

mortal words to the Mayor of Atlanta, "War is Hell." Second, his refusal of repeated overtures to run for president, when he would unquestionably have been elected. And third, when at Louisville they greeted him with "Marching through Georgia," the General raised his arm to still the band, and then said, "Friends, we are not 'marching through Georgia' any more; the war is over."

I knew the General long and well, and I think any of these things constituted a better title to fame than the "March to the Sea."

It may be interesting to mention that General Sherman told me during the last years of his life that he did not consider General Grant a great general; that in strategy his opponent, Robert E. Lee, was far superior to him; but that Grant's great strength was, that after a victory, when another man would want to rest on his laurels, or after a defeat, when another would want to rest his demoralized army, Grant's first question was, "When can we attack again?"

As General Sherman said, "He always wanted to get at 'em." There is a moral in all this for us—the man that knew that war was hell, the man that had no personal ambition, the man that desired peace, saw the greatness and the efficiency of keeping everlastingly at it, even in the thing of which he did not approve.

How much more inspiration to strenuous work should we have, who have the righteous conquest of the world before us?

+ + +

## DEFENSE OF PEOPLE'S POWER.

Summary of Senator Bourne's Reply in the Senate,  
August 5, 1911, to Senator Sutherland's Attack  
on Popular Government on the Admission  
of Arizona.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Sutherland] opposes the Initiative, Referendum and Recall provisions of the Arizona Constitution. To their advocates he applies the words "insurgent soothsayers," "irresponsible balloonatics," "political quacks," "political zealots," "self-constituted reformers," "false pilots," "arrant knaves," "visionaries," "dreamers," and "demagogues." Calling names is the resort of men who have no better argument. I will not reply to attempted ridicule. It is as foreign to my talents as it is obnoxious to my taste. Sneers are not argument; ridicule is not logic.

The Senator's assertion that those who endorse Woodrow Wilson's recent utterances in favor of the Initiative and Referendum are "appealing from Philip sober to Philip drunk." No, they are appealing from Wilson ignorant of politics, to Wilson wise and honest and courageous. Governor Wilson's successful efforts for the regeneration of his State make him safe from the criticisms

of those of us who have less of achievement to our credit.

I believe in truly representative government. It is not a pure democracy that we are arguing for. But under the political system which has been built up, our governments are not truly representative and will not be until the people have the power to make them so. The Initiative and Referendum supersede no State legislature; they merely provide the people a means of securing desired laws which legislatures refuse to enact, and of defeating undesired laws which legislatures do enact.

Says Mr. Sutherland: "Whenever our present form of representative government proves ineffective or works badly, the fault is not with the machine, but with those who are operating it. The remedy is for the people to exercise more care in selecting operating agents." But the people have long tried this remedy. They will now try changing the machinery by providing a few new levers, drive wheels and brakes. The most important difference between the views of the Senator and my own is clear: He believes the machine is all right, but the fault lies with the people; I believe the people are all right, but the fault lies with the machine.

I believe in a direct primary, including a popular expression of choice for Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. Any man who was competent to choose between Mr. Taft and Mr. Bryan in the last election is competent to choose between Mr. Taft and Mr. La Follette in the coming primaries. By adoption of this system political bosses, backed by campaign contributors, will be deprived of the power to select candidates, and thus Presidents will be relieved of that embarrassing obligation which the nominee must feel toward those who have placed him in office.

The Senator said that "some people seem to imagine that by adding together a thousand individuals, none of whom has ever gone beyond the multiplication table, some strange and weird transmutation results by which the combined mass is enabled to work out the most difficult problems of Euclid." He was discussing the competency of the people to vote upon problems of government. I have not contended that problems of government should be solved by men of elementary education alone. The popular government idea contemplates that all voters shall participate. The technical work of drafting a measure should be performed by men of skill in that particular, but the people as a whole are the best judges of the principles involved and can be trusted to pass upon the merits. The welfare of States is safe from injury at the hands of men who have never gone beyond the multiplication table. The chief attention of Congress in recent years has been devoted to efforts to curb the rapacity of large busi-

ness interests, to regulate trusts, to control railroad rates, to prevent manufacture and sale of injurious food products, to prohibit corrupt use of money in elections and to simplify court procedure so that the results of litigation shall not depend upon which litigant has the greatest power of financial endurance. Evidently the government has more trouble with men who have gone beyond the problems of Euclid than it has with men who have stopped with the multiplication table.

The Senator from Utah says he favors popular election of Senators. At the first election after adoption of the Initiative and Referendum in Oregon, the people enacted a law under which we have chosen three Senators by popular vote, the legislature merely ratifying the popular choice. If the Senator really desires to secure popular election of Senators in his State, he should first secure the practical operation of the Initiative, after which absolutely nothing can stand in the way of popular election of Senators.

Hasty consideration of the wholesale bartering of votes in Adams County, Ohio, and Danville, Illinois, would lead to the belief that the people are unworthy of the elective franchise. Careful study and deduction demonstrate otherwise. Those voters had for years witnessed the operation of machine politics. They had only the opportunity to vote for one of two candidates, each nominated by political bosses. Self-respect was finally obliterated, honor blunted, moral fiber destroyed, selfishness intensified. They naturally concluded that they might as well benefit themselves for the day by taking the few paltry dollars for the surrender of what little valueless right they had, for sale of their votes was so much gained in cash without any loss in public service. While I would not say anything that could be construed as approval of the citizens who sold their votes, I can readily understand how they excuse themselves after witnessing the barter and sale of votes in legislative halls, and the use of patronage for the purpose of influencing votes in Congress. Two wrongs will not make a right, but those who condemn the barter and sale of votes among the people who have not gone beyond the multiplication table should be as loud in their denunciation of purchase and sale of votes among those who have mastered the problems of Euclid.

The people of Arizona would better lose Statehood than yield their right to control their State government. What a mockery it is to start a constitution with a preamble declaring: "We, the people of Arizona, grateful to Almighty God for our liberties," and then harbor for an instant the thought of surrendering or limiting that God-given liberty at the instance of any man who happens to occupy temporarily the office of President.

Nor do I see any reason why a man who occupies

a judicial position should be governed by laws and standards of public service different from those which apply to legislative or executive officers. Judges are but human. We sometimes elect legislators to the bench, send former judges to the legislature, and place judges in executive positions, even elevating them to the highest executive office in the land. A man does not change his standards of ethics when he changes his office. A man who is dishonest or incompetent in an executive or legislative office will as likely be dishonest or incompetent in a judicial office. He who would use his power as an executive in an improper manner or for an improper purpose, would exercise judicial power in the same way. In any branch of government he is a servant of the people, not their master; and he should be subject to dismissal by the people after fair opportunity to be heard upon his record. The people elect a judge because of anticipated good service, and they would recall him only for demonstrated bad service.

Like all other men in public life, judges are generally honest. A judge who will listen to popular clamor will also yield to the wishes and interests of a political boss. If the judge must be subject to influences controlling his election and retention, which presents the greater danger, the influence of popular will or the influence of the political boss? If the judiciary is above the influence of the political boss, it is certainly also above the influence of popular clamor, and the argument against the Recall falls to the ground.

Members of the Senate have the right to resign at will. If a Senator can be trusted to promote the public welfare by tendering his resignation or not tendering it, cannot the people of his State be trusted to promote the public welfare by recalling him or not recalling him, when the question is placed before them in lawful manner?

Area in square miles, commercial wealth, number of inhabitants and industrial development are all matters that should be taken into consideration when a Territory seeks admission to the Union as a State, yet these are relatively of slight importance as compared with the character of the people who make up the citizenship of the Territory. As to the character of the men who constitute the voting population of Arizona there can be no doubt. The records of two elections—first for the selection of delegates, and then for the ratification of the Constitution—leave no room for uncertainty. The people of Arizona are a thinking people. They are interested in the problems of government and are devoted to the advancement of general welfare. They have confidence in their own intelligence and their own ability to think and act for themselves; and they have too much independence to submit to dictation from others. They have the courage to assert themselves and the patriotism to sacrifice even Statehood, if necessary, rather than

yield their political principles. Their admission to all the privileges of American citizenship will be an honor to the Union; refusal to admit them would be a national disgrace.

\* \* \*

### THE APPEAL OF THE PEERS.

G. K. Chesterton in the *London Daily News* of January 15, 1910.\*

Would you call upon the people; in what ear shall it be told?  
 Call on God, whose name is pity, though our sins be very old.  
 Will you call on street and township? Who but you have made the smoke  
 Something heavier than a vapor, something sharper than a joke?  
 Who but you have taxed the townsmen of their tired and ugly tilth,  
 Who but you have made men forfeit for their right to live in filth?  
 Will you call on croft and village? On what village will you call,  
 That four centuries of your lordship has not left a tithe too small?  
 Hamlets breaking, homesteads drifting, peasants tramping, towns erased;  
 Lo! my Lords, we gave you England—and you gave us back a waste.  
 Yea, a desert labeled England, where you know (and well you know)  
 That the village Hampdens wither and the village idiots grow,  
 That the pride of grass grows mighty and the hope of man grows small.  
 Will you call on croft and village? Let the rabbits hear your call.  
 Will you call on crest and scutcheon? We might heed you if we knew  
 Even one gutter-thief whose thousands cannot cut his way to you—  
 If there lived on earth one upstart from whose filthy face you shrank,  
 We would hear, my Lords, more gravely, of the grace and scorn of rank.  
 Now, if in your mob of merchants, usurers, idlers, cads, you keep  
 One that did have Norman fathers; let your Norman fathers sleep.  
 Let God's good grass blow above them where their pointed pennons blew,  
 They were thieves and thugs and smiters; they were better men than you.  
 Will you call on cross and altar? and in God's name where were you  
 When the crashing walls of convents let the Tudor axes through?  
 Tell us of your deeds, Crusaders! Waken Ariosto's muse!  
 How you stood the Church's champions when the Church had land to lose—  
 You, the Russells, with the ashes of a hundred altars shod,

You, the Howards, with your wallets bursting with the gold of God,  
 Will you call on cross and altar—will you name the holy name?  
 No, by heaven, you shall not name it. Smite your very mouths for shame.  
 Would you call upon the people? Would you waken these things then?  
 Call on God, whose name is pity; do not ask too much of men.

\* \* \*

### SAMUEL C. ROGERS.\*



An old-time Singletax leader of Buffalo passed on when Samuel C. Rogers died. Always the picture of health, few of his friends knew of any change until they heard he had gone. A contemporary of his in the Singletax movement in Buffalo, F. P. Jones, writes of Mr. Rogers as "a kind man, a faithful friend, a good citizen, whom Buffalo Singletaxers will miss, but with whom he has left the consolation of a pleasant memory of years of affectionate association." Mr. Rogers was a mechanic and inventor of superior ability. "He had a positive genius," writes Mr. Jones, "for solving difficult problems in machine movement, and could get more work out of less metal than most mechanical inventors. The work which some of his simple-looking machines will do is said to be marvelous. And he was not selfish about his abilities, but was always ready, and without reward, to devote time and thought in assisting others to solve difficult mechanical problems. A generous, open-hearted, open-minded man, he found his greatest enjoyment in producing results, whether

\*Reprinted from *The Public* of January 28, 1910.

\*See *The Public* of July 14, page 660.