

lan's decision are worth remembering. In a newspaper interview immediately after the decision he said:

The great thing is that it has been established in the person of this weak and uninfluential milk boy that there is no place under our system of government for the autocrat. This is a government of laws, not of men. No official, however high, is above the law. He has no right or lawful power to do anything except what the law permits him to do, and then only in the manner and way the law limits and prescribes to him. That is free government.

Judge Gaynor was credited with saying at the same interview that he "can name at least five police rulers who have gone out of their offices millionaires in the last fifteen or twenty years." This tends somewhat to account for the growing police despotism, of which the case before Mayor McClellan was a minor example. Despotism and graft are seldom far apart.

\* \*

### The Race Struggle for Work.

"First-class white people, North or South, have ever been friendly towards our people, but God deliver us from the lower grades of whites—the trash." This is the opinion of a Negro, writing from Georgia to the Gazette, of Cleveland, a loyal paper of his own race. The quotation is preceded by a description of a brutal attack by a white mob upon a Negro locomotive fireman during the recent railroad strike in Georgia (p. 589), from which a white woman of what the writer calls the "first-class" had protected the Negro.

\*

It is doubtless true that the brutally cruel treatment of the Negro by some whites at the South comes from what the writer we quote calls "trash." The aristocratic element are, as a rule, kind to individual Negroes, whatever their views may be of the proper status of the Negro as a class; and equally, as a rule, the poor white working class are apt to be brutally cruel. An instance in point is furnished by this Georgia strike. The white firemen struck to compel the railroad to stop giving Negro firemen better firing work on the basis of greater length of service; and its ultimate object was very likely to exclude Negroes from that kind of service altogether. The sympathy of the working whites of Georgia was with the strikers in this controversy, while that of the aristocratic whites was with the Negroes. This fact alone is strong confirmation of the contention we have frequently made (p. 529), that the race question at the South, while influenced by tradition, is at bottom a labor question. If jobs were not scarce in

Georgia, the white locomotive firemen would have no incentive to exclude Negroes from that kind of work. But when jobs are scarce, individual fights individual for what jobs there are, and class fights class; and if class lines coincide with race lines, then race fights race. It would be so at the North. It would be so anywhere. It would be the same if the class line were religious, and even if it were a sex line instead of a class line.

\*

We might add that precisely as the race question at the South is a labor question, so the labor question there is a land question. If the unused and poorly used land of Georgia were held upon a tenure that made its owners keen to put it to its best use, jobs in Georgia wouldn't be scarce. And isn't it quite natural—human naturely natural—that when the owners of land have no incentive to use it to its best, they shall hold it out of its best use in large measure? And when they hold it out of its best use, don't they restrict the demand for work? And when the demand for work is restricted, aren't jobs scarce? And when jobs are scarce don't men who live by work, scramble for employment? And when there are two distinct races, divided by social lines, among the workers, isn't the scramble certain to generate a race war? And in this race war isn't it also quite human naturely natural—Anglo-Saxonly natural at any rate—that they who are in the midst of the life and death struggle for employment shall be brutal toward those of the "inferior" race, while the leisure class, personally unaffected by the bitterness of the fight whichever way it may go, are kind? We condemn nobody for this. We excuse nobody. We merely state a broad fact of human experience, and suggest a responsibility which no one of either race can safely evade.

\* \* \*

## WHY WE ARE A NATION OF GAMBLERS.\*

I.

Whoever has read Andrew Carnegie's recent essays on "Problems of Today" must have been impressed with the author's naive preachments against the folly and dangers of speculation in stocks.

Mr. Carnegie emphasizes the importance of avoiding the gambling instinct if one seeks financial or material success, and gives examples of in-

\*Problems of To-day: Wealth, Labor, Socialism. By Andrew Carnegie. Published by Doubleday, Page & Co., New York, 1908.

dividuals who, carried away with the fever of speculation, have wrecked fortunes, lives and homes by attempting to "get rich quick" in the Wall Street maelstrom.

In the same pages the author shows, with great clearness, how vast fortunes are "safely and legitimately" made.

He demonstrates in detail and by concrete illustration, how one man can, in our day and generation, accumulate a fortune of half a billion or more dollars within a single life span, the only qualities needed being sound judgment and superior foresight. These attributes, when possessed by a man of high personal honor and integrity and reasonable education, are shown to be the touchstones of success in this great land of opportunity.

While modesty forbids Mr. Carnegie's dwelling on the record and example of his own career, they fit in perfectly with his theory. A man of high personal honor and integrity and reasonable education, he combines with these attributes sound judgment and superior foresight, and as a consequence, is closing life with the record of having amassed a fortune of several hundred millions of dollars in the short space of forty years.

In achieving this phenomenal success, Mr. Carnegie never bought or sold a share of stock in the Wall Street markets; he never gambled in wheat or cotton; he never played the races or bet in the lottery gambles; he never "cornered" a market or fixed a "frame-up" on his friends.

His record has been simply that of a shrewd, far-seeing, modern business man, who has had the intelligence to take full advantage of opportunities as they have come within his reach, and has made the most of such opportunities.

## II.

Mr. Carnegie is not the only conspicuous example of a plain business man who has put to shame the merchants and manufacturers of an earlier day.

A peep into the pages of a book published in London a short time ago, which is now being aggressively circulated among American youths in schools and colleges, and which less fortunate fathers are being urged to induce their growing sons to read, gives a vivid panoramic view of business success in this country during the present generation. This book, "The American Billionaire," is calculated to fire the hopes of any ambitious youth. It points the way to success in life with an eloquence which puts Mr. Carnegie's pen

to shame; it unfolds the lives of the great captains of industry of our day in language which should stir the hopes of the dullest youth. No boy of spirit in the age of chivalry could have been more stirred by the exploits of his elders in battle and tournament than the youthful reader of this remarkable record of the lives and achievements of modern warriors in the world of business.

Three generations ago the character of the studious youth was formed by reading of the achievements of the heroes of Greece and Rome, of the period of the Renaissance and the Reformation; by dwelling on the exploits of the discoverers of America, the pioneers of English and American liberty, and the doings of the great statesmen of his time. Pericles and Caesar, Bruno and Luther, Columbus and Raleigh, William the Silent and Cromwell, Washington and Jefferson, Webster and Calhoun, and the times in which they lived and wrought, went far to set the standards and develop the ideals of his life.

But today such things, except to students of history, have far receded in the perspective and their place been given to the more vital and intimate ideals of modern achievement and success. In schools and colleges, at the firesides and in the market-place, the growing youth has constantly flashed before his eyes and forced into his plastic mind the superior greatness of legitimate business success as exemplified by the lives of the Carnegies, the Rockefellers, the Claffins, the Fields and the Hills.

To emulate Marshall Field, who, it is said, began with nothing and died with a hundred million dollars, is more truly a mark of greatness in this modern age than to try to pattern one's character after that of any of the heroes of history, from Pericles to Garibaldi. In a word, the greatness of Lorenzo the Magnificent, and not that of Savonarola, is sought to be the standard and the ideal of life which should inspire the growing generation today.

## III.

That this analysis of the situation is not distorted and unfair, can be easily demonstrated by anyone who conscientiously and intelligently undertakes to find out.

No doubt it holds more in our great cities than in the rural sections, and the spirit is clearly more prevalent in the Eastern than in the Western States. But that these ideals are dominant to more or less extent in every part of the country; that fathers of families everywhere in this work-a-day world are inspiring their sons with hopes of financial success which they themselves have

missed, and that "the thousand millionaires" are held up before the eyes of young America by preachers and teachers everywhere and their careers studiously commended, should be apparent to every thoughtful and observing person.

+

In the abstract, most of us have our "ideals"; we believe in certain standards of right and wrong, we dream of a better and less materialistic age, and we deprecate, nominally, the mad rush for the dollar which seems to be evident on every hand. Yet in spite of all this, while we may stand for reform movements in politics, put transgressors in jail for breaking the law, and point the finger of scorn at Rockefeller and Ryan, we at once spike our guns when it is suggested to so change fundamental conditions that the material achievements of "the thousand millionaires" would be less easy of duplication in the coming generation than they have been during the past.

In fact, many a man who dreams of "greatness" for our nation during the coming years, anticipates a crop of billionaires to replace the thousand millionaires of the generation now closing.

And his expectations will in all probability be realized.

+

During the past four winters the writer of this article has been conducting courses of lectures on financial and kindred topics in New York City, and has thus been thrown in close contact with a large number of men, some young and some middle-aged, who have attended these courses to acquire practical knowledge along business lines.

These men have not been merely Wall Street brokers or brokers' clerks; they have been drawn from many walks of life,—professional men, retail merchants, dry-goods clerks, employes of corporations, engineers, etc. In all, perhaps five hundred different individuals have attended with more or less regularity, and the lecturer has become fairly intimate with a great many of them, and exchanged ideas with a large number.

In perhaps 90 per cent of the instances where he has been able to ascertain their point of view, he has found their minds permeated with the ideal which Mr. Carnegie's life has set before them.

Any criticism of this ideal has manifestly not interested them, while explanations of the methods and real achievements of "the thousand millionaires" in reaching the summits of success has commanded their undivided attention.

These five hundred men have been interested in

the ways and methods employed by the great industrial generals of the age, and not in the ethical question of whether those methods are, in the last analysis, right or wrong. In fact, the question of right or wrong never enters into the matter, and if it did, would not be taken seriously.

The resignation of Mr. J. G. Phelps Stokes from the organization under the auspices of which those lecture courses were conducted, on the ground that the writer was engaged in immorally teaching young men how to exploit the producers with the tools of capital, was almost treated as a joke. \* Practically all these men had already learned in their homes, in their schools and churches, and in their social and business environments, that, with personal honesty and integrity always present, there was no more immorality in the possession of three hundred million dollars by Mr. Andrew Carnegie, than in the possession of a corner lot, worth one thousand dollars, by any one of themselves!

+

This situation can be demonstrated by almost any inquirer.

Ask any group of one hundred men, selected at random, their point of view in this matter, and in the vast majority of instances it will be found that success to them means the amassing of wealth in great aggregates, and the greater the wealth the greater the measure of success.

Lincoln is a great man in perspective, in school books and in story, and on the twelfth of February we unite to glorify his name. But Lincoln is dead. Now we unite not once a year, but daily, to glorify the great modern generals of whom it is boasted that they "have annihilated time and distance, have covered the country with bands of steel, brought the comforts of civilization to our doors, distributed the vast wealth taken from the bowels of the earth, and raised the standard of comfort, health and education for the common man, far beyond what he dared dream of a generation or two ago."

#### IV.

That these modern generals of industry are in many cases remarkable men, goes without saying. Only a very superficial person would assert that Mr. Carnegie, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Harriman or the Rockefellers are intellectually in the mediocre class. Many of those who protest against their

\*In passing it might be stated that if Mr. Stokes had attended these lectures instead of condemning them before they were delivered, he might have heard something of the difference between the potency of the mere tools of capital and the real opportunities which have made possible our "thousand millionaires."

wealth and power are fond of saying that their position in the industrial world is due entirely to their luck in being able to exploit the labor of other men, and, as the Socialist says, in their fortunate possession of capital and its tools.

But as a matter of fact, in any environment men of this stamp would almost surely make a mark upon their time.

This statement does not of course apply to the great mass of rich men, but it certainly does apply to such as those mentioned above. In a full-fledged Socialistic state, could such a thing be reasonably imagined, men of the type of James J. Hill and Edward H. Harriman would certainly not be submerged. In all probability they would be the captains of the ship, just as they are today.

To this opinion Socialists may naively reply, as many have to the writer before, that the people themselves would be enthroned, that the mandate and recall would keep such men down, or make them faithful public servants, etc. But the Socialists forget that the law of gravitation would doubtless hold in their ideal state just as it does everywhere else; and the methods of men of the type of Mr. Harriman, as well as their motives, might be very different from what they are in our own environment. Men of the superior type of ability which is possessed by the Rockefellers and the Morgans ruled the world in other ages; they are found in the histories of ancient civilizations, in mediaeval times and in more modern history. Martial conquest was at one time their motive; religious domination was their tool in later ages, and exploration of unknown countries served them at another time. These were the lines of least resistance to achieve supremacy in their day and generation, just as in our time their greatness and glory are developed along economic and commercial lines.

Given the Socialistic state, whether for good or ill, and these men and men of their type would be to the fore. The people would choose them for their leaders, just as they do today.

+

A brief examination of the evolution of industry during the last generation will give an inkling of what would almost inevitably happen under a Socialistic regime.

Since 1890 the trend toward governmental supervision of industrial interests has been steadily growing.

Municipal control or superintendence, expansion of the powers of commissions, both State and national; legislation affecting or essaying to affect business interests has come to be more and more

accepted as a logical and salutary thing for the rank and file of the people. And just in proportion as the government has reached out into the field of business, business has reached back into the field of government.

Just as, during the anti-slavery agitation, the houses of Congress and the President were selected and supported on the issue of that time, and as the men of the next generation held their seats as a result of their attitude on the reconstruction question, since the days of Grover Cleveland, the selection of every President and Congress has turned on purely economic issues. McKinley, as we all know, was the choice of Mark Hanna, representing the business interests of the land, and his houses of Congress were the same. Roosevelt was an accident at first, but in 1904 was preferred to Parker by the same business interests, while his Congresses were always made safe. In 1908 the same facts have held, and the Senate of today is a stronger bulwark for the business interests than it ever was before, while the lower House seems clearly a close second.

This trend toward government control by the same men who are glorified before the eyes of our youths for their greatness in commercial lines will inevitably grow just as the tendency increases among the people for governmental supervision of the means of production and distribution. It is simply the line of least resistance toward the Socialistic state, and certainly is not looked upon with great alarm by the far-seeing owners of the tools of capital who are in the van today.

+

The captains of industry are preparing for socialism far more intelligently and aggressively today than are the avowed advocates of the theory.

Talking to a prominent member of Congress a short time ago, who owes his seat to the favor of certain business interests, the writer referred to the profit-sharing plan now being developed among the employees of the United States Steel Corporation.

"It is a splendid thing," said the Congressman, "it makes every man a partner in the business, induces him to save money and put it into the concern. Once in, he adds to it from year to year, and as time goes on and his fund increases he will think less and less of joining a strike, of clamoring for more and more wages, or of regarding his employer as a robber who is crushing him down. He will be content with his condition and will become a better producer. It is the solution of the labor problem, and a step toward a sane socialism,

such as we may see the modern world welcome before many more decades have gone by."

That this Congressman got his cue for adopting this point of view from his business benefactors, there is no doubt. Five years ago the same man was as bitter an opponent of profit-sharing schemes as he well could be.

+

Mr. Carnegie, in his "Problems of Today," really adopts the same panacea. He practically shows himself an advocate of this "sane socialism," and points to the profit-sharing path as the only road toward the goal of equal opportunity and of justice to the common man.

V.

But whether he is conscious of it or not, Mr. Carnegie's book, like the record of his own career and the careers of all the other generals of industry, points the seeker of the goal to a path which leads in a very different direction from that of the "profit-sharing plan."

The story of "The American Billionaire," intelligently read, does precisely the same.

+

Mr. Carnegie deprecates the mania for stock and all other speculation, and moves us with the stories of the blighted careers of those who have tried to get rich quick and lost. He does not seem to see that the only essential difference between his own career and that of the men he condemns is that where he succeeded they failed.

He had a longer head than the others and made good. The others essayed to do the same things he did, in degree, and failed. Their real condemnation is their failure and not their pursuit. Had the tables been turned and Carnegie failed, the finger of scorn might as easily have been pointed at him by some successful captain of industry as a man who tried to get rich quick, but could not.

The man who gambles in stocks in Wall Street or elsewhere and loses his money is not essentially different morally from the man who gambles in stocks and wins. And the gambler or speculator in stocks on a small scale is not essentially different from the man who tries to take advantage of any other opportunity in which he thinks he sees a chance of gain. The acts in all cases are essentially alike, the difference of success or failure being simply results of judgment and intelligence. And judgment and intelligence are the only things which have made the Carnegies, Rockefellers, Harrimans and Hills successes in phenome-

nal degree, where thousands have been dismal failures.

+

Mr. Carnegie may not be conscious of it, but he has been the greatest speculator of all history.

Every page of his active life bristles with the speculative mania. From the days of his boyhood, when, with but a few dollars in his pocket, he was taken under the wing of Thomas A. Scott, and given his first "opportunity," he has been an arch speculator. He early foresaw the opportunities of the Bessemer process and gambled on them to "the limit," he reached out with others for the control of ore and coal deposits and staked his all on their possession, he built railroads to gain exclusive rights of way, he built steamer lines to get to and open up the great ore deposits of Lake Superior, he so tied up the railroads that they were largely at his mercy, and he built broadly in other ways to reap the vast benefits which he expected would accrue in the next generation through the great expansion in population and consequent increase in consumptive power of his products by the community. In doing all these things he was building for the future, as every speculator does, large or small, and getting himself in position to be able at the right time to "cash in," as the saying is, and take his profits.

This he did in 1901, when he sold out his entire business interests to Morgan and associates for a cash equivalent of \$494,000,000, of which about 60 per cent came to him personally. The price he sold at was an inflated one at the time, but to use a very apt term somewhere employed by Henry George, it was "the inflation of expectancy." And Mr. Morgan in his turn has now more than realized the "expectancy." He sees the Carnegie properties today worth perhaps double what they really were when Mr. Carnegie sold them to him.

What essential difference is there between this forty-year successful coup of Mr. Carnegie's in the field of speculation, and the purchase of a few shares of Union Pacific stock by an individual speculator in 1899, on a ten-point margin (Carnegie worked on a far narrower margin at first), with the intention of holding the stock a long period for a rise? A careful and intelligent stock speculator in 1899 would have bought Union Pacific at \$40 a share because he believed he foresaw a wonderful future for the property through the growing up of the Western country in population, industry and wealth, the development of natural resources, etc. And he would have made no mistake in doing this. The stock never again sold below \$40 per share, and if he had then bought

ten shares on a ten-point margin (\$100) he would today have a stock certificate worth in the markets \$1,900, or nineteen times his original investment. He would have been doing on a very small scale exactly what Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Harriman have done on a vast scale.

What Mr. Carnegie really condemns in his tirade against speculation is not the thing itself, but failure to do what he did—profit at the expense of the nation.

## VI.

And here we come to the kernel of this whole matter. Just as long as the American people (or any people for that matter), have thrust before them the opportunity for privately speculating in natural "futures," (as Mr. Carnegie and a host of other far-seeing men have done and are doing), shall we be a nation of gamblers. Why should the average man slave his life away in earning a competence, when the opportunities for securing an unearned one are daily placed before him?

Mr. Carnegie did not waste a minute as a railroad clerk when he saw visions of the enormous possibilities in the future of control of the ore and coal deposits in the steel industry.

Marshall Field did not give half or perhaps one-tenth as much solicitude to the dry goods business as he did to the realty and other interests where his great fortune was really coming from.

Mr. Morgan has never exerted one-tenth of his great ability in the ordinary business of banking, receiving deposits and buying and selling exchange, as he has in acquiring control of railroad systems and exploiting the natural resources tributary to them.

The Elkinse and Wideners of Philadelphia have not thought so much about lighting streets and houses with gas as they have about getting into position for benefiting by the steadily increasing increment in the value of their properties resulting from growth of population.

And why should they?

It is not in the ordinary processes of production and trade that the big money lies, but in these "side issues" that men are enabled to take advantage of.

So it is with the man of small means, the clerk and the retail dealer. His labor may bring him a moderate income, but he thinks he sees opportunities for easier money in a "side line" of stock or other speculation. He knows that all the multimillionaires have amassed their fortunes in this way, and he logically feels that he is entitled to a share. So he has his little deal in real estate, in mining ventures or in Wall Street. If fortune

favors him, he too may become rich, while if disaster is the result, he nevertheless, in the great majority of instances, keeps on speculating to the end of his days. The fascination of getting something for nothing becomes a part of his nature. The examples of "success" as personified by the "swollen fortunes" surround him everywhere; his teachers and elders point to the success of those who have made the fortunes, and he learns to despise the idea of merely working to earn a living. And saddest of all, if he is never successful himself, he usually brings his own children up with the same ideas of achieving success. He thinks the Carnegie libraries are a blessing to the rising generation, and that it is a good thing that the youth of the land should be inspired with an ambition to emulate the man who has founded them.



In view of all this, is it not reasonable to say that Mr. Carnegie's career, including his library donations, is one of the potent causes of a gambling and speculating spirit among the rank and file in this country?

No incrimination of Mr. Carnegie personally or of his motives is intended. He is simply one of a thousand who reflect in the concrete the great disease of modern society. If the conditions which gave rise to it did not exist, we should have no such career as Mr. Carnegie's dangled before our eyes. Nor should we be a nation of gamblers such as we inevitably must continue to be so long as open opportunities exist for individuals or groups of individuals to profit by the natural increase of social values.

When these opportunities are eliminated, will the "Wall Street gambling problem" be solved and not a moment before.

## VII.

While many people may accept the foregoing diagnosis of the situation, they will not concede the remedy. Mr. Carnegie recognizes the fact all through his book that he did not make his money with his own labor, and probably most men of his type do. But they will not listen to such a thing as having opportunities for grabbing social values eliminated.

They are willing to pass their fortunes over to the state (at death), but they think that future generations should have the same chances that they have had. In other words, they cry out against the evils of gambling, but insist on keeping alive, at all hazards, the seed which makes its elimination or diminution impossible.

State regulation, profit-sharing, even Socialism,

they will face with equanimity, but the more radical cure they will not tolerate. State regulation is thought to be sane, because the control of the state can be retained in the hands of the beneficiaries of the unearned values; profit-sharing is looked upon as safe because it distributes the increment a little more equitably, but still leaves the control of the situation in the same hands; Socialism will be tolerated as a last resort, because here, too, the situation will be in the hands of the forceful.

But under any method of actually eliminating the opportunities themselves through the taxing power, the gambling instinct on both large scale and small would have nothing to feed upon, and the motive for the control of government would be gone.

+

It is because of this, that, of all proposed reforms, the Single Tax is the one which will be fought in this country to the last ditch. Even after Socialism is on trial, should Socialism come, a bitter fight will be waged against it.

An inkling of this is shown in the present English situation. The spreading of Socialistic sentiment and Socialistic reforms in Great Britain in recent years has not at any time created half the real consternation that the proposal to tax land values is now causing.

+

Let no disciple of Henry George think the fight is won, in England or elsewhere.

It has really but just begun.

JOHN MOODY.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date. ●

---

Week ending Tuesday, July 6, 1909.

---

### The Tariff in Congress.

The tariff schedules (p. 634) having been disposed of in the Senate on the 28th, consideration of the income tax and the corporation tax questions were taken up on the 29th, the discussion being opened by Senator Cummins (Republican) of Iowa. Senator Cummins rested his argument upon the fact that the question then was not

whether there should be an income tax amendment to the tariff bill, but what kind of income tax it should be. In explanation he said:

The amendments offered by the Senator from Texas and myself, which have now been merged into a single amendment, provided for a general income tax to be paid by all persons, copartnerships and corporations with net annual earnings in excess of \$5,000, so adjusted that the tax would not be laid upon any person unless he enjoyed such an income even though a part of it is derived from a corporation. The amendment recommended by the President, and offered by the finance committee, provides for a special income tax laid only upon corporations and measured by their net earnings. The difference between the two plans is fundamental, and involves the most vital principle in the authority of any government to tax its citizens and their property.

Before Senator Cummins got the floor, two motions were made by Senators Lodge and Aldrich, respectively, evidently by prearrangement with a view to preventing any amendments of the President's corporation-tax provision as formulated by his advisers. Mr. Lodge first moved as an amendment to the Cummins-Bailey income tax proposition, a substitute providing for countervailing duties against countries imposing duties on articles exported to the United States; whereupon Mr. Aldrich moved, as an amendment to Mr. Lodge's amendment, the substitution of the corporation tax provision recommended by President Taft. As there can be no amendment to an amendment of an amendment, the corporation tax proposition was thereby fenced in against attempts to alter it either in form or substance.

+

Senator Cummins and Senator Borah occupied the time on the 30th, both speaking in favor of the Cummins-Bailey income tax proposition. Both speakers turned their batteries upon Senator Aldrich.

+

President Taft's corporation tax proposition was adopted by the Senate and became a part of the Aldrich bill on the 2nd, by a vote of 60 to 11. Eight Republicans and three Democrats opposed the amendment on the final vote. The Republicans were Borah of Idaho, Bristow of Kansas, Bulkeley of Connecticut, Clapp of Minnesota, Cummins and Dolliver of Iowa, Heyburn of Idaho and La Follette of Wisconsin. The Democrats were Hughes of Colorado, Chamberlain of Oregon and Shively of Indiana. Three other Democrats—Bacon of Georgia, Overman of North Carolina and Stone of Missouri—were present and declined to vote. The path to this final vote required four preliminary steps, in forcing which Senator Aldrich is accused of breaking the traditions of Senatorial courtesy by cutting off debate. The first vote was upon the corpora-