

"Ah, a male scold," said the Reader of Novels, readily.

"He was very fond of children."

"What's that?" said the Reader of Novels, scenting something incongruous.

"One time his heart was set to murder his brother, and only his brother's fight prevented his death."

"A thug," said the Reader of Novels, always to himself.

"He denied himself all that makes life worth living in order to make the last days of his mother comfortable, and, moved by a good impulse, he divided the estate with his brother, although it had all been left to him."

"The same man?" said the Reader of Novels, dumfounded.

"He did a despicably mean act in business and was never, sorry for it."

"Ah, I thought so," said the Reader of Novels. "His true character is coming out."

"He told a vulgar story to a friend and both laughed at the undoubted humor of it."

"Ah, ha!" said the Reader of Novels. "He is being drawn a little truer to life."

"He was deeply moved by a spiritual poem and appreciated it so sincerely that he wrote it out and carried it with him, and finally learned it by heart and tried to govern his life according to its precepts."

"The deuce he did!" said the Reader of Novels, incredulously.

"He told another vulgar story."

"He'd better have given up shamming," said the Reader of Novels.

"He drank more than was good for him and was seen in a condition of inebriety by young people, who had respected him as a governor of the church."

"Of course," said the Reader of Novels. "He is getting truer and truer to his character."

"He established a club to which young men were welcome and at which no intoxicating liquors were sold, and said in all sincerity that he believed immoderate drinking to be a curse."

"The hypocrite," said the Reader of Novels.

"He voted the Republican ticket."

"Good," said the Reader of Novels, who was a Vermonter.

"He voted the Democratic ticket."

"Turncoat," said the Reader of Novels.

"He gave generously of his means to help a poor man who had been buffeted by the world, and spoke well of him when to do so exposed him to contumely."

"Who was this, anyhow?" said the Reader of Novels, more and more puzzled.

"He said malignant things behind a man's back, things that worked the man's downfall, although he never knew that."

"Pity he didn't. He would have exulted," said the Reader of Novels.

"He reproached a man in all sincerity for saying like things of another behind his back, and had a poor opinion of that backbiter from that time on."

"This is beyond me," said the Reader of Novels.

"He refused night after night to give up his seat in the cars to poor tired women, and at last gave his life to save a poor wretched Magdalen from death by fire."

At this point the Reader of Novels addressed the judge and said:

"What was this person, anyway?"

"He was a human being," said the judge, gravely. "There are many such."

"TO THE VICTOR BELONG THE SPOILS."

No one sentence is perhaps more famous or familiar than this is in the literature of politics. Ask a hundred men who is the author of it, and 99 will say Andrew Jackson. Yet Jackson never uttered it, and, in fact, repudiated its sentiment. Strange fatality, indeed, that "Jacksonian Democracy" should popularly be taken to include the practice of giving office as reward for political activity.

The real author of this phrase was William L. Marcy, a United States senator from New York, and it was used during a debate in the United States Senate on the confirmation of Martin Van Buren as minister to England. New York State politicians were the pioneers in this country of the "spoils system," and to this system Marcy and Van Buren were devoted. Van Buren was Jackson's secretary of state, and had been nominated by "Old Hickory" to be minister to the court of St. James. Van Buren had gained the enmity of a number of the leading senators, and when the Senate convened a determined and successful fight was made on his confirmation, only to result, as Benton said, in "breaking a minister and making a President;" for Van Buren succeeded Jackson. Marcy, in the course of his speech, said:

I know, sir, that it is the habit of some

gentlemen to speak with censure or reproach of the politics of New York. Like other States, we have contests, and, as a necessary consequence, triumphs and defeats. We have men of interprise and talents, who aspire to public distinction. It may be, sir, that the politicians of New York are not as fastidious as some gentlemen are as to disclosing the principles on which they act. They boldly preach what they practice. When they are contending for victory they avow their intention of enjoying the fruits of it. If they are defeated, they expect to retire from office; if they are successful, they claim, as a matter of right, the advantages of success. They see nothing wrong in the rule that

to the victor belong the spoils of the enemy.

With Democracy in the saddle in Cincinnati and having upwards of 4,000 offices that are the "spoils of the enemy," it will be a sad awakening for many a "worker" to learn that one of the great saints of the party has had words put in his mouth that he never uttered. Indeed, Prof. Sumner, in his "Life of Jackson," says, page 147:

It is a crude and incorrect notion that Jackson corrupted the civil service.

Jackson, when he took the Presidency, found, as he believed, that the departments were full of incompetent and corrupt men, and that Clay and Adams had demoralized the whole civil service so that many changes were absolutely demanded by the public welfare. No man was closer to Jackson than Amos Kendall, a member of the so-called "Kitchen Cabinet." He was the mouthpiece of the Jackson administration, and, writing to the editor of the Baltimore Patriot on March 24, 1829, he said:

The interests of the country demand that office shall be filled with men of business and not with babbling politicians; partisan feeling shall not enter here.

In fact, none of the "fathers of Democracy" seem to have believed in the doctrine contained in Marcy's declaration. Jefferson had these qualifications for office:

Is he honest? Is he capable? Is he faithful to the constitution?

During his eight years of service as President he made but 39 removals from office. Madison, in a debate on the President's sole power of removal, declared that if the President should remove any officer for any reason not connected with efficient service or character, he should be impeached. Madison, during eight years as President, made but five removals, and three of these were defaulters. Monroe, in eight years, made but nine removals from office. These are the "fathers."

Of later-day leaders, United States

Senator George H. Pendleton, of Ohio, was the most distinguished advocate of the merit system of the country. Grover Cleveland put it into practice. Tom L. Johnson declares it part of his creed. Thus does another historical superstition seem to vanish.—Alfred H. Henderson, in Cincinnati Times-Star.

THE LAW AS A MODERN CONVENIENCE.

The Prosperous city official paused to greet his fellow office-holder.

"What about your latest scheme," he asked, "to charge people 25 cents who stand in the shade of public buildings?"

"It's a long story," replied the fellow office-holder; "it worked all right though until the Daily Moon got out its injunction restraining me from using the sidewalk."

"That was bad."

"No; that was good, for it gave me a chance to get back at them. I got the court to grant me an order for the Moon to show cause why it should not be restrained from restraining me."

"Good for you!"

"No; that was bad for me. The proprietors of the Moon retaliated by mandamus me to withdraw my application for an order to show cause."

"Dear! Dear! What did you do then?"

"I withdrew it as instructed by the Court and then went to another judge, one of the faithful, and had the Moon's order vacated."

"You're all right!"

"No; I was all wrong. The Moon mandamus the Court for an order to show cause why its application for an injunction restraining me from exacting 25 cents of people who stand in the shade of public buildings should not be granted."

"Well! well! what will you do now?"

"I intend to mandamus the Courts to stop restraining me."

"That's the talk!"—Harry Hamilton, in Puck.

TOM L. JOHNSON ON THE HOPE OF DEMOCRACY.

An outline of the speech delivered by Tom L. Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland, at the testimonial dinner given on the 30th of November, 1905, to District Attorney Jerome, of New York, and to Mayor Weaver, of Philadelphia, by the City Club of New York.

My subject, "The City, the Hope of Democracy," is taken from the title of a book of the Hon. Frederic C. Howe.*

*Sold by The Public Publishing Co.

of Ohio. In this volume is presented the problem of the City and its solution. It describes the dangers that beset densely crowded centers, and fills us with well-grounded hope for their removal. The book is an inquiry into the causes of the corruption that produces misgovernment, and suggests the only way out—a free city, unhampered by State regulation; a city free to make mistakes, of course. The best way to know what to do is to learn by experience what not to do. Out of every mistake a free people will rise triumphant and stronger.

Our city governments show the conflict between two antagonistic forces, one in the direction of socialism, and the other in the direction of special privilege. Socialism would destroy individual enterprise. Privilege, in its struggle to protect its monopoly, destroys citizenship. Socialism would put industry and property in the hands of the government, and make it the sole employer of labor. Plutocracy, or conservatism, as special privilege delights to call itself, would keep all city enterprises in private hands for profit. These are the two extremes, and each must lead to destruction. We who favor municipal ownership of public service enterprises stand, as it were, between these two conflicting forces. We contend that public business only should be managed by the people, and that private business should always remain in private hands. These three schools of thought have been accurately described as Plutocracy, which advocates the private ownership of public business; Socialism, which favors the public ownership of private business, and Municipal Ownership, which demands the public ownership of public business.

What is it that stands mostly in the way of our cities becoming healthy, beautiful and full of public spirit? What are the forces back of the corrupt boss and petty grafter? Mr. Lincoln Steffens says, "Big business," and Frederic C. Howe says, "Big privilege;" but they really mean the same thing—unfair advantage of some kind. It is the corrupting influence of these owners of law-made advantages in an effort to preserve, enlarge or secure new privileges, that places great funds in the hands of corrupt bosses, or corrupted political parties.

In this process of city making which you are considering, what influence most baffles effort? It is the alliance of the keenest minds and the brightest intellects with our privileged corporations. This alliance is not, as is claimed by some, in order to keep

these enterprises out of politics; it is to keep bad men in politics, that larger profits may accrue to the owners of special privileges. The stockholders and investors in such enterprises find that their pecuniary interests lie in perpetuating the power of the boss.

But for the great profits that flow to them from grants of street railway and lighting franchises, these men would exercise their great influence to make our cities better, instead of, as now, to keep them bad. The greatest loss to the city is not the value of the franchise to its private owners, nor in loss of convenience or profit to the people; it is in the destruction of public spirit and civic virtue among the men who naturally belong in the ranks of those seeking to make this world a better world for all of us.

We hear on all sides that what we need is good government, the abolition of graft, the election of good men to office. At times we have examples of good government, of cities free from graft, and of good men in office; but without any marked change in our civic life, and certainly without any enduring evidence of improved conditions among the people. The truth is that we attach too much importance to merely good government, desirable as that is. It is the environment of the citizen that determines his usefulness, more than mere forms of government; and the environment of the citizen is more affected by economic conditions than by forms of law. Good government, no graft; good men will save money and enforce the law. But economic changes require the abolition of law-made advantage.

THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM

By HERMANN LIEB

An effective statement of the origin, history, and usefulness of The Initiative and Referendum and of their great importance in the self-government of American cities.

12mo, 178 pages, cloth, 75c., postpaid; paper, 40c., postpaid

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.
First National Bank Building . . . CHICAGO