As a physician I would despise myself, and be rightly held contemptible by my colleagues, did I content myself with treating symptoms alone and never touching the cause. For the whole tendency of scientific modern medicine is to cure by prevention—to go to the root of things—and not merely to dabble with effects.

Yet—think of it!—in not one single one of all the appeals for "charity" that I have received in the past thirty years has there been so much as a hint that poverty is a curable disease of the social body, and that the charitarians, in addition to relieving, were seriously trying to eradicate poverty by going down to its cause! How weary, stale, flat and unprofitable to the medical mind seems all this ceaseless cry of "Relieve, relieve, relieve!" untempered by the faintest whisper of "Cure"!

Now I, and many, many besides me, believe with Henry George that poverty *can* be cured, that it is not a divine institution but a devilishly infernal one. And because one thousand people will blindly give money for measures merely alleviative where one will give for eradication, therefore shall I devote what money and time I can to means that, to my mind, strike deep down at causes—strike not at symptoms but at the disease—and I shall give nothing, or next to nothing, to "charity."

Perhaps you have never seriously considered the philosophy of Henry George. If so, do me the favor to read the enclosed. It will at least give you an outline of a doctrine that has encircled and enriched the world, that has infused new life and hope and religion into thousands, that is daily gaining new adherents and losing no old ones, and that is based on reason, on justice and on brotherly love.

IN A SWEATSHOP.

Richard Burton in The Atlantic.

Pent in, and sickening for one wholesome draught
Of air,—God's gift that cities sell so dear,
They stitch and stitch. The dim lights fall upon
Bent bodies, hollowed bosoms and dead eyes.
Their very mirth is horrible to hear,
It is so joyless! Every needle-stroke
Knits into dainty fabrics that shall go
Where Fashion flaunts, the protest and the pain
Of ravaged lives, of souls denied their food.
At last the clock-stroke! From the beetling shop
The prisoners file, and up and down the street
Scatter to hutches humorists call Home,
To sin, to die, or, if it may be, clutch
Some pleasure fierce enough to drown the thought
That on the morrow they must meet again.

The co-operation of all for the benefit of the few, we are going to put into the rag-bag where Reform keeps the other old clothes of history.—Henry Demarest Lloyd.

POVERTY AND ORGANIZED CHARITY.

First Part of Address of Louis F. Post, Editor of The Public, Before the Thirty-ninth National Conference of Charities and Correction of the United States, at Cleveland, Ohio, June 17, 1912, on "Distribution of Industry in Relation to Congestion, Rent, Taxes."*

As I understand the matter, I have been invited here in consequence of a letter which was addressed to the Charities and Correction Conference of last year by Joseph Fels. It seems to me well, therefore, to read that letter by way of introducing my subject and for the light it may throw upon what I shall have to say. This is the letter:

June, 1911.

To the Members of the National Conference Charities and Correction, Boston, Mass.:

Nineteen hundred years ago a charitable man was so eager to help the poor that he openly found fault with a woman who used costly oil in a ceremony in honor of One she highly esteemed. "It would have been better," remarked this philanthropist, "to sell the oil and give the proceeds to the poor." But he was soon informed that there are better ways to use wealth than in alms-giving.

The ceremony in which this oil was used was a practical method at that time of calling attention to the principles for which the man stood to whom honor was shown. Popular education on fundamental principles of justice and on practical means of enforcing them are required to establish conditions which will make alms-giving unnecessary.

That it is better to use money to remove the causes of poverty than for alms is a truth that is no longer denied by most prominent contributors to charity. But though the fact is conceded, action in accordance with it is not so freely taken. I have particularly in mind a remark made by a Kansas City gentleman who is prominent in the charitable circles of that city. He said that social workers admit the injustice on which the modern industrial system is based and that modern charity only aims to support helpless ones until the basic evils can be removed. If such is the case, I will be glad to co-operate with charity organizations in spite of the inexpediency of alms-giving, but I have seen too much that convinces me that it is not so.

The greater number of charitable contributors whom I know are either bitterly opposed or utterly indifferent to the reforms that will remove the fundamental wrongs which cause poverty. It will not do to plead in excuse for these that they do not know the cause, and are trying to find it. The cause is known and any one who sincerely wants to learn can easily do so in a short time. It is more than thirty years since Henry George showed in "Progress and Poverty" how land monopoly deprives the masses

*The Second Part of this address will appear in the next issue of The Public, under the title of "Poverty and the Singletax."

of mankind of opportunities for self support. He moreover proposed a simple and practical method of abolishing the evil. He proposed a tax on land values to which the name has since been given of the Singletax. There is no reason why any one sincerely interested in the welfare of the poor should not be familiar with the truth made clear in this book and should not be working for the opening of natural opportunities for employment to all the people.

If it is a fact that charity workers are anxious to learn how to remove the cause of poverty, would it be unreasonable to ask this Conference to take some action in the matter? Why not, for instance, appoint a committee to report to your next meeting, the duty of this committee to be a thorough investigation of the merits of different proposed plans to put an end to poverty? The details of this investigation must, of course, be so arranged that nothing concerning any proposed remedy may be misunderstood. The personnel of the committee must also be such that there will be no ground for lack of confidence in its fairness or intelligence on the part of those who have remedies to suggest.

Should this suggestion meet with your approval, I will be glad to do what I can to furnish the committee with information, and feel sure that other Singletaxers, as well as advocates of other reforms, will do the same. Your organization will then be in a position at your next meeting, to take definite action in the war against poverty. Yours very truly,

JOSEPH FELS.

From the program of the present Conference of Charities and Correction it may be said in reply to Mr. Fels's letter, that any grounds previously existing for his criticism have been removed, at least in some degree. Certainly the subject assigned to me is broad enough for all the purposes of a fundamental discussion. The "distribution of industry" opens up the whole matter, if we are agreed upon the meaning of those words, and I trust we are not at variance there. If there turns out to be a variance, let me remind you of the anecdote of the Dakota man who laughed at the Upper Michigan man for spelling "soo" s-a-u-l-t, insisting that the only sensible way of spelling "soo" is s-i-o-u-x. Definitions as well as spellings may be a matter of habit. So I shall ask the privilege of defining Industrial Distribution, in my own habitual way.

Now, I imagine that Mr. Fels was not altogether wrong in his criticism; for such subjects as are found on the program of this Conference might until recent years have seemed quite alien to the functions of any conference on charities and correction. But the innovations are their own sufficient defense. It would be very narrow, I should suppose, to regard charities and correction as having no broader functions, no deeper purpose, no more brotherly motive, no higher civic spirit than merely to deal with methods of relief. Yet I heartily concede that it would by no means follow that the narrower functions ought to be wholly abandoned in favor of fundamental reforms, nor even neglected. Important though it be to police the Jericho road, the compassion of good Samaritans is nevertheless not to be censured. What should be censured, as I conceive it, would be the straight-jacketing of rudimentary charities in a fixed purpose to ignore the poverty-producing conditions of a wealth-producing society. Was it because he let Lazarus eat the crumbs which fell from his table that Dives was condemned? Surely he would have been pardoned for that. Amelioration can be objectionable only in so far as it fosters or conceals the causes which, now as aforetime—essentially the same though outwardly different—evolve a privileged Dives with crumbs to spare and a famishing Lazarus to devour them. If rudimentary charities are blameworthy, it cannot be because they are rudimentary. It must rather be because they may exalt generous giving above righteous getting.

Of course you will understand that my allusion here is not to unrighteousness of the law-breaking kind. Since we are all averse to conduct that may send us to jail, there is little danger of our exalting generous giving above lawless getting. My allusion is to industrial distributions which, though unrighteous, are lawful. Obscuration of this unrighteousness would logically be the besetting sin of any organization for the relief of poverty which resisted exposure of its social causes. You will also understand, of course, that I am not blaming individual beneficiaries of this lawfully unrighteous getting. Were they to renounce their industrial advantages they could only substitute other beneficiaries, leaving the unrighteous distribution to go on; and of what benefit would that be to anybody but the substitutes? Since lawful unrighteousness is confirmed and perpetuated by social action or inaction, the obligation upon its beneficiaries is not to *re*nounce but to *de*nounce. No individual duty of theirs is it to reject their own shares in industrial privilege. It may be an individual duty of theirs, however, to help eradicate industrial privileges from the social system; and if any were to foster such privileges in the social system, whether by approval or by silence, in order to retain or to acquire vested rights in unearned incomes, wouldn't it be disloyal to every sound principle of truth and justice not to single him out and say: "Thou art a guilty man!"

But if its beneficiaries ought to denounce industrial privilege in the social system, precisely what shall they denounce, and precisely how shall they do it? Each beneficiary must answer for himself, under the impulse of his own conscience and in the forum of his own intelligence. The answer that appeals to me I thrust upon no one. It is to facts that I shall direct attention; not to any theory you might call fanciful or out of date or ahead of the time, but to facts; and not to any milky-way of statistical facts, either, but to a group of those large facts of our common life

which all of us observe and any of us can test for their verity.

Among the greatest of the large facts of our common life, there is one so prominent that we are hardly able to overlook it when we try to. All can see that poverty prevails almost altogether in that part of our population which, in spite of our democratic reluctance to acknowledging that there are classes in this country, we instinctively call "the working class." To be sure there are individual delinquencies in this class, and in abundance; but after making full allowance for them, a question of social culpability nevertheless remains. Charity workers must know, and I am told that when they get experience, those who whole heartedly throw themselves into their work do know, that their real problem, whatever it may prove to be, is not upon the whole a problem of individual delinquencies among the poor. Charity workers must surmise, furthermore, that such of those delinquencies as there are, may possibly hark back to causes for which industrial institutions are not blameless. It won't do any longer to lay the blame for poverty wholly upon its victims. These cruel theories can not face a growing suspicion that poverty is somehow involved in the ethics of industrial distribution. Is it not universal, that principle which the first great historian of the English people applied to a particular instance when he said of poverty in Ireland toward the end of the 18th century, that much of it was "the direct result of unjust law"? And of those crimes that come within the purview of corrective agencies, the same great historian again applied a universal principle to the history of a particular instance. Writing of what he called "a terrible pauperization of the laboring classes" in England a hundred years ago, Green observed that "with the increase of poverty followed its inevitable result, increase of crime." Be the inferences what they may, the plain fact is that the poverty and its crimes which rudimentary charities would ameliorate, prevail significantly in "the working class."

To forestall captious criticism, let me explain that I do not credit "the working class" with all useful work. Many employers, perhaps most of them, are in greater or less degree useful workers, though they are seldom thought of as in "the working class." Confusions at this point rise out of the impossibility of making accurate economic contrasts by personal classification. But unfortunately industrial discussion has run into habits of classifying by persons. We talk, for instance, of profit-takers instead of profits, of big business men instead of big privileges, of landlords instead of landlordism, of capitalists instead of capital, and of employers, workers and so on instead of their respective and often overlapping industrial interests. Accordingly we get the conception of a distinct working-class in the personal sense. But so inaccurately does personification distinguish economic differences, that a little abstract thinking might be wholesome. The contrasts in industrial distribution are between economic *interests,* not between personal *classes.* At the social extremities there are indeed personal classes whose work is so slight or so useless that they might be regarded as having no working interests at all; those at one extremity boasting of the leisure of aristocracy, while those at the other acknowledge themselves vagrants and vagabonds. Some one has said that the vagrants and vagabonds are to industry the less burdensome of the two classes, since it doesn't cost so much to keep them; but let us look alive to the fact that both groups, correlative products as they are of maladjustments in the distribution of industry, may be more sinned against, or sinned for, than sinning. The point for emphasis is, however, that although those extremes may be personally classified as parasitical, yet every personal class between them may rightly claim to be in some degree a working class. Nevertheless, it is in the so-called working class alone that we find working-interests exclusive of other economic interests. Take the day laborer, for instance. He owns no tools, no land, no investments of any kind. He has only his own personal working power to sell. His income is therefore confined to wages for work. He is distinctively a workingman. His income is not as much as it should be, not so much as it would be if there were no unearned incomes, not so much as the earned incomes of other men may be; but of working incomes pure and simple, the income of the day laborer is a type. When such workers are out of employment, their working power goes to waste and they have no income at all; when they are employed, the wages of the lowest-paid among them are so low that we are forced to resort from very shame to minimum-wages laws; when they give up the disspiriting struggle, they drop into one of the two classes of the perennially workless—the lower and cheaper one. Now it is because there is a fringe of the working class, at the minimum of subsistence when employed and on the edge of vagrancy when disemployed, a fringe which grows relatively wider while the working class itself grows larger in proportion to population,—it is because of this that we instinctively think of the working class as personifying all working interests. With this apology for adopting the personal class distinction, I invite your attention back again to the fact that the poverty which charities would ameliorate prevails distinctively in the working class.

It is an amazing fact. Poverty is lack of things produced by work; yet poverty is a phenomenon distinctively of the working class! Isn't it a little like carrying coals to Newcastle—the charitable giving of products of work to workers? One might reasonably think so, but the facts would

be against him. A great and growing proportion of workers, "the worthy poor" we call them, are often in dire need of charity. This is a fact, and it is facts that I am discussing. And legislation protecting workers as workers—legislation fixing a maximum of hours and a minimum of wages, let us say,—doesn't that present the same curious anomaly? There is no escape from it, though, not as a fact, not under prevailing methods of industrial distribution. The only alternative, unless society mends its ways, is to abandon large and increasing numbers of the working class to a fate from which every person in circumstances at all prosperous would shrink as from a scourge. Industrial conditions oblige us to be our brother's keeper. Let us redeem the obligation. But let us not allow its soothing satisfactions to tempt us into tolerating distributions of industry that necessitate his having a keeper. Only by uprooting those conditions can we bring on the good time coming when the lion and the lamb shall lie down together—each on the outside. No longer may we reasonably look forward, as once we did, for advances in productive power to solve our poverty problems. A century of marvelous invention goes to prove that increased productivity of work does not imply better industrial distribution. The poverty of the working class persists in spite of increase in its own industrial productiveness.

These characteristics of the working class, that poverty prevails especially in that class, and that in spite of continuous augmentation of working power it persists, must be accounted for as industrial disease. Dr. Walter Mendelson of New York has made the pathological figure definite. He likens mere meliorative charity to poulticing a cancer. The figure is true, but it would not be true if poverty itself were thought of as the cancer. Poverty is a cancerous effect. Some one has defined physical cancer as "a parasite of normal cells become abnormal which take without giving." May we not paraphrase that definition by saying that "a parasite of normal industrial interests become abnormal which take without giving" defines the industrial cancer. Thus defined there is involved in either kind of cancer, the physical or the industrial, a destructive conflict with the law of life; for no getting without giving is possible in any direction unless there be giving without getting in another. When this abnormality occurs in the physical system, the cancerous parasite impoverishes the physical body; when in the social system it impoverishes the industrial body. Is not some such cancerous growth in our social system fairly indicated, then, by the prevalence of poverty in the working class?

If we disregard personal classes, discussing economic rather than personal contrasts, as I prefer to do, we shall find impoverishment just the same. It ramifies all the industrial interests which the working class personifies. Few things are clearer to human vision than that work alone is not rewarded with wealth. Occasionally an individual's industry may secure him economic prizes, but wealth is not as a rule associated with the work of producing it. If we wish for wealth, which do we hustle the harder to do—to produce it or to command opportunities for its production for us by others? Are we more eager, for instance, to help dig coal than to help monopolize natural deposits of coal?—to produce oil or to "strike oil"? The questions are answered in the asking. We all try to lay up our treasures in the economic heaven of monopoly; and we all acknowledge by our conduct that work is hell. By the ordinary but short-sighted tests of mere self-concern we are right. Industrial interests do suffer perpetual impoverishment. We may not know the cause, but we know the fact. Somehow industry is forced to give without getting.

If there were no other evidence, that fact alone would suggest the presence in the social body of some parasitical growth which gets without giving. But there is other evidence. Vast interests which do not thrive upon the industry of those that own them, nevertheless do thrive. Along, then, with producing interests that languish, we have non-producing interests that prosper. Either fact by itself might be difficult to account for, but considered together they account for each other. If in social life, lack of products of work is characteristic of productive workers, and superabundance of products of work is characteristic of aristocratic leisure, there is but one inference and that inference is irresistible. It won't do to say that aristocratic leisure is purchased with products thriftily saved or fortunately inherited. The magical secret can not be in saved-up products which in fact won't save; it must be in unrighteously lawful power over producers as they produce. The only reasonable inference is a social cancer.

But what is the cause of it? Let me emphasize *what,* for I do not accuse any person or any class. I present no personal indictment, unless it be against those who, consciously domiciled in this parasitical growth, or trying to be, cover it over with "no trespass" signs. Even on that indictment I ask a merciful sentence. Wholly apart, then, from all considerations of individual turpitude or innocence, what is it that causes this abnormality of industrial distribution?

One of the most common explanations is monopolization of machinery by a capitalistic class. This would hardly be satisfactory if we thought only of unrelated machines; for if the working class makes and repairs and renews and uses machines, why does not the working class itself monopolize them and their products? But if we think of machinery as an intricate whole, as an organization of the world's industry into one great mechanism, historically as well as mechanically,

and interrelated throughout, the monopolized-machinery explanation would put before us a serious fact.

Little more may be necessary here than to suggest to the imagination such a unified machine, such a universal factory, all under one roof and all upon one foundation, a vast complex of interlaced parts and processes. Those who work would be workers there, their several functions minutely specialized; and upon access to this industrial equipment they would depend for opportunity to make a civilized living. Unless you own a proprietary interest in that world factory you must find a place at one of its work benches or fall helplessly into one of its scrap heaps. Exclude yourself from it or be excluded, and you are an economic outlaw as forlorn as the masterless man of feudal times or a homeless dog in a modern city. Outside of this comprehensive organization of industry, outside of this world factory, apart from this machine by which civilized man is fed and clothed and housed, you might find spots of earth suitable for an independent but primitive life,—more primitive than Crusoe's; but if to make it less primitive you co-operated with others, thereupon you would of necessity become a cog in the machine. Every mere worker would be helplessly appurtenant to that mechanism in a sense too desperately literal to be thought of as metaphor. If a world work-shop thus comprehensively organized be regarded as the monopolized machinery that explains the impoverishment of industry, may the explanation be considered inadequate? Possibly. But at any rate we should have to admit that it is an explanation not to be ignored.

Consider, then, that this monopolized workshop is no mere figure of speech. Though our social cancer be only an analogue, that interrelated and monopolized mechanism with which all the world's work is done, and at the benches of which the working class have to earn their living or go to the scrap pile, is one of the large facts of modern life. Our whole industrial system is in very truth a comprehensive, intricately adjusted and monopolized machine—a vast complex of factories, stores, offices, farms, mines, ranches, railroads, steamships, docks, mills, telegraphs and what not, organized and equipped and unified for enabling the modern world to get its work done day by day.

Those who have proprietary interests in that complex machinery are only a few of the people living at any given time. Such of these as have absolute control are fewer still, while those of them that have subordinate proprietary interests draw dividends—shall we say, unearned? Perhaps not always so nor wholly so—ranging from a comfortable income to a Christmas present or a charity dole. But as to the working class distinctively, they have no proprietary interests in the world's unified mechanism of production, no interest in it at all beyond fragile hopes of steady or occasional participation in the opportunities it affords for productive work. Now ask yourselves this question: What would certainly occur if the necessities and the productive power of the working class at any time were to exceed the market demand for production? No one should hesitate for an answer. Every era of hard times, and every intervening displacement of labor, cry out the answer like a chorus of megaphones. Workers would underbid one another for admission into that world factory, for access to that machinery, as for their lives.

In those circumstances tendencies of working hours to the limit of endurance and of wages to the starvation point, necessitating short-hour laws and minimum wage-laws, would seem to call for no further explanation. In those circumstances the grim eagerness of workers to earn incomes pitifully low at risks to life and limb and health so inhumanly unnecessary as to require labor-hazard laws, would be less of a puzzle. In those circumstances the reason for persistence of poverty among the working class in spite of augmentation of their working power would begin to clarify, and the necessity for perpetual and increasing charity relief for workers would have its convincing apology. Proprietary laws making the privilege of access to that workshop of the world increasingly valuable, would afford even to the most obtuse at least a hint of why the working side of the industrial system is steadily impoverished.

Does not this explain our problem? It certainly would if the process of monopolization were explained. But still the question rises: Why is it that this universal and intricate and artificial industrial mechanism, which must be constantly repaired and renewed by the working class, continually slips out of their own proprietorship and into the control of non-working classes or interests? What is it that causes continuous monopoly of that working mechanism to the detriment of the working class?

Some reply that the cause is of the past, and is therefore of no importance now. But the cause cannot be of the past alone. It is evidently a continuing cause, and continuing causes of present industrial maladjustments must not be ignored so lightly.

Others argue that we are confronted by a condition of life and not a theory of causes: wherefore, regardless of causes, they purpose taking this great mechanism over as common property for management hereafter in social partnership. The practicability of such an enterprise I do not now dispute—nor the desirability of its hoped-for outcome; neither would I join with those traditional objectors to every change (from sail vessels to steamboats in commerce, and from monarchy to democracy in government) who explain why im-

provements can't work which afterwards prove that they can work by working. I suspect, however, that the task of seizing this universal industrial mechanism, taking it by law away from the monopolistic interests that control it, may be no child's play. Such a revolutionary adventure might call for the qualities attributed to Hotspur when upon washing his hands for breakfast after a morning's kill of six or seven dozen Scots, he remarked that he was tired of this quiet life and wanted work. Yet it may be feasible. Possibly those are right who think they can organize the working class into political parties out of which, through class warfare at the ballot box, a working class republic will eventuate and take peaceable possession of the industrial mechanism of the world. But theirs is not the only plan. More thrilling if not more convincing is the plan of those who are organizing the working class for "direct action" in contradistinction to political action, and who hope by class warfare regardless of the ballot box—peaceable when and where possible; destructive when and where serviceable for its purpose—to seize the industrial mechanism of the world without either the formalities or the moralities of legal process. For one I can see no future for this criminal policy but destructive vendettas, with carnivals of hangings for climax and a paralyzing reaction for outcome. He must be a hopeful observer of the signs of the times, however, or a foolish one, who does not fear that as we go now we are rushing headlong toward a hideous war of classes, and a war of violence at that. Doubtless this social catastrophe can be averted. But if the past is prophetic of the future, it can be averted only by intelligent readjustments of industrial distribution in the direction of social righteousness.

In promoting those readjustments, no greater service could come from any source than from such sources as these Conferences represent. The truly charitable, the sincerely humane, the men and women of righteous instincts and purposes who are devoted to rescuing the worthy poor from their economic thralldom, could declare with exceptionally beneficial effect for prevention as well as melioration of poverty. If they would do that, however, they must first find the primary causes of continuous monopoly of the mechanism of modern industry—not secondary causes merely, but primary causes. Removal of secondary causes alone would not be effective; old troubles would quickly reappear in new ways, as upon removal of secondary causes they always have. Why, then, to repeat my crucial question, why is the industrial mechanism of the modern world continuously monopolized to the prejudice of working interests and the working class?

There may be many reasons. There doubtless are many reasons. In a mechanism so vast and intricate it would be strange if there were not a puzzling complexity of reasons. But the primary reason, as I see it, is suggested in the description of that world-wide mechanism which I have already given: The mechanism is *"all under one roof and all upon one foundation."* Its all-enclosing roof is the canopy of heaven, its all-controlling foundation is our revolving planet; and they are monopolized.

BOOKS

PARTY GOVERNMENT.

Readings on Parties and Elections in the United States. By Chester Lloyd Jones, Associate Professor of Political Science in the University of Wisconsin. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1912. Price, $1.60 net.

The framers of our Federal Constitution carefully separated the executive, legislative and judicial powers of the Government, vesting each in a separate department, intending that each department should be independent of the others. Had this intention of the Constitution makers been realized, confusion and inefficiency would have resulted. If Government is to be efficient, these departments must work in harmony. The Constitution provided for a dispersion of the powers of government; but the political parties which have grown up have by pressure from the outside brought and kept the several parts of government into a workable combination and made them effective. Party, then, is a big thing in our Government. If we are to have efficient Government we must have strong parties, and if we are to have popular Government those parties must be controlled by the people.

Recognizing this condition of affairs, and to make "easy of access some of the discussions illustrative of the development, present organization, abuses and remedies for the defects in our party Government," Professor Jones has brought together from books, magazine articles, reports of organizations and state papers something of the best that has been written on the development of parties and party organization, the methods adopted by party leaders to secure and keep control of the organization, and the system used to select the party candidates, together with some suggestions for the correction of the abuses that have grown with the development of our party system.

It is an informative book.

Among the authors drawn from are Bryce, Goodwin, Woodrow Wilson, Ostrogorski and Merriam. The development of the caucus and convention system of nominating candidates and formulating platforms is traced, the defects of our present primary laws and the need of supplementary legislation shown, and the abuses arising from electing