

which should try to serve itself in this simple and inexpensive manner. But what of that? Are we under any obligation to continue them in business?

+

I am told that in addition to the other obstructions is the fact that "not many people in Denver can spare even \$5 as an investment, to say nothing of the larger denominations that would be needed;" also that "to issue a portion of the bonds in small denominations to the citizens of Denver might make it more difficult to market the remainder."

As to the former objection: We can never tell till we try. I should be sorry to believe that "only a few people in Denver" could afford to pay two or three years in advance for their water supply if they were convinced that such a course would save a great burden of taxation to themselves and their children for years to come.

And for the second: Are there not enough Denver men of wealth and public spirit to take up in large sums what the "common people" find themselves unable to assume? I believe there are. If the tax-payers are getting something back in interest for what they pay in taxes it will lighten the burden of taxation to that extent.

Just here Mr. Conservative comes along and remarks, "You can't get rich by taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another." Sure. But you'll come nearer to it that way than by taking money out of both pockets and handing it over to New Yorkers year after year.

+

I submit, without fear of any intelligent contradiction on the matter, that to keep the annual interest (which seems to be inevitable for a few years) right at home would be of immense advantage to merchants and to all local business men, except possibly the money-loaners; and if a specified portion of the bonds should be made redeemable by being received for water rates each year, thus (as soon as the plant becomes self-supporting) lessening the interest by that amount, we could, before many years, have a water plant all paid for without incurring any very heavy burden.

Is not such a result worth working for?

CELIA BALDWIN WHITEHEAD.

+ + +

The dead are below, and the landless, and those who live to labor

And grind forever in gloom, that the privileged few may live.—John Boyle O'Reilly.

## "ONE MORE SOLDIER FOR POR-FIRIO!"

William James, though a pacifist, nevertheless concedes the military type of character to be persistently desirable.

He believes, however, that the character elements in the martial type can be as effectually cultivated in constructive social service as in war.

You cannot answer the militarist by citing the horrors of war: they are its enticing thrill! The cost of war? A bagatelle! Its bestialities? It's all in the price of the higher, hardier manhood of the race. So argues the militarist.

But Mr. James thinks that "patriotic pride and ambition in their military form are, after all, only specifications of a more general competitive passion."

This "competitive passion" will find ample room for exercise even where the military "specification" is absent.

+

And why not?

Russia built a railroad for military purposes—and, to her surprise, the territory traversed by it has become a vast theater of teeming industry, supporting in comparative affluence millions of human beings. The rulers of Russia intended the railroad for the conquest of a state; but economic law seized upon it for the uplifting of the Russian people!

If it be answered that the military spirit was father to that railroad, and therefore the cause of the people's prosperity, let the retort be that militarism, as the rule, greatly burdens and oppresses the people, and that in this instance the benefits were purely accidental. It demonstrates not that *war* but that *railroads* are beneficial to society.

+

Does war indeed ennoble manhood?

Where are the descendants of Alexander? "Alexander's career was piracy, pure and simple; nothing but an orgy of power and plunder. When he died his generals and governors attacked one another."

The whole history of war for war's sake is an orgy of power and plunder; and that for the glory, not of the people of either side, but solely for a few distinguished individuals.

+

Napoleon would respectfully bow to the pregnant woman wherever he met her, not from respect for motherhood, but to encourage the

French women to rear men to die for his personal glory.

Dorothy Johns, writing in the American Magazine for August, under the caption of "Barbarous Mexico," relates that she saw a poor woman on the street, bearing a heavy burden, fall, and roll into the gutter, where she gave birth to a child. A policeman had thought her drunk. But "when he became aware of the woman's condition he leaned over and with his middle finger deliberately thumped that expectant mother in the side, as one tests a ripening melon, and with a knowing leer hailed another policeman just then crossing the street, with, "Say, mate! (Oyez, Compadre!) It's all ripe, ready to pull; another soldier for Porfirio!"

Napoleon was more polite to motherhood, but his appreciation thereof was no higher than that of the brutal Mexican policeman.

Were the French mothers proud to bear men-children for Napoleon's wars? So also were the mothers of India proud to cast their children under another Juggernaut.

+

When Frederick the Great spurred his soldiers to valor by shouting "Dogs, would you live forever?" it doubtless had the desired effect upon the "dogs." But it also revealed the true status of the common soldier in the estimation of the "hero" (God save the mark!) for whose individual glory the common soldier is to die.

+

War is but an incidental phase of the evolution of the human race in its progress to the goal of universal peace.

The hazards of constructive industry today demand a courage as great as the soldier's; and the noblest achievement possible to the individual is to diminish those hazards.

The elements that make for unselfish, patriotic, heroic manhood are all—every one of them—multitudinous in the common life of the people.

The voice of militarism is but the "call of the wild," a beckoning back to the low, savage levels of the outgrown past, up from which the nations have struggled through blood, rapine, famine and pestilence!

Have we gained the glorious uplands of peace? God help us to go forward!

EDWARD HOWARD PUTNAM.

+ + +

I will smite the winter house with the summer house; and the houses of ivory shall perish, and the great houses shall have an end.—Amos, iii:15.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### THE ISSUE IN NEW MEXICO.

Albuquerque, N. M., July 25.

New Mexico is now in the heat of a struggle for popular government as against government by the special interests.

With the passage of the enabling act for the formation of a State government at the close of the last session of Congress came the proclamation of the Governor for the election of delegates to the Constitutional Convention; and it is over this election, which will be held on September 6, that both political parties are now engaged in the warfare for ascendancy.

Whether the new State shall adopt a conservative, "safe and sane" Constitution, as urged by President Taft, or a Constitution embodying vital safeguards for the people and direct legislation, is the question at issue.

+

The Democrats have taken advanced ground on the question of the Constitution. They insist that it shall embody direct legislation through the Initiative and Referendum; election of Senators by vote of the people; the direct primary; publication of campaign contributions; the establishment of a State corporation commission elected by the people, with power to regulate railroads and public service corporations; and other minor features.

The Democrats have come out through their central committee with a clear declaration of principles. Their platform is not voluminous, but is vital from the standpoint of securing popular government.

+

In the fight of the Democracy the influence of John Z. White's recent visit to the Territory has played a prominent part. Mr. White spoke before a number of bodies in Albuquerque on "Direct Legislation," and the tremendous sentiment for popular government among the Democrats and progressive Republicans is due more to the seed thus sown than to any other one thing.

The Democratic central committee has placed orders for 5,000 copies of Mr. White's essay on "Direct Legislation," which first appeared in *The Public*, for general distribution. Other copies will be ordered later. *The Tribune Citizen*, the organ of the Democratic party in New Mexico, has been running Mr. White's essay as a standing advertisement. Five thousand copies are being translated into Spanish for circulation among the native people. In addition to this, as campaign material, the Democrats are circulating several thousand copies of Senator Bourne's speech on direct legislation in Oregon.

+

The Republicans have made no declaration of principles. Although the Democratic central committee at its recent meetings in Albuquerque proposed a non-partisan Constitutional Convention, the Republicans