

the King o' Lions had sailed all that distance to do some killin', not because he was hungry, but simply because he wanted to kill an' have some hides to adorn the floor o' his kingly den, then I would have been astonished. If you had told me that the Lion King had brought along his youngest cub to participate in the killin', an' lay in a few aristocratic human hides to show his prowess in the killin' line, I should have been more astonished, for I never heard about anything in the animal kingdom actin' that way, 'less it was a weasel. Most animals kill to satisfy their hunger, an' because they know no other way to satisfy it.' An', come to think about it, why should a sane an' reasonable human bein' want to load himself down with killin' machines, an' go out in the wilderness an' shoot down animals that are doin' no harm?

"Of course we start with the presumption that the man is sane an' reasonable. If we admit that he has homicidal, or circular, or some o' the other fashionable kinds of lunacy, we can understand why he delights in killin'. But there's a mystery concealed in the actions of a person who takes so much pains an' trouble to go to the wilderness to shoot wild animals. If the animals was injurin' the crops or makin' it dangerous for the killee in his own country, self-defense would be a reasonable excuse for the killin'; but you can't find such an excuse in the case of the mighty modern hunters. You can't find the excuse of hunger, although some of 'em turns a little ready money by sellin' the spoils. The natives o' the country where the wild beasts breed have not called on any of the big killers to go to their help. At least, the call hasn't been printed yet. Yes, sir-ee! It makes a man think sometimes when he reads about the natives of the countries where the wild beasts live that they would suffer a little less from the wild beasts than they do from the kind o' civilization that the hunters an' the diamond diggers an' the lawmakers bring along with 'em an' impose on the natives, without askin' their consent.

"Of course the men o' science that try to figure out the why is it, about everything, can demonstrate to our satisfaction that the big animals don't have much nerves an' no feelin' to speak of, an' that the killin' don't hurt 'em much, which may be true or may be jest a little untrue. But that ain't what bothers me. I want to know what it is in the man that makes him delight to kill. It would take a man a long time to make a reasonably respectable lookin' lion; an' the man never lived that could put that mysterious thing we call life into the best lookin' lion that could be made. If some feller should make an imitation that looked an' acted jest like a real lion, do you suppose the mighty hunters would travel round the earth to shoot an' destroy it? I think not. Now, if you can explain the impulse that

leads sane an' Christian men to enjoy the takin' o' life without any excuse, an' to enjoy the killin' jest because it is killin', you will give me a heap o' satisfaction.

"I never read about Christ loadin' up with destructive weapons an' goin' out to kill things jest for the fun of it. St. Paul was a strenuous sort of a man, an' we never read about him goin' out to do a little shootin' jest for the fun of it. We read about them goin' fishin', but that was because the hunger drove 'em to it. They made a livin' by it, an' as soon as they got the light o' the gospel in their brains, they cut out the fish, an' went out to catch men an' wean 'em from wrong-doin'.

"No! I ain't a bit astonished when I hear about the killin' o' things for fun. I'll be astonished when they quit killin'. After all, I 'spect it is better to kill the wild beasts than it is to capture 'em, an' shut 'em up in cages, an' treat 'em the way they do in the shows an' menageries. There's a whole lot o' things done by men, an' especially by white men, that could be done better if we could only make our Christianity a little more on the Christian pattern."

GEORGE V. WELLS.

+ + +

## THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM.

### An Effective Ally of Representative Government.

Lewis Jerome Johnson, Professor of Civil Engineering, Harvard University, in the *New England Magazine* for June.

Our fathers founded this government in order to secure for the people—all the people—the blessings of life, liberty, and happiness. They devised institutions and machinery for attaining this end.

Today, after the lapse of a century and a quarter, combinations of power, of financial, industrial, and even political power, have found intrenchment in these institutions in the face of which, for multitudes of our population, life is precarious, liberty practically despaired of, and happiness, except of a kind enjoyed by the Roman proletariat and the plantation slave, unknown. We wonder why. We know that no one would be more impatient of such conditions than our revolutionary forefathers, and no one more keen and resolute in seeking a remedy. Honor to their revered memory requires us to scrutinize their work, and modernize it if necessary, just as they modernized their inherited institutions.

Accordingly we turn first to the underlying spirit and purposes of our institutions. We find nothing to criticize, even after all this time. Even in this blasé age we are thrilled and inspired with a new enthusiasm by the ideals expressed by our fathers in founding this Republic. We quickly conclude we cannot hope to suggest improvements in this quarter.

We turn next to the details of their governmental machinery. Little of their industrial methods and institutions survives. Perhaps their political devices are now equally out of date. If they are, perhaps it is not too late to supplement or replace them with better. Let us see.

We come first to the legislative machinery. At the first glance we observe something peculiar. We find the law-making power entrusted to representative bodies, the personnel of which, so far as the party machines will permit, is under partial popular control, but the output of which is, to an astonishing degree, not under effective popular control at all. On reflection, it occurs to us that the predatory interests do not work on that principle. They seek to control results, and are quite indifferent to the names or professed opinions of the parties or men who actually deliver the goods. We realize that this is not only another instance of big business being wiser than the big, powerful, but at present dazed and more or less delirious public, but we surmise that there is a suggestion involved.

Further reflection and survey of the field convinces us that here is the loose screw of the mechanism, that whatever else need be done, and there may be much else, this glaring defect should be corrected at once, and furthermore that when corrected, the way will be open for the rest of the progress as soon as the public can be shown that it is good.

The problem is, then, how shall the public get effective control of results?

The answer is easy.

The public must do as the other, but smaller, corporations do, which are so skillfully run for private profit. It must adopt means for dictating and revising the policies of agents and representatives whenever it sees fit, expecting these representatives, however, to frame policies and produce acceptable results under broad, general instructions (constitutions), with a minimum of interference from higher authority.

The means to this end have already been devised and tested in actual practice and have met expectations. They are called the Initiative and Referendum, or combined in one term, Direct Legislation.

The Initiative enables the people to enact, by direct popular vote, desirable measures, ignored, pigeonholed, or defeated by their representatives. The Referendum is the power of veto, by direct popular vote, of acts of the representatives. Each includes, of course, suitable machinery for its safe and intelligent operation, which will be described below.

The Initiative and Referendum secure popular control over legislation. The former corrects sins of omission, the latter of commission.

They usually result, before being long in operation, in the establishment of the Recall, or the

properly guarded power of removal of unsatisfactory officeholders before the expiration of their terms. This adds popular power of removal to the already existing power of election, only it may extend to the incumbents of non-elective offices.

The Recall secures popular control over personnel.

The Recall, though sometimes, as in city charters, established contemporaneously with the Initiative and Referendum, and logically part of complete popular control, will not be discussed further here. It should be looked upon as one of the numerous desirable measures to which the Initiative would open the way, and may, more safely than the Referendum, be left to be taken as a second step.

With the Initiative and Referendum, then, and what they will secure, the people can control their own government, in cities, States, and nations, as effectively as the owners control a large private business, and with the better results to be expected in so far as honest public service is more ennobling than the pursuit of private profit or ambition.

The machinery of Direct Legislation, although not complicated, was not a possibility before the introduction of the modern means of spreading news and ideas by the telegraph, high-speed printing press and the railway. For the system presupposes not only means for quick returns from elections, but, even more important, it now presupposes an adequate system of providing each voter with the information he needs as a basis for his conclusions.

The Initiative is set in operation by volunteer groups of citizens, trade, labor, or political organizations, who draw up laws which they think good for themselves, or the public, or perhaps both. If they can get a certain moderate percentage of the voters of the city or State to sign a petition to that effect, the measure goes to the legislature for adoption without amendment or change of any kind, if the legislature is willing; or, if not, to be transmitted unchanged to the people for their decision. If the legislature thinks it can produce a better enactment in the same line it can draw it up and send it to the people with the other as a competing measure. The voters then choose which they prefer or reject both.

The Referendum, upon similar petition, usually by a somewhat smaller number of voters, calls to the popular tribunal acts of the representative body for veto or confirmation.

All this carries with it adequate and systematic means, independent of the newspapers, of furnishing each voter with the full text of the measures to be voted on, also the highly condensed form in which it will be printed on the ballot, an impartial statement of the reasons for and against each measure, and the names of those behind each call to popular action—also the provision of a suitable

amount of time for deliberation and discussion before the vote is taken. These are details which it has not been found difficult to meet in practice. In Oregon, this information goes eight weeks before election by mail to each voter in the form of a State document from the Secretary of State. The cost of this pamphlet is divided between the State and the interests who wish to insert arguments therein. Conciseness and sincerity of argument are secured by charging the contributors some sixty dollars per page. In cases of initiated measures, supporting arguments are accepted from none but duly accredited representatives of the friends of the measure, while any one who will pay the cost may insert arguments against such a measure, or on either side in a referendum case. In the election last June, when nineteen measures were acted upon by the electorate, the State pamphlet was a document of one hundred and twenty-five pages.

A feature to be observed at once in this system is the way it forestalls the misleading of voters by a subsidized press.

Further protection from false or misleading campaign literature was secured by a popular vote last June—part of a law of some twenty pages coming from the people by the Initiative—which provided a heavy penalty for circulating political literature without the names of its authors and publishers. This law also requires that such charges as any may wish to make against the character or motives of any candidate shall be submitted in person to the candidate assailed, in the exact form in which they are to be printed fifteen days before publication. If this is not done, all concerned in printing and circulating such charges, are punishable for criminal political libel. Space forbids going further into this matter, but the general scheme and its spirit may be gathered from the foregoing.

It is expected that popular voting will ordinarily take place only at regular elections.

Supplemented by the Initiative and Referendum, to serve as a permanent background, and for application when called for, the representative system will gradually but surely enter upon an era of honor and usefulness hitherto never surpassed and probably never equaled. Relieved of the unnatural excess of power under which they now stagger and fall, legislative bodies will cease to be attractive fields for bribery and secret influence. Log-rolling will greatly diminish. The power of bosses and rings will be undermined. Seats in the legislatures will then begin to be unattractive to grafters. At the same time they will be more attractive to high-minded, public-spirited citizens. There will be a fairer chance that a man clean when elected will stay clean. It will make it safe materially to reduce the size of legislatures and to diminish greatly the number of elective offices; we may reach the point of competing

successfully with the corporations in attracting the best young talent to our, the public's, service. It is believed that the practice of repeated re-elections will develop under this system here as it has in Switzerland and the New England towns. In the presence of Direct Legislation it is not necessary to defeat a good legislator to express disapproval of his work. The bad laws can actually be got rid of and the man retained. Thus real representative experts may gradually be developed.

In view of such undeveloped possibilities, it is beside the mark to wonder whether representative government is a failure. We begin to realize that it has not yet been fairly tried, or at least not in recent years. We realize that our legislators have been working under almost intolerable conditions. They have been continually under temptations that no ordinary man ought to be asked to face, and it is a tribute to human nature that so many of our legislators have stayed straight. Under the new conditions they will have all the power that is ever accorded to representatives and agents in business, which is all that is wholesome or attractive to worthy citizens of a democratic republic. Any man who enjoys for its own sake or deliberately seeks final power over his fellows belongs in a despotism, not in a republic.

While an ample sufficiency of power is thus left with the representatives, a very wholesome and salutary increase of responsibility is thrown upon the voter. It brings him into closer touch with great affairs to some purpose. It enables him to vote for men apart from measures. He can begin to assume the stature of a man, a sovereign in fact as well as in fancy—at least a member of a very large board of sovereigns—instead of the muddled and thwarted chooser between unattractive nominees of the party rings. It will enable him to settle something at an election besides the party label of officeholders, which settles in turn little except which crowd shall hold and dispense the offices. We know only too well that platforms are “merely to get in on, not to ride on.” Even if they were expected to be observed, they are composites which rarely represent except in the roughest sort of a way the views of any one voter.

With Direct Legislation in vogue the State offers an attractive field of usefulness for such of her citizens as do not care to give up their whole time to public life. Public-spirited citizens, without dislocation of business or profession, may and will devote a much larger share of their time than now to the consideration of public questions. If they conceive of a desirable step in legislation, they will not have to contrive to get into office and to stay there long enough to accomplish their ends. They have a dignified and honorable chance to lay the best fruits of their labors, in the form desired by them and their trusted and sympathetic advisers, before the final authority for adoption and rejection, free from the chance of mutilation or

distortion by ill-informed, overworked, or officious legislatures. This alone would be a powerful means of bringing spontaneously to the public service, and at no expense, a large amount of talent of the finest possible sort for which there is now little encouragement in public life. This is the talent on which we probably must depend for the most serious law making, and which we have had little chance to utilize. The legislature will thus be facing a reasonable and wholesome competition and the public cannot fail to profit.

Most fundamental of all, and of the most far-reaching value of all, is the education afforded the average voter. One cannot help believing that a toning up of the public standard of thought and morals would be in the long run the most beneficent feature of the innovation. In a word one can discern in the Initiative and Referendum a fair prospect for the actual realization of the cherished American aspiration—a government of and by as well as for the people.

The historical development of the Initiative and Referendum idea has been quiet and unostentatious. It may be seen in the institutions of the Plymouth Colony. It appears in our time-honored New England town-meeting—a most radical exemplification of the Initiative and Referendum principle, and very similar to the ancient Swiss Landsgemeinde. It appears in the insistence by our State constitution framers, in spite of their pitifully inadequate facilities, on a popular vote to ratify their doings and the doings of amenders. Finally, we note the steady development and extension of the Initiative and Referendum in its more modern form from canton to canton in Switzerland, its application to the Swiss Federal government in 1874, and its adoption in the last decade by city after city and State after State in this country. Direct legislation (usually accompanied from the start by the Recall) is an essential feature of nearly all modern city charters, and those without it will doubtless have to add it sooner or later to get satisfactory results. Notable among the direct legislation cities stand Los Angeles, Des Moines, our own Haverhill and Gloucester, and the newest recruits, Berkeley, Cal., and Colorado Springs. Similar examples among the States are South Dakota since 1898, Oregon since 1902, Montana since 1906, Oklahoma since 1907, and Maine and Missouri since last autumn.

This steady progress—though sometimes in the face of strenuous opposition by favorites or managers of political machines—misrepresentations by professional lobbyists and conspicuous and sometimes even eminent officeholders, the appearance of hostile plate matter “editorials” in a certain portion of the public press, all indicate that public attention is becoming really focussed upon the Initiative and Referendum.

New England, the home of the town meeting, enjoying the inspiration the Massachusetts and

other New England State constitutions, with Maine already in the ranks, may be expected to take especially kindly to this new and long advance step toward the realization of her ancient ideals.

For examples of the effect of Direct Legislation, we naturally turn first to Switzerland, where it has been in operation on what may be called a large scale for fifty years. Since the establishment of Direct Legislation, and with no burdensome use of it, Switzerland has rid herself of the regime of exploitation and corruption, which were rampant under their unperfected form of representative and party government of only a few decades ago—a system much like our own present one—and has come to be an admirably governed country. Mr. James Bryce, the present English ambassador, declared to a Cambridge audience in 1904 that Switzerland is the most successful democracy the world has ever seen. Our own President A. Lawrence Lowell, of Harvard, wrote of it\* in 1897: “The Swiss Confederation is on the whole the most successful democracy in the world. . . . The people are contented. The government is patriotic, far-sighted, efficient, and economical, steady in its policy, not changing its course with party fluctuations. Corruption in public life is almost unknown. . . . Officials are selected on their merits, and retained as long as they can do the work, and yet the evils of bureaucracy scarcely exist. . . .” This is the work of representative government with a fair chance. The Referendum is only occasionally resorted to, except in a little over a third of the cantons, where it is obligatory, but nobody forgets that it is there, and the Initiative has been far less frequently resorted to even than the Referendum.

Mr. Lowell, after speaking so highly of the present conditions in Switzerland, suggests that little Switzerland is not an adequate precedent for an immense nation like the United States. Nevertheless it may be asserted that Switzerland does form a most reassuring precedent for the adoption of Direct Legislation in our cities and States, particularly the small, highly educated manufacturing New England States. Switzerland, a pre-eminently manufacturing nation, is larger than any one of these States except Maine, which already has the Initiative and Referendum, and is larger than Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut combined, with a population slightly larger than Massachusetts.

The real questions for us in New England to answer are:

1. Are we in Boston, in Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, or Connecticut, as fit for this forward step as the Swiss were when they were putting the system in operation thirty to fifty years ago?

2. Is not even a complicated law, properly ex-

\*Lowell: “Governments and Parties in Europe,” vol. II, pp. 334, 335.

plained and vouched for, as suitable a thing for a popular vote as a choice between complicated candidates?

3. Is not an occasional vote on an ordinary law a natural and reasonable addition to our time-honored system of popular votes on State constitutions and their amendments?

4. Is not the separation of men from measures likely to be salutary in any effort at popular government?

To ask these questions in America, in New England, is to answer them in the affirmative. Many Americans are coming to share in this view. Oregon, nearly half as large again as all New England combined, is setting us a most encouraging example.

Seven years ago she adopted direct legislation. She was then in no specially enviable condition politically. Thanks mainly to the Initiative, and measures secured with it which legislatures had refused to pass, she has made great progress toward better government and the house-cleaning is going right on.

We in New England are interested to see how gracefully Direct Legislation fits in with the spirit of our wonderfully far-sighted and successful constitution framers. It will be worth while to quote a few passages from the Massachusetts constitution, passages found in different form and phraseology, but without change in spirit, in the Constitutions of other New England States. Such sentiments, moreover, are no strangers in other parts of the country.

They seem, however, to be quite unfamiliar to a few of our editors and conspicuous officeholders. These gentlemen, although themselves quite apt to flout the Declaration of Independence when it suits their convenience, profess great alarm that any one could so far think of "subverting the institutions of our fathers" as seriously to propose Direct Legislation. For the benefit of such as might be misled by these filial gentlemen Articles V, VII, and VIII of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are here reproduced to show what the fathers were really trying to do:

Article V. All power residing originally in the people, and being derived from them, the several magistrates and officers of government, vested with authority, whether legislative, executive, or judicial, are their substitutes and agents, and are at all times accountable to them.

Art. VII. Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness of the people; and not for the profit, honor, or private interest of any one man, family, or class of men: Therefore the people have an incontestable, unalienable, and indefeasible right to institute government; and to reform, alter, or totally change the same, when their protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness require it.

Art. VIII. In order to prevent those who are

vested with authority from becoming oppressors, the people have a right, at such periods and in such manner as they shall establish by their frame of government, to cause their public officers to return to private life; and to fill up vacant places by certain and regular elections and appointments.

On reading these sturdy New England doctrines one can hardly help concluding that the only reason in the world the Fathers did not there and then establish direct legislation for the State, and for cities as they might develop, was that it was at that time physically impossible. Mechanical invention had not provided the means even if they had conceived the idea. We must not forget that their facilities for disseminating information and gathering returns were little if any superior to those of Julius Cæsar. They knew no more of railways than Cæsar did, such highways as they had were probably not so good as Cæsar's. But they did what they could in this direction. They provided an obligatory referendum on the adoption and amendment of the Constitution of the Commonwealth. And it is clear that nothing was farther from their minds than that the will of representatives should prevail over the will of the people, some modern officeholders' insinuations to the contrary notwithstanding.

Sometimes officeholders are heard to profess a great fear that "mob rule" will be the result of Direct Legislation. This must be taken to mean that they fear, probably with reason, that the people after weeks of deliberation and with adequate information would not support their pet schemes. Prospective abundance of popular majorities in their favor would neither excite their alarm nor be called by them "mob-rule." No; hasty mob-action finds a more promising field in nominating conventions, in legislatures, and even town meetings than in the long, quiet process of gathering signatures, weeks of discussion, and deliberation, and the quiet vote on an Australian ballot in isolated, individual booths.

How simple an enactment would suffice in Massachusetts to bring the Constitution of that Commonwealth right up to date can perhaps best be shown by quoting in full the constitutional amendment prepared by the Massachusetts Direct Legislation League and presented to the present legislature for its approval. The league, not unexpectedly, met the firm but courteous refusal implied in "leave to withdraw." But the campaign has only just begun in Massachusetts.

The proposed amendment runs as follows:

#### RESOLVE,

To provide for an Amendment of the Constitution authorizing Direct Legislation or a People's Veto through the Optional Referendum and a Direct Initiative by Petition.

#### Article of Amendment.

The legislative authority of the Commonwealth

shall be vested in a General Court,\* but the people reserve to themselves power to propose laws and amendments to the constitution, and to enact or reject the same at the polls, independently of the general court, and also reserve the power at their own option to approve or reject at the polls any act or resolve of the general court, except as herein-after provided.

The style of all laws shall be, "Be it enacted by the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts."

The first power reserved by the people is the initiative, and shall be set in operation by petition requiring the signatures of legal voters of not more than eight per cent in number of the vote cast for governor at the last preceding election. The full text of the measure so proposed shall be included in the petition.

Initiative petitions shall be filed in the office of the secretary of the Commonwealth within six weeks after the general court assembles.

If the measure thus petitioned for is not passed without amendment in that session, or if vetoed by the governor is not passed over his veto, it shall be referred, together with any amended form or substitute recommended by the general court, to the people at the next State election. If passed either with or without amendment it shall still be subject to a referendum petition.

The second power is the referendum. It may be ordered either by the general court, as other bills are enacted, or, except, as to emergency measures, by petition requiring the signatures of legal voters of not more than five per cent in number of the vote cast for governor at the last preceding election and filed in the office of the secretary of the commonwealth within ninety days after the signature of the act or resolve by the governor or its passage over his veto. A referendum may be ordered against one or more sections or parts of an act or resolve.

An act or resolve shall not take effect until the expiration of ninety days after its signature by the governor or its passage over his veto, except such as by a two-thirds yea and nay vote of all members in each house shall be declared to be an emergency measure, and shall in the preamble state the facts constituting the emergency and contain the statement that therefore the act or resolve is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety. But no grant of any franchise shall be declared to be an emergency measure. Any measure, or part thereof, upon which a referendum has been ordered shall either as to the whole or such part thereof, be suspended from taking effect until approved by the people at the election to which it shall be referred.

Measures referred to the people of the State shall be voted on at the next regular State election.

Measures so referred shall become law at the expiration of thirty days after the election if approved by a majority of the votes cast thereon.

\*In the States of Massachusetts and New Hampshire the official designation of the legislatures is the "General Court." According to the Century Dictionary they are so called because the Colonial legislature of Massachusetts grew out of the general court or meeting of the Massachusetts Company.—Editors of The Public.

The veto power of the governor shall not extend to measures approved by the people.

Every measure referred to the people shall be described on the ballots by the secretary of the Commonwealth clearly and simply. When there are competing measures or substitutes the secretary of the Commonwealth shall have the ballot so printed that the voter (first) can choose between any measure or none, and (secondly) can express his preference between one and the other. If a majority of the votes on the first question is affirmative then the measure receiving the larger number of votes shall become law.

The secretary of the Commonwealth shall print and distribute to each voter a sample ballot with the text of every measure to be submitted to a vote of the people, and the general court shall provide for public dissemination of information and arguments thereon.

In carrying out the provisions of this amendment, which shall be self-enforcing, the secretary of the Commonwealth and all other officers are to be guided by the general laws and by the act submitting this amendment until further legislation shall be especially provided therefor.

All the provisions of the existing constitution inconsistent with the provisions herein contained are hereby annulled.

This amendment follows closely the lines of the Oregon enactment which has been working so well since 1902. It adds, however, the provision, above referred to, for a competing measure from the legislature in case of an initiative, with a means by which a voter can express a preference for one over the other, while voting against both. This feature is known to be approved by the leaders in Oregon, and is likely soon to be adopted there.

In closing it may be said that the Initiative and Referendum are found to appeal to progressive Americans in whom still glows the spirit of the liberty-loving men of '76. They readily grasp the necessity of controlling the important results, and of not limiting themselves to toying with the husk of popular government while the privileged few make off with the kernel. They take great satisfaction in a remedial measure so thoroughly in harmony with the old ideals and institutions, involving, after all, only a bit of additional machinery, and dependent for its success only upon our fitness for self-government. Of course it is only a machine. It will not suffice merely to set it up. It must be made to work promptly and with vigor when required. This will take real citizens. Oregon shows that such citizens still exist—some of them of New England stock, some of them born in old world monarchies.

It is proposed, then, to shift from the representatives the excess of power which is now engulfing them, to the body of voters who have not enough power to enable them to retain their self-respect, to say nothing of securing life, liberty, and happiness. This may well prove to be the

salvation of representative government and hence of popular government.

---

## BOOKS

---

### MALTHUS REVIVED.

**The Distribution of Livelihood.** By Rossington Stanton. Published by C. O. Farwell, New York and London.

Production forces are divided into three groups: First, those working on the land directly; second, those engaged in "making tools, refining raw materials, or making exchanges," i. e., "the artisan, commercial and professional occupations"; third, those "neither connected with land direct, nor even with its materials"—meaning hired labor. "These may be designated as Land, Landless, and Simple Value, respectively."

Rent represents the difference between Land and Landless value; interest the difference between Landless and Simple value, comparatively considered.

By sufficiently limiting the hours of labor of the third group the livelihood (or wages) of this group would advance till it equaled that of the second group—and interest disappear! Equity, says the author, demands that this be done. Rent remains to be disposed of. As "this exists at all times in the varying fertility of the soil," and "since there are no means by which the soil can be equalized, it must be effected through taxation." "In practical application, the workday of labor should be gradually restricted, and land at the same time taxed until no rent is offered for it! If conditions of livelihood are still distressful, population must be restricted. Two possible methods are given: First, holding the number of births at a given point; second, reducing the number of infants as they are born! (Swift's irony, as to the disposal of Irish infants, is lost.) Individual effort in the first failing, the State's duty "seems very clear." The book is interesting, like backgammon, and as valuable.

JOHN Z. WHITE.

---

## PERIODICALS

---

Fruit as a food should interest us all. It is the subject of an illustrated article in *Physical Culture* (New York) for August.

The story of the sugar trust is the subject for July of John Moody's series in *Moody's Magazine* (New York) on "The Great American Industrials."

"The Wisdom of Yesterday," by Grace MacGowan Cooke and Alice McGowan, in *Everybody's* (New York) for August, blends with much charm the chief

characteristics of present-day life in progressive localities of the South—the left-over ante-bellum white and black aristocracy, with the incoming white and black business elements. O. Henry, always funny and always sane, is up to the mark in his "Poor Rule" in this issue of *Everybody's*.

"Some Fallacies of the Peacemakers," the leading editorial of *The Open Court* (Chicago) for May, furnishes Paul Carus with an opportunity to say the best things that can be said in justification of war, as that "there are goods in this world which are higher than human lives," and that "there are super-individual interests, there are ideals dearer than our own persons, for which it is worth while struggling, suffering, fighting and dying"; that "life is not the highest boon of existence, and no sentimental reason, based on the notion of the sacredness of life, will abolish struggle in the world or make war impossible." All of which is very true. War is indeed an alternative to which any people may be driven in defense of something dearer than life. But isn't this academic? The practical question which the peace movement raises today, is not whether a nation shall through war resist invasion by other peoples, but whether it shall cultivate a war spirit which leads irresistibly on to the invasion of other peoples.

Judge Lindsey's fight for Denver's juvenile court, and how it was saved, is graphically told in the *Arena* (Trenton and Boston) for July, by William MacLeod Raine. The suffrage question in the *Far West*, by Elsie Wallace Moore, is another contribution of unusual importance. Carl S. Vrooman tells interestingly of what but little is known in this country, the recent extraordinary changes in the French educational system which have culminated in the displacement of the priest by the schoolmaster as the communal representative of the nation, giving to his story a personal flavor by making Charles Seignobos, "an apostle of light," its hero. Another article especially enlightening is William Kittle's exposure of the plutocratic methods of manufacturing public opinion in the United States; and Charles E. Russell contributes a pointed satire on Roosevelt's notions of socialism. "The Master Note in the Message of Christian Science"—its spiritual vitality at a time of ecclesiastical and business materialism—is Mr. Flower's own special contribution to this number.

"Initiative, Referendum, and Recall; but the greatest of these is Recall." "Under the Initiative and Referendum alone it would not be possible to refer to the people more than one-twentieth, or even a smaller per cent, of the important measures; in the rest the legislators could have their way, regardless of popular opinion. . . . Under the Recall the people could force the legislators to make all the laws as the people saw fit." So writes Roger Sherman Hoar, President of the National Democratic League of College Clubs, in *Equity* for July. And this statement of opinion is emphasized by a subsequent article describing how the politicians of St.