

But the patriotism of bondholders does not appear to be so disinterested as it has been represented. Now that the new bonds are being distributed, the fact develops that millions of dollars' worth have been subscribed for fraudulently. Systematic schemes were set on foot to enable single subscribers to get large quantities of the bonds, though the limitation to each subscriber was \$500. Many subscribers were hired to apply for bonds, which they were to turn over to their employers. Among these fraudulent subscriptions were something like a million dollars in the names of Armour & Co.'s employes. Now, why did rich men like Armour & Co. indulge in such irregularities? Was it from excess of patriotism? Permit us to doubt. Even the Armours are not so intensely patriotic as to hunt for "irregular" opportunities to spend a million of good money upon a patriotic impulse. At any rate, since the return of the million in "sound money," with a three per cent. interest attachment, was guaranteed, all these "irregular" investors are entitled to the benefit of the reasonable inference that it was the return of their money with interest, and not excessive patriotism, that induced them to play their "gum games" with the treasury department. Patriotism! What was it that old Sam Johnson said of patriotism?

A company has been organized by a set of campaign fund contributors, for the purpose of exploiting the islands which our soldiers fought to free, but which these Sam Johnson patriots seek to appropriate. The company is called the American Indies company. It is organized under the laws of New Jersey, with a capital of \$18,000,000, and it is empowered to do almost anything that requires a monopoly franchise. Here we have a center of imperialism influence. Here is a manifestation of the pecuniary interests which are driving this country on to turn a war for humanity into a war for land-grabbing and monopolistic plunder. The vultures that hov-

ered about San Juan, waiting till the battle should end that their sickening feast might begin, were very types of innocence and purity in comparison with these ghouls.

Clarence Moeller, the populist candidate for county assessor of Cook county, Ill., makes a point worthy of consideration by people who are imperialists because they want to extend American markets. "There is a way," he says, "to open up, at once, a market right here at home for \$1,000,000,000 worth of labor products." The way he proposes, and that which the populist platform advocates, is to shift the entire tax burden from consumers to land values. "This," says Mr. Moeller, with point and force, "will lower rent, thus permitting the doubly-taxed, rent-ridden tenant class to buy labor products instead of buying rent and taxes." That hits the nail on the head. There can be no prosperity so long as the great working class are compelled to spend so much in "buying rent and taxes." Let taxes be lifted from their shoulders by the abolition of taxes on labor products, and rents be lessened by driving vacant and poorly-improved land into the market through exclusive taxation of land values, and those who now buy so much rent and taxes could buy labor products instead. That would increase the home market enormously.

J. Sterling Morton, formerly Mr. Cleveland's secretary of agriculture and now the editor of *The Conservative*, of Nebraska City, Neb., appears to have fallen from grace as a democrat much further than we had supposed. In his prospectus, it will be remembered as we quoted him not long ago, he advocated equal rights for intelligent citizens. We then ventured to ask what he proposed for unintelligent citizens, suggesting that upon democratic principles equality of rights can be made to depend no more upon intelligence than upon property or birth or any other consideration except manhood. Answer-

ing our question, Mr. Morton puts forth the astounding proposition—astounding as coming from a professed follower of Thomas Jefferson—that "the rights of the unintelligent should be defined and defended by those who are intelligent." The rights of one class to be defined, marked out, limited, arbitrarily regulated, by another! What would Thomas Jefferson have said to that? How abhorrent must such a sentiment have been to the great democrat who declared for "equal rights for all, special privileges for none!"

Can it be possible that Mr. Morton realizes the full force of the sentiment he expresses? We hope not. For in that sentiment lies the germ of autocracy. It is a sentiment which acquires vitality only as it deadens democracy. All monarchical and oligarchical theories—from that of the divine right of kings to govern, down to that of the right of a man to vote in virtue of the jackass he owns instead of the natural rights he has to guard against encroachment—proceed from the essential principle of Mr. Morton's undemocratic doctrine. The white men of the south, before our civil war, acted upon it. They defined the rights of the unintelligent. How they did it, is not that written in their slave codes? For the rich whites alone, the subjugation to a state of slavery of such of the unintelligent as could be distinguished by their color, resulted doubtless in a more comfortable state of affairs than came forth from the black governments following the war; but for the southern people as a whole—black and white, rich and poor, intelligent and unintelligent—the black governments of reconstruction days, bad as they were, were infinitely better than the slave governments that preceded them. Fraudulent bonds are altogether less infamous than slave codes. Nor was there anything exceptional in the way in which the intelligence of the south diverted the functions of government from the equal protection of all to the enslavement of the

masses. Never since the world began have the few pleaded superior authority to define the rights of the many, without making the plea a pretext for riding upon their backs. And of all the forms which the plea takes, the most specious is that which bases the superior authority upon an assumption of superior intelligence.

We have thus far accepted Mr. Morton's theoretical distinction of the intelligent from the unintelligent. But in practice how shall we make the distinction? He himself belongs, of course, in the ranks of the intelligent; and he would doubtless concede the same privilege, as matter of courtesy if for no other reason, to the editor of *The Public*. That fixes his status and ours. But there are others. Now how shall he and we assign them to their proper class? What shall be the test of intelligence? Would it be skill in accumulating property without rendering commensurate service for it? One might jump at that as Mr. Morton's idea, for he urges that the suffrage be restricted to taxpayers. By taxpayers Mr. Morton does not mean indirect taxpayers, those who pay their taxes in the prices of the goods they buy and the rooms they rent; that would include the whole population, as no one knows better than he. He means the persons who secretly collect and in part openly pay over to government the taxes for which in so great measure those whom he would disfranchise for their poverty do the sweating and moiling and toiling. These are the taxpayers—these persons who are intelligent enough to manipulate the laws so as to appear to pay all the taxes, while in truth they pay hardly any—to whom Mr. Morton would limit the right to vote. He likens them to the stockholders in a corporation. He does not also say, but the logic of his proposition would require it, that in full analogy with his corporation simile, the highest taxpayers should have the most votes. We can hardly believe, however, that Mr. Morton would to

this extent make mere money grubbing the test of voting intelligence. Surely he would not give more votes to Mark Hanna than to Carl Schurz. Yet upon the taxpaying theory of suffrage, Mark Hanna has a stockholding interest in the state as much greater than that of Schurz as Schurz's is greater than that of the day laborer who never pays a tax except through storekeepers and landlords. The truth is that there is absolutely no analogy between a money corporation and the state or any other grade of public government. A money corporation is a voluntary association, of which no one becomes a part except upon his own volition; a state is a body of which everyone becomes a part by the mere fact of birth—no one can let it alone, for it won't let him alone. A corporation concerns only the funds invested in it; a state concerns rights to which mere money rights are subsidiary—the right to life and the right to liberty. It is appropriate, therefore, that voting in money corporations should not only depend upon the fact of stockholding, but should be in proportion to stockholding; but to propose to regulate public government in that way argues a lack of intelligence respecting government which should disfranchise the proposer, if Mr. Morton's theory of government by the intelligent were adopted. This aside, however, it must be clear that the possession of wealth cannot properly be made the test of civic intelligence.

What, then, can be made the test of civic intelligence? Should it be reading, 'riting and 'rithmetic? Apparently that would be Mr. Morton's choice, for he says that anyone who cannot read should be denied the right to vote. But the three "r's" afford no conclusive test of intelligence. Many men who can read and write, and even some who can cipher, are woe-begone fools; while it is often a matter of common observation that illiterate men are clear-headed. Human rights would be in as safe keeping with illiterates as with snobs.

Neither wealth nor book learning is a test of voting intelligence, any more than voting intelligence is a test of the right to govern. Intelligence, let it not be forgotten, may be inspired by bad motives as well as good; if a first class banker is intelligent, so is a first class forger. The only right to govern is that which comes from the consent of the governed; and the governed are not one class in the community alone—not the rich, the poor, the intelligent or the unintelligent—but all. Without their consent, no one has the right to govern them. To deny this is to deny the principle of individual liberty, the essence of democracy. When rights are in question, they must be defined by a consensus of those to whom they belong, and not by one man for other men, nor by one class for other classes. This, apparently, is not Mr. Morton's view. Evidently it is not. But it is the democratic view, and Mr. Morton still professes to be a democrat.

In discussing the question of rights, Mr. Morton drops, quite thoughtlessly we incline to believe, into a little bit of plutocratic cant. He says that citizenship is too much regarded as if it were all rights and no duties. But it is impossible to dissociate the idea of rights from that of duties. With a little introspection, Mr. Morton will see that he cannot claim a right as to another without asserting a corresponding duty on the part of the other; and if he asserts a right in the other as against himself, he thereby admits a corresponding duty from himself to the other. Consequently, to assert that civic rights are universal, is to assert that civic duties are universal; to assert that all have the right to life and liberty, is to assert the duty of each to respect the life and liberty of the others; to assert that all have the right to vote in order to guard their own natural rights against encroachment, is to assert that all are under an obligation to use their votes for the protection of the natural

rights of each. That civic duties are fearfully neglected we freely admit; but it is not the class whom Mr. Morton would disfranchise for unintelligence who neglect them most flagrantly. Nor is it "the everlasting twaddle about equal rights for men who are mentally, morally and socially unequal," to quote Mr. Morton's ill-considered phrase—it is not that "twaddle" that puts the idea of civic duties and obligations in the background. On the contrary, it is the turning of a deaf ear to that "twaddle." Were civic rights effectively denied, civic duties would be scouted. Meanwhile, to the extent that the idea of rights is made the subject of unintelligent sneers, we must expect the idea of duties to fall into noxious desuetude.

Mr. Morton fears anarchy, turmoil, bloodshed and destruction, as the sequence of an organized majority of unintelligent voters. Let him calm his fears. If there is really so little civic virtue among the unintelligent, the intelligent will not fight them when they rise up in the strength of an organized majority. They will either fool them or buy them off. Should we ever have anarchy, turmoil, bloodshed and destruction in this country it will not be because unintelligent voters become an organized majority. There is no danger of that, and there would be almost as little danger from that. It will be because "intelligent" voters, the professional "taxpayers," succeed in acquiring their coveted power to "define" away the rights of the "unintelligent."

We should feel like apologizing for devoting so much space to what may at first seem like idle controversy with a contemporary; but the importance of the subject of discussion removes it from that category. In these days there is a perceptible drift away from the fundamentals of democracy. As a rule, however, great caution is exercised to conceal the real character of the drift. Old democratic names are retained, old democratic epigrams are

exploited, all the old democratic landmarks are kept in sight, while the essential principles of democracy are abandoned. Thus under the banners of democracy we are passing into despotism. What we therefore have to thank Mr. Morton for is his extraordinary candor. He blandly repudiates the democratic epigrams along with the principles they express. For that reason controversy with him offers a tempting opportunity to discuss Jeffersonian truths, than which no subject is to-day more vitally important.

While we abhor Mr. Morton's brand of democracy, as a stray from the flock of monarchism, we are glad to be able to agree with some of his miscellaneous observations. His idea of the legal tender quality of money, for instance, strikes us as excellent. Here it is, short and sharp, from the columns of the Conservative:

Why not deprive both gold and silver of the legal tender quality when those metals are used in coin as money?

That would surely settle the coinage question; for its vitality, as a coinage question merely, depends upon the discrimination involved in demonetizing silver alone. Let gold also be demonetized, and the metals would be as truly upon an equality as if both were full legal tender, while the sort of government protection which creditors have and silver miners want, would be abolished. But is Mr. Morton quite sure that his yellow friends would join him in his proposition to demonetize gold?

The socialists of California have united with the Southern Pacific railroad republicans to oppose the election of James G. Maguire as governor. Maguire's good luck clings to him.

Besides nominating James G. Maguire, a Henry George man of international fame, for governor, and James H. Barry, another prominent George man for congress in Maguire's place, the California fusionists have nominated for one of the rail-

road commissioners William M. Hinton, who was George's partner in the publication of the San Francisco Post. Under pressure they abandoned that paper to the railroad monopoly and walked out upon the street, poor men, rather than conduct it in obedience to railroad dictation. Hinton is a man of the strictest probity, who has earned a reputation in San Francisco for square dealing which will make it extremely difficult for the allied monopolies to defeat him at the election.

Gov. Altgeld threw a bombshell last week into a little plan which the republicans of Chicago had concocted for turning a peace jubilee into a partisan glorification. Though peace has not yet been established and will not be until after election, these republicans must needs fix the date for their peace jubilee a few days in advance of the election. They explain this move on the ground that the president could not be present at any other time, the good faith of which explanation is put under some suspicion by the other things the promoters of this partisan celebration did. For instance, the orators they had invited were prominent republicans. Suggestions that they invite Bryan, who stands as the leader of over 5,000,000 voters, was superciliously scouted. His Post-Prandial Windiness, Chauncey Depew, of Vanderbilt fame and connections, the man who was sued for compensation by the penny-a-liner who wrote one of his centennial orations, was to stand at the top as the orator; but Bryan was not good enough, though his power as an orator goes unquestioned, for a place anywhere in the list. His patriotism lacks gilt. These earmarks of partisanship aroused Altgeld, who induced the democratic state committee to denounce the jubilee for what it was, and advise against participation in it, unless its promoters would consent to postpone it until after election. The shaft struck home. In the first place it waked up some of the pseudo-democrats on the jubilee com-