

Burton at Oakley.

EDITOR ADVOCATE:—Wednesday was a gala day for Oakley. Governor L. D. Lewelling came down from Winona in a buggy, and for two hours and fifteen minutes he expounded People's party principles to more than 500 people of all political parties. It was the largest gathering of people ever held in Oakley. Mr. Hendee was on hand and got quite a number of subscribers for the ADVOCATE. O. L. Smith was here also and made one of his characteristic speeches, and people for the time forgot the failure of crops and drouth, as everyone seemed to be happy.

But the day came to an end as good things will, and the next day the g. o. p.'s had Ralph Burton here, and there were about 150 people out to hear him, of which about one-half were Populists. This shows the g. o. p.'s will not come out to hear anyone, not even their own speakers, but after Mr. Burton had got through villifying Governor Lewelling and the Populist party among other things he said: "There is not enough gold and silver to do the business of the country, and the republican party made paper money and they made laws making every dollar of it as good as a gold dollar or a silver dollar." And no one asked why the soldier at the close of the war had to give \$2.50 of that paper money for a gold dollar when it was as good as a gold dollar itself. Yet both are true. When it was in circulation among the people it took \$2.50 to buy a gold dollar. Yet the soldier had to accept his \$13 or \$16 per month in paper, after he had been promised gold by that same party.

The government bought all her supplies and paid for them with this sort of paper money, and the common people had to accept that or nothing; but the man who had money enough to buy government bonds could take his gold dollar and buy \$2.50 of the paper, and then invest it in a bond calling for \$2.50 of coin. So, you see, Mr. Burton told you the truth when he said they made laws making it as good as a gold dollar or a silver dollar; and then by the demonetization of silver they have made them even better than the silver dollar, but not until they were in the hands of the bondholder or money gambler.

And there was no law making any except the first 60 million dollars as good as coin, until all but about 346 million dollars had been converted into coin bonds and destroyed, and we are paying interest on the bonds now, instead of having that money, which was as good as gold, to pay our debts with; and the fact that 346 million dollars was by the law of 1875 made as good as coin (even for the poor people) is proof positive that it all could, for the same backing was behind it that is back of the bonds issued in its stead.

Mr. Burton also said, in answer to the question of the Thomas county representative, on the contraction of the currency, when cited to ex-Senator Plumb's statement on contraction, "there was no truth in it, no more than in yours" (the Thomas county man), but nevertheless I would like for you to publish what Mr. Plumb said on contraction, and also that part of Mr. Plumb's letter to you written in April or May, 1890, when you asked him in regard to the prospects of having any of the demands of the people known as the St. Louis demands enacted into law, for I think the people yet have as much faith in the truth and wisdom as set forth by Senator Plumb as by Mr. Burton.

E. A. MELLON.
Oakley, Kas.

[We regret that the letter of Senator Plumb above referred to has been mislaid and cannot be found.—ED.]

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE OMAHA PLATFORM.

NOT PATERNALISM, BUT FRATERNALISM.

By G. C. Clemens.

PART I.

IS PROGRESS IN GOVERNMENT IMPOSSIBLE?

The world advances, and in time outgrows
The laws that in our fathers' days were best.
—LOWELL.

As viewed by statesmen, leading politicians and editorial writers, government is an ancient hand-organ, into which its antediluvian manufacturers put certain tunes which must never be changed. It ceaselessly grinds out the Tariff schottische, the Gold-Silver-and-Parity waltz, the Revenue polka, the exhilarating gallop—"Our Foreign Relations," and the soothing measures of "After Us the Deluge." And heretofore all political contests have been waged over the single, mighty issue, "Who shall turn the crank?" Whenever, growing tired of the endless monotony, the people have demanded a change of program, they have been assured that the hand-organ was all right, that the trouble was with the unskilled or negligent wretch who was grinding the machine; but no matter how often the operator has been changed, suffering humanity's ears have still been greeted with the same old tunes which were doubtless popular with their progenitors some centuries before the flood.

At last a party has arisen to demand a more radical change; which says to the people, "Let us remodel the old organ somewhat, so as to adapt it to modern music, and put into it an entirely new set of tunes. Let us substitute for this antiquated noise the beautiful strains of 'The Earth Was Made for All,' and 'All Men Are Brothers Now,' and the grand hallelujah chorus, 'Poverty Is No More.'" But the champions of prehistoric melody exclaim in horror, "The impious innovators are going to change our consecrated tunes and even overhaul the sacred machine! Let us redeem the holy noise-box from the blasphemous wretches."

The world in modern times has witnessed marvelous change. There has been phenomenal progress in every department of knowledge and of life. Steam and electricity have bridged oceans and made continents shrink till all people of all nations are next-door neighbors; the invention of labor-saving machinery has made the slave an incumbrance, and by its increase of productive power has virtually multiplied the human race; isolated China has thrown open her ports to the commerce of the world; the steamboat has been seen on the fabled Nile; railroad construction pushes onward toward the northern regions of eternal ice; sons and daughters of the Orient make out their curious wash-bills in American cities, and the erst wild Indian plays base-ball and sings, plays the piano, reads essays and delivers orations at college commencements; education has been revolutionized; the insane, formerly treated as social enemies, are kindly cared for and restored to reason; the mutes, formerly treated as public nuisances, are gathered into schools and even taught to speak; philanthropy pleads for the criminal as the victim of heredity or of social conditions, and prisons are more humane to-day than schools for children were once; even religion has experienced a development man-ward so remarkable that, last year, all the once warring and persecuting creeds, cults and sects of the whole earth met harmoniously at Chicago in a "World's Parliament of Religion;" everywhere, in everything, in all institutions, great progress has been made—*save in government alone*. That ancient machine remains unchanged in a world of change. The ancients had monarchies and republics; so have we. The ancient governments never appealed to the reason or the heart to secure obedience, but always and only to fear. The same policy is pursued to-day. The ancient statesmen were busied with grave questions of tariff and "parity," while the people clamored for bread. Our statesmen are busy with the same questions under the same circumstances now. The ancients settled questions of right by killing each other in war. So do the nations of to-day. Under the ancient governments all wealth concentrated in the hands of the governing few, while the millions delved and starved. Precisely the same conditions exist under our modern governments, too. It was the old theory that the rich should govern, the poor obey, and that the starving poor should venerate as sacred the laws made by the rich. Our government operates on the same theory still. In all former times, under all governments, the poor rebelled at last and redistributed the national wealth. Our statesmen say, by their conduct, at least, that our government must wait helpless and supine till Justice come with the same bloody hands again. All life has changed; society has changed; customs, ideas, feelings, sentiments have changed; trade, commerce and agriculture have changed; the entire industrial system has changed. Can we live on with the same old notions and

machinery of government invented for use in barbaric ages by masters over slaves? Can twentieth-century civilization thrive under the same governmental contrivances ancient Babylon employed? Shall everything else on earth be revolutionized and improved to suit the age and government stand still? Was the last word of statesmanship spoken by Pericles or by Tarquin centuries before the dawn of the Christian Era? For more than eighteen hundred years ideas concerning man's relations and duties to man—ideas the very reverse of those which had always hitherto prevailed—ideas which involve the most radical changes in the very structure of society and the principles of government—have been winning their way into the minds and the hearts of civilized men; and is government, nevertheless, to undergo no change?

I hope I write for enlightened readers, who will be ready to believe that government should be open to improvement to suit the altered times in which we live, and who are prepared to say, as Lowell makes Cromwell say before the English revolution of 1641:

"The time is ripe, and rotten-ripe, for change;
Then let it come; I have no dread of what
Is called for by the instinct of mankind;
Nor think I that God's world will fall apart
Because we tear a parchment more or less."

PART II.

PATERNALISM.

Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law.
—GOLDSMITH.

The theory which has hitherto prevailed is, that government is an organization instituted primarily for the purpose of protecting property against the propertyless; the rich against the poor.

This has been affirmed by authors who wrote for the rich, and who cannot be accused of having Populist leanings. In the very year in which our forefathers put forth the Declaration of Independence, Adam Smith published in Scotland his great work, "The Wealth of Nations." In that work, published at a time when it was not supposed the poor were likely to read a book of that kind, he thus explained the origin and purpose of government:

Wherever there is great property, there is great inequality. For one very rich man, there must be at least five hundred poor, and the affluence of the few supposes the indigence of the many. The affluence of the rich excites the indignation of the poor, who are often both driven by want, and prompted by envy, to invade his possessions. It is only under the shelter of the civil magistrate that the owner of that valuable property, which is acquired by the labour of many years, or perhaps of many successive generations, can sleep a single night in security. He is at all times surrounded by unknown enemies, whom, though he never provoked, he can never appease, and from whose injustice he can be protected only by the powerful arm of the civil magistrate constantly held up to chastise it. The acquisition of valuable and extensive property, therefore, necessarily requires the establishment of civil government. Where there is no property, or at least none that exceeds the value of two or three days' labour, civil government is not so necessary. * * * Civil government, so far as it is instituted for the security of property, is in reality instituted for the defense of the rich against the poor, or of those who have some property against those who have none at all. (Book V, Chapter I.)

In the convention which framed the constitution of the United States several debates occurred which brought out expressions from the delegates, all men of property, concerning the purpose for which government was instituted. Here are some of those expressions gleaned from Bancroft's "History of the Constitution:"

Gouverneur Morris—"Not liberty, property is the main object of society. The savage state is more favorable to liberty than the civilized, and was only renounced for the sake of property."

Rutledge—"Property is certainly the principal object of society."

King—"Property is the primary object of society."

Madison, speaking of the senate—"It will guard the minority who are placed above indignance against the agrarian attempts of the ever-increasing class who labor under all the hardships of life, and secretly sigh for a more equal distribution of its blessings. In future times, a great majority of the people will not only be without property in land, but property of any sort."

Sherman—"The people should have as little to do as may be about the government."

Hamilton—"Gentlemen say we need to be rescued from the democracy. But what are the means proposed?"

Gerry—"I fear a civil war. In Massachusetts there are two parties: one devoted to democracy, the worst, I think, of all political evils."

Perhaps, these quotations may throw some light on the question which some puzzles people—why there is such a marked difference between our government and the kind of government alluded to in the opening paragraph of the Declaration of Independence; but they will at least show that the framers of our Constitution understood that they were men of means framing a government for people of means over the poor.

John Adams was the second president of the United States. In 1778 he published a work entitled a "Defense of the American Constitution." Here are two choice extracts from that work:

The people in all nations are naturally divided into two sorts, the gentlemen and the simple men, a word which is here chosen to signify the common people. By the common people we mean laborers, mechanics, husbandmen, and merchants in general, who pursue their occupations and industry without any knowledge in liberal arts and