

matter what their motive may be, but it makes sinister prognostications regarding Mr. O'Connell, and on no other apparent basis than that Mr. O'Connell "does not train in its crowd." If Mr. O'Connell's official record is bad it was right that the Record-Herald should say so and therefore criticize his promotion as unfit. But it does not denounce his record. With reference to Mr. O'Connell it does essentially what Mayor Dunne's critical friends did with reference to Mr. Fisher. Mr. Fisher was none of theirs, and therefore they, etc. Mr. O'Connell is none of its, and therefore the Record-Herald, etc. Merely upon its own impression that O'Connell "rises to the stature of a ward politician and no higher," the Record-Herald prophesies "a very little service at a very high price." This prophecy may turn out to be good foresight, but with the Record-Herald's editorial the wish seems to be father to the thought. Either a bad record should have been produced against Mr. O'Connell, or a reasonable time been allowed for him to justify the Mayor's judgment in his case as it has been justified in Mr. Fisher's. To denounce the Mayor for his promotion as having "made a blunder," and as "bereft of understanding," as having eyes but seeing not and ears but hearing not, as the Record-Herald does, and without producing the slightest evidence against the appointee, is only to repeat the sentiment and almost the very language with which the Mayor was at first improvidently denounced by critics of the Fisher appointment. It reads more like partisan billingsgate than judicial criticism. It is now reasonably well proved to have been unfair in the Fisher case; the same thing may possibly be proved in the O'Connell case. At any rate, common fairness demands that the Mayor's appointees be judged by their past records or by their future service, and not by personal or factional prejudices. This spirit toward public officials is especially demanded of newspapers everywhere that profess to place considerations of good administration above personal and party preferences.

* * *

WHAT IS A DEMOCRAT.

Is there any difference between a Democrat and a Republican? If not, then a political campaign should be only a question of getting the best men elected regardless of party.

If there is a difference between the two parties in principle, then candidates must be regarded as bearing the standard of the party to which they respectively belong, and the principles are

the vital things to be discussed, understood and voted on.

If you are a Democrat or a Republican because your father was, that is no reason at all. By the same reasoning you might as well wear his style of hat or coat. Every man is entitled to form his own opinions, and those opinions should be formed on good reasons which he understands and can give.

If you are a Republican because it is the party in power and gives you more chance to be elected to some office, then you'd better remain a Republican, because no decent party cares for camp followers who have no higher principle than to get office or graft.

It stands to reason that, taken as an average, Republicans are no worse than Democrats, and Democrats are no better than Republicans. The question one ought to answer is, Why am I a Democrat? or, Why am I a Republican?

Most men belong to a party from mere habit. They do not seek office. They do not believe all the bad men are in the other party. In fact, there are many Republicans who should be Democrats and many Democrats who should be Republicans, and the following may help each thinking man to classify himself.

*

The two parties might be classified in a general way by saying that the Republican party is the party of the rich, of the privileged classes, of the trusts; and the Democratic party is the party of the common people. Anyone who will stop and think this over will see it is true as a great general proposition.

For example, would a Democratic or a Republican committee have the richest people to go to for campaign funds? Think that out.

The great railroads, the banks, the insurance corporations, the trusts, all throw their weight for the Republican party. Why? Think it out.

Most people do that from which they expect the greatest benefit. Why do the privileged classes favor the Republican party? Why is the Senate, that body of trust and corporation agents, Republican? Because the Republican party favors those ideas which have created the privileged classes, and because the privileged classes can get from the Republican party that protection and those further favors they want.

The Democratic party of the South in 1861 and for some time prior thereto was thoroughly undemocratic, in so far as it protected human slavery and stood for class privilege. And the Republican party of that day was truly the demo-

cratic party of the plain people. It did a great work under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln, and many men are Republicans to-day because it was once the party of Lincoln and freedom.

But that was nearly half a century ago, and that party has been in power and making our laws ever since, substantially, and now it is the party of the Depews, the Aldriches, the Ryans, the Vanderbilts, the Goulds, the Rockefellers, the Morgans, the Harrimans, the Standard Oil and the railroads. Why this change?

Is it because the Republican party, being the party in power for so long a period, has been seized by those shrewd men who want special privileges by law, or is it because the principles of the Republican party lend themselves to the creation and protection of legalized special privileges? Think it out.

In fact it is both, and the difference between the Democratic and the Republican parties in principle will be sufficiently shown by briefly examining the fundamental democratic principles.

Thomas Jefferson has been called the father of the Democratic party, and Alexander Hamilton the father of the Republican party. In fact, Jefferson did believe in the plain people and favored a government getting as close to the people as possible, and Hamilton thought the people incapable of the science of ruling, and favored a governing class and a strong central government. He was closer to a monarchical form, Jefferson closer to a democratic form. In fact, neither of these men discovered any new ideas or principles; but Jefferson in his own way announced some of the fundamental doctrines accepted in England and France and wherever the people had struggled for liberty against a nobility or governing class.

+

The two great democratic general principles were and are and always will be:

First, Equal opportunity for all, special privileges to none.

Second, That government is best which governs least—that is to say, which interferes the least with individual enterprise and individual liberty.

From the second of these two principles come two others:

(a) That every man, so long as he is peaceable and does not invade the equal rights of others, has an inalienable right to regulate his own affairs, his habits, his pleasures, his religion, and all other things belonging to his own life, and for even a majority of his fellow citizens to de-

prive him of this right is as much a tyranny as if it were the act of a despot.

(b) That each locality must be left to regulate its own affairs, not interfered with by the general government.

Thus it will be seen that if a man be truly a Democrat, he must attack every special privilege and try to give an equal opportunity to all.

+

Special privileges are known to exist in the three great domains which embrace every source of wealth and every aspect of society:

First, Special privileges in land.

Second, Special privileges in money.

Third, Special privileges in existing power created by particular laws, such as the protective tariff and public-service corporations.

All things come from the land. Commerce and manufacture are applications of labor to the products of the land, and from land and labor comes all wealth.

So whoever has a special privilege created by law in land, and in those engines of commerce, money and transportation, or whoever has the special privilege of taxing the people, really has all labor working for him. Hence it is, there are a few richer than they deserve, and so many poorer than they deserve; for it must be plain that the poverty which comes from bad habits is not the only nor the most common poverty.

The monopoly in land is created and protected by the paper title of the old feudal days by which a man can hold land for speculation and neither use it himself nor permit others to use it. Thus babes unborn will come into a world pre-empted and secured before they drew breath.

There are two remedies proposed for this: one is to make title depend on actual use and occupation of the land; the other is the single tax.* But the proposition now to be put is that no man can be a true, consistent Democrat and favor this special privilege and denial of equal opportunity. Some remedy must be found, and found by the true Democrats.

Money is the blood of commerce. It is an absolute necessity, and the control of it is the control of all industry. The rate of interest depends on the demand for money. With plenty of money interest is low.† Money is of two kinds—money of actual value, as gold and silver; money of cred-

*See editorial note (first subdivision) at end of this article.

†See editorial note (second subdivision) at end of this article.

it or representative value, as bank notes. During the civil war, in order to force a market for the government bonds, a law was passed taxing any bank ten per cent. which issued bank notes on any other security than government bonds. This gave a monopoly to national banks, which exists now. In fact, there are many bonds other than United States bonds which are just as good and safe for the purpose of securing an issue of bank notes—in fact, better, as they represent accumulated wealth and not a debt, as do government bonds. The strength of government bonds is in the power of taxation. Every bank should have an equal opportunity to issue its bank notes secured by such good and sufficient security as may be declared by a general law, and under a general supervision alike to all.

The tariff is really a tax levied on the consumer for the special privilege of the protected manufacturer. Hamilton frankly called the protective tariff a bonus given to encourage infant industries. It is a violation of the democratic principle, special privilege to none, and always was. It is an interference by government with the freedom of commerce and the right of the consumer to buy where he can buy cheapest. It has helped create the trusts and as a special privilege should be attacked by every consistent Democrat.

Every true Democrat will also declare railroads and public service corporations to be trustees for the people, and that they hold their special privilege on express condition of a performance of the trust, that is to say, to give an equal service to all at an equal and fair rate. And having no vested right in the franchise, which is the gift of the people in trust; and no vested right in the right of way, which is the public soil occupied for a public use, on violation of its trust the corporation can be turned out of control by payment (at most) for those things actually created by the corporations—rails, ties, rolling stock, etc.

✱

The foregoing shows the principal denials of equal opportunity which exist by law, and which every Democrat who truly understands his creed is bound to oppose. But so long as these special privileges exist, making plutocratic barons of a few men, and practical slaves of the laboring masses, other violations of the democratic doctrine of the greatest possible individual freedom and the least possible interference by government, will of necessity occur. Such, for example, as laws regulating child labor, eight-hour laws, laws regulating working hours for miners, locomotive engineers, and so on.

If the masses were economically free as they would be under democratic principles fully applied, so that there were no special privileges anywhere, they could take care of themselves. They would not be as now slaves to capital. No man prefers to work ten hours a day, or to set his little child to work. It is necessity which compels all this, and the necessity arises because of the special privileges which give the bulk of the wealth of the country to a few. Abolish all these special privileges, and there will be room for all, enough for all. Labor will take care of itself when it is really free, and the sources of wealth, land and money† are not by law specially privileged to a few.

The interferences by government in the hours of labor belong to the economic side, and arise from necessity. Under our present economic conditions labor is powerless to help itself, but prohibition, local option,** Sunday laws, etc., are very different. They belong to the domain of personal habits or morals, and no necessity for them exists. The real test is whether law seeks to protect the health and earning capacity of those who are not yet sufficiently economically free to protect themselves, or whether it tries to regulate the habits of individuals, or a man's private morals. If the former, it must be justified for the present on the plea of necessity, till labor is free enough to protect itself. If the latter, it is wholly unjustifiable as an unnecessary interference in individual freedom.

Under the democratic doctrine every family and every man should be free to take care of himself, and it is against true democratic doctrine to prohibit those who can control themselves in order to try and save by force of law a few who cannot control themselves.

The true democratic principle is to try each case on its own merits and not legislate against all because of the fault of some. A bad saloon should be suppressed as a nuisance or its license revoked. If saloons are objectionable in a neighborhood, so are livery stables, and there is no difference in principle in prohibiting livery stables in a certain district and in prohibiting saloons; no difference in prohibiting baseball on Sunday or theaters on Sunday, than in prohibiting church on Sunday. Each interferes with the right of the individual to decide all questions of his own morals for himself. The fact that the intention is a good one, viz.: to save men from getting

†See editorial note (third subdivision) at end of this article.

**See editorial note (fourth subdivision) at the end of this article.

drunk or to save them from bad company on Sunday, does not alter the principle, and every consistent Democrat must stand by the full logic of his principles, that it is better some neighborhood be intruded on by a saloon or a baseball ground or a beer garden, or that some people go to theaters on Sunday instead of church, rather than to give up the precious principle of personal liberty in all personal matters. When any man or any business becomes offensive or a nuisance, he or it can be specially proceeded against on that ground.

*

In conclusion: If you are for the masses of the people, if you are against all special privilege in every form and wherever found, if you truly want to have as an actual fact equal opportunity for all in all the things of this life (land, money, commerce), if you believe personal liberty is better than goodness by force of law, if you believe that the true science of government is to keep peace and order and that government must everywhere and at all times and in all things be kept down to the very least possible interference with men or business, if you believe in local self government and not government by bureaus and commissions in Washington, if you believe dependent colonies and a large military and naval force to maintain them (all supported by the taxpayer) is a violation of personal liberty and of that truth that "governments are founded on the consent of the governed"—then you should be a Democrat, and not only vote the ticket, but preach its doctrines. If you do not believe in those principles, or are not willing to carry them to their full logical conclusion, then you may consistently be a Republican or a Socialist (this is not said offensively, of course), but you are not yet a democratic Democrat.

C. E. S. WOOD.

[Notwithstanding divergence of view in some particulars, the general principles of the foregoing article and their practical application in most respects are so entirely in harmony with the editorial policy of *The Public* that we use the article as an editorial, contenting ourselves with calling attention to the points of divergence without elaborate argument. (1) We regard the single tax, and titles to land dependent on actual use and occupation, as the same remedy and not as different remedies for land monopoly, the single tax being a method for making the competitive impulse automatically operative in causing the practical abandonment of all titles except those dependent on occupation and use and for making these secure. (2) We do not think that the control of money controls all industry, nor that the rate of interest is dependent on the relative supply of money. We think that great volumes of

exchanges could be freely made without money, and that interest springs from the relation of the element of time to the production of consumable objects. (3) Neither do we regard money as a source of wealth; our view being that land is the sole source of wealth and labor its sole producer, actual money being only a medium of exchange, and money terms (often confused in thought with actual money) mere symbols for the comparison of values. (4) By "local option" is evidently meant those laws which leave to localities the legal right, free from State interference, to determine whether or not to allow the use of liquor as a beverage within their boundaries. This seems to us democratic so far as the State is concerned. For the majority of a "local option" locality to prohibit liquor might be undemocratic, but this does not seem to us to be true of the law referring the question to the people of the locality instead of having it arbitrarily determined by superior legal authority.—Editor of *The Public*.]

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Wednesday, May 16.

President Roosevelt and the Railroad-Rate Bill.

The acquiescence of President Roosevelt and his supporters (p. 129) in the so-called Allison amendment to the railroad-rate bill, which would allow unlimited review by the courts of rate regulation fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a concession to the railroad interests which he had previously opposed, raised a storm in the Senate.

*

Premonitions of this storm appeared on the 11th, when Senators Bailey and Rayner accused the President of vacillation. Senator Rayner said that Senator Aldrich and his associates had tricked the President with the so-called Allison amendment, and while he would not imply that the President had walked into the trap, he was bound to acknowledge that President Roosevelt is so constituted he cannot look at a trap without fooling with the spring.

*

On the 12th the storm broke. Senator Tillman, contrary to his custom, read a paper on the floor of the Senate, in which he charged the President, inferentially, with bad faith. The paper as it appears in the Congressional Record of May 12 at page 6973, states in substance that—

Senator Tillman was informed, March 31, 1906, by ex-Senator William E. Chandler of New Hampshire, that President Roosevelt had sent Chandler a note requesting his presence at the White House that evening; that Chandler obeyed the call, and the President told him he de-