeing, tastes the bitter brim;

Who drinks the less, nor looks to see
His chains unbound—not even by Thee,
Thou Christ that walked by Galilee.

O Christian God and Christian creed!
Where is your promised help in need?
Come, scourge me now this Christian greed!

Laura H. Earle.

A SOCIAL FABLE.

A Widow who was walking along her darkened path, with an Orphan's hand in her right hand and a single share of dividend-paying stock in her left hand, heard a groaning, and the groaning ceased, but a Voice said:

“Ha! I see him now!”

“See whom now?” said the Widow.

“The man who has been keeping my wages down and my hours of labor up,” replied the Voice. “There he is, do you not see him?”

The Widow looked and saw two men; the man with the Voice was a Laborer, and the other man was a Trustee, who claimed to have credentials from Providence. In his hand he held a calculation, which read:

Plant	\$1,000,000
Good will	1,000,000
Material	50,000
Cash on hand	50,000
Bills receivable	100,000
Water	7,800,000
Total capital	\$10,000,000

“Why did I not see you before?” asked the Widow, of the Trustee.

“Because,” replied he, “I was sheltering myself behind your skirts.”—From the Monthly Leader, of Philadelphia, for October.

DESERVES IT.

“No, I take no interest in politics,” remarked Mr. Howson Lotts. “It is dirty business—too dirty for honest men to engage in. Only ward heelers, tricksters and self-seekers engage in politics.”

“But do you not think that it is your duty as an American citizen to take an active interest in politics?” we queried.

“No, sir; I am too busy engaged in looking after my private business affairs to engage in politics. Besides, look at the class of men who make politics a business. It's enough to make a decent man sick.”

“But why not assist in purifying politics?” we ventured.

“O, that's all nonsense. What's the use trying? Just let the politicians run things to suit themselves. I'm not going to interfere. It takes too much time and I can't spare it from my business.”

“I see that the legislature has just enacted a law that will result in raising the taxes on private property and lowering the taxes on corporations,” we ventured to say.

Then there was an explosion.

“That's what it did!” shouted Mr. Howson Lotts. “The ordinary business man is ground into the dust by unjust taxes, while the corporations escape. Our tax laws are infernally unjust, so they are. The man least able to pay is robbed blind, while the men who are able to pay escape by the aid of unjust laws. The country is going to the demnition bowwows and I think it a shame. The corporations and trusts are—”

Here we interrupted by rising and starting for the door. We had heard all that so often that it is wearisome. It was a good opportunity to preach a sermon to Mr. Howson Lotts, but after a moment's thought concluded that he deserved all he was getting.—Will M. Maupin, in The Commoner.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE HAS BEEN NULLIFIED.

So much is being written about the Monroe doctrine and its abandonment by our Republican administration, until the European powers have collected their debts of Venezuela and the other South American republics, that it is important that the people of the United States remember just what President Monroe said when he made that declaration to the world and his countrymen.

It must first be remembered that a coalition of some of the old world

powers had been formed, to restrict the march of Democracy, and the Monroe doctrine was a declaration that, for our own safety, we would not permit any extension of European control on this continent.

President Monroe made this plain in these words:

We owe it to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and the allied powers to declare, that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any part of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere; but with the governments which have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and just principles, acknowledged, we could not view an interposition for oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

This doctrine was enlarged by John Quincy Adams when he said that “the American continents should no longer be subjects for any new European settlement,” and was strengthened by Thomas Jefferson, who said:

We will oppose with all our means the forcible interposition of any other power, as auxiliary, stipendiary, or under any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any powers by conquest, concession or acquisition in any other way.

Those were the bold words of the fathers of the republic, and the same doctrine has been upheld by the statesmen of all parties until President Roosevelt made a new interpretation in his last message to Congress, in which he said:

No independent nation in America need have the slightest fear of aggression from the United States. It behooves each one to maintain order within its own borders and to discharge its just obligations to foreigners. When this is done, they can rest assured that, be they strong or weak, they have nothing to dread from outside interference. More and more the increasing interdependence and complexity of international political and economic relations render it incumbent on all civilized and orderly powers to insist on the proper policing of the world.

This is a modification of the Monroe doctrine and a most extraordinary one, for not only does it give European countries permission to collect their debts, by force if necessary, but it also advances a new doctrine for the “Policing of the World” by the civilized and orderly powers.

That amendment was evidently expected by Germany and England, for as long ago as last June, there are

strong indications that a secret understanding had been arrived at between those countries and the United States. The coercion of Venezuela was then decided upon, but was to be delayed until the effect of the president's message to Congress had been observed. It did not take long for the allied powers to act, upon finding that no expressed opposition had developed to the "policing of the world."

In an interview, President Roosevelt is stated to have said, that those who wish to fully understand his position on this question, "must read between the lines of his first message."

Are we to understand from this that an entangling alliance has been entered into with Germany and England and perhaps other "civilized and orderly powers," to aid them in collecting their debts of the semi-civilized and disorderly countries, wherever they may be?

What if this question is considered by The Hague court, when it tries Venezuela for her shortcomings, and the arbitrators decide that the "policing" of that state is necessary and appoints Germany or England or both as high-sheriff to civilize her and collect what is due and charge a good round sum for the expense of collection?

Where will the Monroe doctrine be then? Will President Roosevelt be in a position to maintain it, with the sheriff in possession of Venezuela for an unlimited time, until the debts and expenses are paid? Venezuela cannot pay what she owes; the only settlement possible is for her to issue bonds at a large discount and a ruinous rate of interest. That would be a mortgage on her land and her people, principally to England and Germany. If she defaulted in the interest or otherwise became disorderly, which an uprising of her people against some great injustice would be construed by the powers to be, her creditors would claim the right to occupy and administer her affairs until the debt was extinguished. Like England's occupation of Egypt, this would be perpetual.

All the South American republics may be claimed to be disorderly, and all owe large sums to Europe, and there is no doubt the same coercion will be used on them and with a like result eventually—permanent occupation.

There is but one escape for all

of them and that is the refusal of the people of the United States to indorse "the policing of the world" and by the defeat of the president and party who have undertaken to carry it out.

With a Jacksonian Democrat in the White House and a declaration by him that the Monroe doctrine will be maintained at all hazards, the powers of Europe would not venture to molest or make afraid our sister republics.

We must take the bold position of the Fathers of the Republic, or in some time of stress, when political factions might be battling for supremacy, the Allied Powers of Europe might attempt the "policing" of the United States or part of them.

The Monroe doctrine must be preserved.

R. M.

DR. BASCOM ON ROCKEFELLER.

A letter from Prof. John Bascom to the Chicago Chronicle, published in the Chronicle of January 8. In this letter Prof. Bascom explains in greater fullness the statements recently made by him in two interviews already commented on in The Public. Prof. Bascom has the chair of political economy at Williams college.

In the haste of the moment one does not always select the most suitable stone to shy at a dog. I should like the use of your columns for a more explicit statement of the reasons which render unfit an acceptance by colleges of Mr. Rockefeller's gifts than was possible in a hasty interview with reporters. The question is whether colleges are at liberty to solicit donations without reference to the manner in which the money has been accumulated; or whether there should be some correspondence between the temper with which it has been made and that with which it is to be used. Some seem ready to say that money has no character and may come from all quarters and go in all uses. Our Lord did not take this view of the widow's two mites. He gave them a decided preference over the lavish sums with which they were associated, and this feeling has clung to men's minds ever since. It is the temper of instruction which makes it educational and this temper may be expressed in many ways.

The Standard Oil company has for more than a quarter of a century been the corporation most conspicuous in this country for inadmissible business methods; the faults have chiefly consisted in securing unequal rates from railroads and in direct and persevering attacks on competitors. No other cor-

poration has won so bad an eminence in these particulars. The first of these, unequal rates, has from the beginning been contrary to law. Common law does not recognize any right in public carriers to give different rates to different individuals. Much of the early success of the Standard Oil company was due to these illegal contracts, which were at times of a most flagrant character. In 1887 the interstate commerce act came in force, designed to put an end to these unequal business conditions. The Standard Oil company has done its utmost, in its entire history, to subvert the civil law in its watchfulness over the general welfare and to establish a monopoly in the teeth of all its provisions. If it secures to-day fewer discriminations in its favor than hitherto it is due in part to the fact that, its end being attained, it has less need of them and in part to the fact that the interstate commerce commission has made this method more difficult.

The Standard Oil company has attacked directly and in a great variety of ways all competitors, and has in most instances driven them from the field. The antitrust bill just introduced by Senator Hoar makes criminal, with a penalty of imprisonment, the means which have been constantly employed by this corporation. The intent and spirit of these methods have been from the beginning as criminal as the senator would now make them to be in law.

The monopoly set up by the Standard Oil company has been pushed in the most vigorous way till the wealth accumulated has become something monstrous in the world's history. Even now, while the profits are enormous, this corporation is steadily increasing the price of oil. These profits come mostly from the poorer and more dependent classes. Every workman among us in these winter days is lighted to his morning meal by a lamp and out into the darkness by a lantern on which the Standard Oil company imposes its claim. The wealth of this company is gathered chiefly from the most ragged and empty pockets among us.

The wrongful and unflinching way in which this wealth has been won, the long period over which these extortions have been extended and the surprising success which has accompanied them have made the Standard Oil company the pioneer in a policy the embodiment of methods which threatens the very existence of our institutions. Is a college at liberty to accept money gained in a manner so hostile to the