

progress in public opinion. They go to show that in this country the principle of fundamental democracy, which means fair play all around, is seething in the public mind.

That this is the condition of things is implied by the fact that Roosevelt and his party are listened to eagerly. It is also implied by the behavior of the Republican party which Roosevelt has left. It is implied again by the fact that the Democratic party is more democratic, fundamentally, than it has been since it elected Andrew Jackson to the Presidency some 80 years ago. It is implied by the whole political break-up, about which every good citizen all over the United States is thinking now and thinking hard.

But our country is not the only storm center of fundamental democracy. That principle is at work everywhere. When we read about world politics as we read about our own politics, or about sports, we exclaim again and again, "What a little world this big world is!"

Fundamental democracy has different ways of working. Yet once to know it is to be able to recognize it in its working clothes always and everywhere. If you believe in the Declaration of Independence, where it says that "all men are created equal"—which means that the men and women of every race and class should have equal rights—if you are in that spirit when you read the political news of the world, you know that there is nothing strange in the politics we are having in this country now; nor in the governmental experiments we are making or trying to make; nor in the necessity for them.

We may be ahead of other countries in some things. Or a little behind in other things. And surely there is great variety of detail. But the spirit of fundamental democracy is in them all. From the Northwest Side of Chicago, where the burning question may be street improvements, or some other peaceable proposal for local betterment, to far-away places where struggles for fair-play may still cost blood, the human race is working out its age-old problem of how to live and prosper in good fellowship and with equal rights. That is to say, mankind is everywhere working out into practical life, the everlasting principle of fundamental democracy.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

A LIBERAL CRISIS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Grasmere, England, August 19, 1912.

The Liberal success at the by-election at Hanley has been followed by two reverses, one at Crewe, where the Tory candidate benefited by the Liberal-Labor conflict, and the other at North-West Manchester, where a Liberal majority of 445 was turned into a Tory majority of 1,202.

Mr. Murphy, who fought the Crewe division for the Liberal Party, was heralded as a champion of the taxation of land values policy, but failed to make an aggressive campaign on that issue.

The Liberal candidate for North-West Manchester, uncertain of his position on the land question, declined to pledge himself to support the Memorial

presented by the Land-Tax group in Parliament to the Prime Minister and Mr. Lloyd George, and signed by 177 Liberal and Labor members. He contented himself with an endorsement of the vague land nationalization programme and confined his attention to a defense of Government measures, relying on the historic Freetrade sentiment of Manchester to carry him in. The result is viewed with equanimity by all those whose Liberalism transcends mere party lines.

The situation is thus summed up by R. L. Outhwaite, M. P., in a letter to the "Daily News and Leader":

"When the vacancy for North-West Manchester was announced, the land values men who had carried North-West Norfolk, Holmfirth and Hanley, and, coming in at the end, had averted a humiliating result at Crewe, were prepared to rally to the aid of the Liberal candidate. The division provides such object-lessons in the need for land value taxation and rating reform that, once the question had been raised, the Tory candidate would have found it impossible to talk Insurance Act. Free-trade and the Taxation of Land Values versus Tariff Reform would within 24 hours have been the issue. But the candidate, his backers and the 'Manchester Guardian' decided to fight on a negative policy and to angle for the votes of Free-trade Unionists, and so the land values men decided to stand aside. Precisely the same thing happened at the South Manchester by-election, and the Government has received two staggering blows in the citadel of Free-trade which are the prelude to the loss of Lancashire unless different tactics are adopted. My object in writing is to point out that the land values propagandists have determined to pursue a definite policy. They know that only the taxation of land values can effectively rally the democratic forces. After long years of officially disregarded works they have come into their own. During the last four years, largely owing to the generosity of Mr. Joseph Fels, they have spent some \$150,000 in educational work, and they are not going any longer to act as vote-catchers for candidates who only give lip-service to their cause. When a Liberal candidate determines to fight on the Memorial policy which has been adopted by the party organizations of England, Scotland and Wales, every effort will be made to aid him against Tory or Socialist opponent. I believe that only in this way can Liberalism be saved, and that, if party organizers do not quickly realize what it is the electorate wants and put forward candidates to advocate it, the Government will suffer defeat after defeat and be driven from office before the great measures it has in hand can reach the statute book."

F. W. GARRISON.



WHAT SHALL WE DO IF WE LOSE?

Warren, Ohio.

"She never knew defeat. When that happened which others called defeat, she was wont to think of it merely as the establishment of a mile-post to indicate the progress which had been made, and she never doubted that victory was just ahead." So spoke Carrie Chapman Catt of Susan B. Anthony in her eulogy of the departed leader. What was true

of Miss Anthony is true of the rest of us—not because we are great, as Miss Anthony was great, but because we are instruments in the working out of a natural law. "Liberty means justice, and justice is the natural law." It cannot be defeated. It is doomed to success.

The forces of evil may prevail to the extent of defeating Amendment 23 on September 3, but the righteousness of the measure is not thereby defeated. Its operation is only deferred. No matter what the result of the count of votes, this campaign is already won in its deeper meaning, in its spiritual significance. "The chief value of any social movement, perhaps, lies in the influence it exerts on the minds and hearts of the men and women who engage in it."

Recently a group of hard-worked and pretty tired campaigners were discussing election day chances and one of them said: "Weil, whether we win or not, it has all been worth while. I am more than compensated for everything in finding the wonderful women I have found—women shut up in back rooms of miserable houses on side streets, of whose existence I had never dreamed. O, humanity is so wonderful and so splendid."

Another worker writes in a private letter: "At first, I was not for it with every bit of me, but now everything I do is colored by this wonderful movement. It has turned my life from tragic suffering and loneliness into one of such active service that I have no time to remember the sorrow. I feel like telling everyone I meet how marvelous it is and what it has meant to me. I am continuously glad to be here to serve. I am glad that I am a very humble person in the ranks so my anti-friends can see that it isn't the importance of myself that counts, but just what I can do for the cause, no matter how small. If we lose, which we won't, I hope my income will then be at my disposal so that I can give up my earning occupation and devote all my time to this until we win. If only the bridge-playing, party-going women could see what it might mean to them—the enlargement of horizons, the splendid growth of the impersonal spirit and the elimination of all pettiness and intolerance! God may have looked on man and thought he was good, but if he is looking on woman now, he must be amazed at the result of his handiwork."

Why, isn't it perfectly plain that we have already won? Think of what we have seen accomplished in these few months of consecrated effort! Think of the tremendous asset in this new sympathy of woman for woman, in the solidarity of our forces, in the intellectual and spiritual awakening occasioned by this work!

Whether we shall "initiate" under the Initiative and Referendum (if it becomes a law), whether we shall appeal through the legislature as of old, whether we shall work to defeat our enemies and elect our friends to office, are matters of detail. In the event of an adverse decision on September 3rd, nobody knows what our policy will be, but that the work itself will not be permitted to stop, everybody knows.

Sentiment, you say? Yes, we admit it. Of a piece with that sentiment which called the world

into being, set the stars in the firmament and keeps the planets spinning in space.

ELIZABETH J. HAUSER.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, August 27, 1912.

Political Corruption.

The political corruption attending the Presidential election of 1904 through enormous campaign contributions from corporations, has again been thrust upon public attention and is now under investigation by the Senate. [See vol. xiv, p. 1310; current volume, page 27.]



This phase of the corrupt character of that campaign comes out through the publication by Hearst's Magazine of a private letter. It is one of a collection of private letters of an incriminatory nature which have in some mysterious manner come under Mr. Hearst's control. John D. Archbold, political manipulator for the Standard Oil trust, is the writer of the letter. It bears the date of October 13, 1904. It was written to Boies Penrose, who then was and still is a United States Senator from Pennsylvania. Following is the letter:

Personal.

October 13, 1904.

My Dear Senator:

In fulfillment of our understanding, it gives me pleasure to hand you herewith certificate of deposit to your favor for \$25,000 and with good wishes I am yours truly,

JNO. D. ARCHBOLD.

To Hon. Boies Penrose, 1331 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Senator Penrose was the Pennsylvania member of the Republican national committee in the campaign of 1904. But as he had also been a member, and Archbold had urged him to take the chairmanship, of the United States Industrial Commission, the Pittsburgh Leader (issue of August 20, 1912) charged that—

Penrose was paid this \$25,000 after the report of the Industrial Commission had been submitted to John D. Archbold and approved by him previous to its being made public.



Rising in the Senate on the 21st to a question of personal privilege, Senator Penrose replied to charges growing out of the Archbold letter. He said that—

the letter, if genuine, must have been in Hearst's