

That two such plays, so different in class and detail yet identical and novel in spirit, should have come to the stage at the same time and without plagiarism or confederacy is suggestive enough; that each has found an actor peculiarly adapted to the subtleties of the principal part, and has caught upon the imagination of theater goers, is highly significant of a popular tendency away from materialism but not back to paganism.

+ +

Jack London's Rediscovery of Malthus.

What could better preserve the balance of absurdity than the endorsement by Charles P. Taft's Cincinnati Times-Star of Jack London's endorsement of the Malthusian doctrine? It reminds one of an old caricature of the coat of arms of Kentucky, which represented two befuddled bears sustaining each other over a barrel of the "Colonel's Favorite," and under them the motto: "United We Stand (hic) Divided We Fall." Jack London's endorsement of Malthus came out in an article in the Forum, wherein he asserts that "the history of civilization is a history of wandering, sword in hand, in search of food." This argument that wars have always been for lack of food, reminds us that Xerxes didn't invade Greece to get food; that Napoleon didn't invade Russia to get food, nor Egypt because the French were hungry; that the American Revolution was not a hunger struggle; that Great Britain didn't attack the Boers to get food; that hunger didn't drive us to grab the Philippines; that scarcity of food was not what caused Russia to grab Finland; and—but why organize an expedition to pursue an absurdity? Isn't it evident that Jack London has become excited by reading the pessimistic speeches of James J. Hill, and that "Brother" Charles is aiding and abetting him in the hope of finding a substitute for "Brother" William's "God knows"? There has never been a famine or a tendency toward it that wouldn't have ceased at once if the monopolized earth all about it had been released from monopoly.

+ + +

NECESSITY FOR THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM.

As we learn of the influence of Big Business in moulding the laws of our land, the necessity for the Initiative and the Referendum in support of representative government becomes more and more apparent. In shaping legislation Special Interests alone are active. While the great mass of the people are at home working for a living, the

shrewdest representatives that Trusts can employ are busy at every law making center.

+

When Congress is in session, every Trust has its ablest lobbyist at Washington every minute that any legislation affecting the Interests is under consideration. But there are no mechanics, no farmers, no clerks, no miners, lobbying there for *their* interests.

A recent investigation in the legislature at Albany has brought to light the fact that one lobbyist, representing half a dozen corporations, absolutely dictated every bill of consequence that was passed. It is a notorious fact that not one bill affecting the System is passed in the Pennsylvania legislature without the approval of Boies Penrose.

The Guggenheims wield the same power in Colorado. "Jackpots," etc., control the legislature of Illinois. Similar power is at work in every other State legislature.

Lobbyists use the most plausible arguments their fertile minds can devise, to influence legislators. If they cannot convince by slick arguments, they bribe; and if they cannot influence by argument or bribe, they telegraph the corporations they represent to warn obstinate legislators that unless they "get in line" they will not be returned at the next election. After the lobbyists pull their strings, bills are almost certain to go through in the shape the Interests want them.

+

Years of such one-sided pressure upon legislators give us convincing proof of the necessity for the Initiative, to compel action on stifled legislation, and the Referendum, to allow the people, as well as the Trusts, to put their "o. k." on bills.

The people are beginning to realize this, which accounts for the wonderful progress of the Initiative and Referendum in popularity. They are weapons which insure fair legislation for the many.

The people cannot afford to lobby, but they can and are determined to be represented right on questions that vitally concern them.

BERNARD B. MCGINNIS.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE SHAKEUP IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Philadelphia.

The progressive victory in New Jersey comes at a time when Pennsylvania, the State most to be affected by her neighbor's example, is on the threshold of change. With reluctance for four months have the Philadelphia editors, to whom two-thirds