

were fighting the United States. Now one principal reason why we have tried to prevent their becoming independent has been the fear that they would fall to fighting with one another if we made them independent. I should like to ask Mr. Warren or Gen. Miles how many we have killed off in battle of the Filipinos to prevent their killing one another?" Gen. Miles replied as follows:]

As to the fear of their killing each other or a civil war, it is a curious fact that our government was engaged in something of that nature for four long years, and there was more "blood-letting" in that great war of Americans against Americans in the four years from '61 to '65 than in all the wars where lives were lost in the whole western hemisphere for 100 years, and I think the less we talk about that the more becoming it would be for us, for when 500,000 lives, the very flower of American manhood, went to untimely graves in the civil war among ourselves, we are certainly not the ones to talk about peoples of other countries fighting each other.

DISINTEGRATION OF POLITICAL PARTIES.

Extract from the serial letter of March 10, 1906, by Lincoln Steffens, as published in the Chicago Record-Herald of March 11.

When I came down here I couldn't tell the difference between a Democrat and a Republican, and it hurt my pride to have statesmen tell me about their parties. The candid thieves who run our States and cities had ceased long ago to try to work off that sort of buncombe on me, and I thought that all talk of parties was for the "peepul," not for me and the railroads and the boodlers, who change parties as we change cars to follow the majority from State to State.

But still they would talk parties, and the speaker, Mr. Cannon, was especially annoying. He sat me down in a big chair, gave me a cigar, stuck another in his own mouth, and then he stood up over me and delivered a regular stump speech.

He called it an interview, but it was the sort of oration he delivers to his constituents out in Illinois. All about "the" party, "the great party which has made this great country what it is—great."

Since he is a humorist, I thought at first that he was "joking," but he seemed very serious, and I put it down to habit, till by and by it dawned on me that he was trying to deceive himself as well as me. I half believe he half believes the G. O. P. brings up good crops.

But he said one thing that is true:

"This is a government by parties." It is.

As I left the room John Sharp Williams, the minority leader, entered. They work together, these two, for government by parties. We have a bipartisan system here as well as in the cities and States. The pension bill graft goes to Democrats as well as to Republicans; no party difference there. If there's a river and harbor bill, the Democrats get their "divvy." They don't get so much as "the" party gets, but—there's no difference in "pork;" which, mind you, is treated as "graft."

So with the other pork barrel—the public building bill. Toledo needs right now a federal building, so does Atlanta, and other places, but they can't have what they need till there's enough money to go around to all the Congressmen of both parties who voted right. And they vote right here without any precise regard to party.

The speaker put his Philippine bill through only with the help of the Democrats, and Rice, the last special interest "taken care of" by "Uncle Joe" Cannon in his free trade measure, was expected to win over enough Southern protection Democrats to overcome the insurgent high tariff Republicans. The party line there is as confused as that sentence. And, as for the Hepburn rate bill, everybody voted to pass that measure up to the Senate to be fixed. So there's no difference there.

And, taking the Senate, what's the difference between Aldrich, the Republican leader, and Gorman, the Democratic leader? Or between Clark, Democrat, of Montana, and Wetmore, Republican, of Rhode Island?

Bailey, of Texas, is a Democrat, but he is not so much of a democrat as La Follette, a Republican, of Wisconsin. And, certainly, Dolliver, Republican, of Iowa, is at least as democratic as McLaurin, Democrat, of Mississippi.

There are differences among these men, and these differences are political. They are broad enough to build political parties on. But the old political parties are not built upon them. The new parties will have to be and, as a matter of fact, the new parties are being built upon them now, here as elsewhere in the United States.

What are those differences? What is the line the President and Mr. Aldrich could not draw in words? What is the American issue?

Out in Chicago some 12 years ago a group of reformers undertook to clear the boodlers out of their council. The street railways, which needed a corrupt council in their business, were in poli-

tics, and they fought reform. The fight has been waging ever since.

"Municipal ownership" is the form the issue has taken out there, but the fight is really between the public service corporations and the people for the control of the government; and men divide according as they are for special interests or the common interest.

In Cleveland the story is essentially the same. The form of the issue is "three-cent fares," but the fight, which has extended into the State, is between the railroads and other public service corporations on the one hand and the people on the other, for representation in the government, and the voters are dividing as in Chicago.

In Wisconsin Robert M. La Follette undertook to tax the railroads like any other property. They resisted. He taxed them. They were going to take it out of the people of the State by means of higher rates. He undertook to regulate rates. The issue there was, as in Chicago and Cleveland, representative government; the fight was between privileged business and the people, and the voters abandoned the old parties and took sides according as they were for the special interests or the common interests.

Everett Colby, Mark Fagin, George L. Record and their friends in Jersey are just beginning to tax the railroads. Their cry is "equal taxation." But the people of Jersey are really fighting against the special interests for the control of their government in the common interest of all of them.

In Wisconsin the common interest party calls itself Republican and it controls the Republican organization, but the La Follette half-breed party contains many Democrats. In Ohio the reformers call themselves Democrats, but they won with Republican votes. In New Jersey the Republican party is the party used, but in the last election the voters paid no heed to old party lines. They were for themselves.

And so it has gone in Pennsylvania, Missouri and elsewhere. Wherever the people have found a leader who would lead, they have crossed all party lines to follow, and they are forming a new party. For Folk (Dem.) and Colby (Rep.), John Weaver (Rep.) and Tom Johnson (Dem.), La Follette (Rep.) and Dunne (Dem.), all belong to one party.

Differ though they may in ideas, in wisdom, in the slogans they have raised and the symbols they vote under, they all are fighting one fight, raising one issue. They are dividing

old parties into new parties, and all that is needed to complete the realignment is national leaders to bring them together.

And the same thing is happening here in the same way and from the same cause. When the President undertook to pass a rate regulation bill he opened up that old crack which runs across the front of both the old parties. That bill is called an attack on the railroads. It isn't. It may not be a wise bill, but it isn't unfair. Purporting to empower the interstate commerce commission to regulate railroad rates, it will do nothing of the sort.

The best friends of the Hepburn bill, as it passed the House, do not pretend that it will solve the railroad rate problem; the most that they claim for it is that it is "a step forward," and the advocates of the effective regulation of rates want to amend the bill to make it do its work.

So while the bill may be weak, it is not harsh. But it is a challenge to the power of the railroads in the national government and they prepared to oppose its passage.

Public opinion put the bill through the House, and the railroads hoped to avoid an open fight by "fooling" the President into accepting amendments. Everybody thought that they would succeed in this, but they didn't. The President saw the game. When Senator Aldrich expressed his concern lest the bill is unconstitutional, the President is said to have answered: "Then why do you object to it?"

When Senator Knox offered an amendment to perfect the bill and Attorney General Moody reported that the Knox amendment did a little more than that, the President lost some of his faith in one of his most trusted advisers and Mr. Knox lost his temper. The fight was on. Further attempts were made toward a "reconciliation," and the President listened to them. But if he won't lead, others will.

It certainly looks as if the fight would go on to the end, the fight the country is waging in so many parts of the country. The apparent issue here is an accident; railroad rate regulation may not be central or essential; but neither is three-cent fare central or essential. The particular issue does not matter, however; anything will do that brings the people (by "people" I mean all men, not alone the "down-trodden") in just conflict (not with the "rich") with the interests which corruptly rule this country.

"What do they represent?" That is the question we have always to ask, and when the fight was thrown out of the White House into the interstate commerce committee of the Senate, the answers came fast. Elkins, Aldrich, Kean, Foraker, Crane, Republicans, were for an amendment to appeal rate making to the courts for delay, and two Democrats, McLaurin and Foster, leaned that way. No old party line there. Dolliver and Clapp and Cullom, Republicans, and Tillman, Carmack and Newlands, Democrats, were opposed to any emasculation. No old party line there.

But there were new party lines, and Senator Aldrich indicated them. When it appeared that the bill must be reported out with a whole skin, he said that this (the Republican President's) bill was a Democratic bill. And it is; it is in "our" interest. Wherefore Aldrich said: "Let a Democrat lead it through the Senate," and he named Senator Tillman, and the Republicans voted the leadership to this Democrat.

This incident was regarded as highly picturesque because Tillman is no friend of the President. But it may turn out to be more than picturesque. Tillman is a Democrat, but Theodore Roosevelt is a democrat. The President isn't an intellectual democrat, else he could not have advocated a ship subsidy bill. But instinctively "that man" is for that government which Lincoln said should not perish from the earth.

Kings used to suppose society would lapse into chaos without their noble support. We know now that the king had the same relation to society that the thermometer has to the temperature.—Goodhue Co. News. of Red Wing, Minn.

The Argumentative Man:—But, my dear fellow, I tell you it's impossible for the moon to be inhabited. When it is full it is all right, but when it wanes down to a little crescent, where the deuce would all the people go to?—Woman's Journal.

There is not an opponent of woman suffrage who is not obliged to deny the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence.—George F. Hoar.

BOOKS

DARROW'S FARMINGTON.
Farmington. By Clarence S. Darrow.
Second edition. Published by A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago. Price,

\$1.50 postpaid. Sold by the Public Publishing Co., Chicago.

You have perhaps seen mention made in *The Public* (vol. vii., p. 430) of Mr. Darrow's *Farmington*. You have no doubt read it and admired it. I, too, have read it, and admired it intermittently. While liking the scheme of the book and enjoying the reminiscent and suggestive tone, I find it yet open to criticism when judged by literary standards, and liable to arouse differing opinions in its readings.

In the first place, it seems to me that the introduction is almost a superfluity. It is too long, too wordy, too explanatory. There is a harping on one string like "the reiterant katydid." I read *Farmington* aloud, and as I read, a seven-year-old girl sat beside me. For all Mr. Darrow's volubility in this introduction, he is clear, and so it is probable that the child understood much of what was read. When those ten pages of apologetics were finished, she looked up and queried: "That book was written by a woman, wasn't it?"

The fault of apologizing is the greatest one. One is reminded of the excellent housewife, who, having set a plain, substantial meal before you, worries you with self-reproachings as to the simplicity of the food and the absence of pie and cake. Perhaps our author does not apologize so much for the quality of his mental pabulum as he attempts to justify having offered it at all. You may say he is telling John Smith's story, but the guise is very thin—it is Darrow, after all. If a book is worth writing, it needs no excuse. If the book is a poor one, the critical will not read it, and no amount of self-depreciation will render it more enticing. *Farmington* is worth the telling, and this introduction weakens it. Were the author a novice, doubtful of recognition, he would remind one of old Uncle Remus: "It's mighty funny 'bout tales. Te'l 'um ez you may, an' whence you may, some'll say tain't no tale, an' den ag'in some'll say dat it's a fine tale. Dey ain't no tellin'. Dat's de reason I don't like ter tell no tale ter grown folks, 'specially ef dey er white folks. Dey'll take it an' put it by de side er some yuther tale what dey get in der min' an' dey'll take on dat slonchidickler grin what allers say: 'Go 'way, nigger man! You dunner what a tale is!' An' I don't. I'll say dat much fer ter keep some un else fum sayin' it."

So, trying to forget the tedium of the "grace," one comes finally to the feast. Who that remembers his childhood with pleasure can do aught but follow this small boy in his simple sports and tasks, with a heart full of sympathy? Whatever may be the benefits of town life to the adult, that child is deprived of his birthright