

operator, nor necessarily to his value as an adviser. It is to his autocratic assumptions with reference to the general policies involved in the utilization of the facts he discovers, or the desirability of the special skill he possesses. This food-devitalization fad, with its collapse, affords a good illustration. The time will probably come when the vaccination fad will suffer a similar disaster. And so with that other and kindred and more irrational and horrible fad that has recently made its way in the field of medical expertism—human sterilization as a check to the propagation of criminal propensities.

* * *

SEEDS OF BAD GOVERNMENT.

The men "higher up" in politics sow seeds of bad government, of which men "higher up" in business reap the sordid fruits.

An illustration was given at Albany last winter by Elihu Root, United States Senator from New York, when he argued against the referendum. Appealing to the legislators not to be allured into allowing the people, their principal, articulate expression in public affairs, he said: "Whenever you take away [legislative] powers, you weaken [legislative] responsibility." So Senator Root would weaken the responsibility of the people by taking away *their* power. He would have the people delegate governing authority to agents, and be outside of and consequently indifferent to the government themselves. He would make them apathetic subjects, not intelligent citizens wide awake in affairs of state and by initiative and referendum compelling their agents to respond to their corporate will.

It was the same Mr. Root, then Secretary of State of the United States, who made the suggestion, imputing dishonesty to the United States Supreme Court, that "constructions of the Constitution would be found," etc. This did more to undermine the respect of the people for that august tribunal than patriotic and courageous attacks on its reactionary decisions.

Richard Olney has afforded another illustration like that by Senator Root. Mr. Olney was President Cleveland's cabinet officer, and as a member of the Democratic party is supposed to differ from Mr. Root's party in principle. But only recently in addressing the Massachusetts legislature he said: "For the legislature of the Commonwealth to leave the question of Boston's future charter government to the arbitrament of a fraction of the voters of the State would be an abdication of its functions and a practical refusal to perform one of the most important trusts committed to it."

Shades of Sam Adams and the New England Town Meeting! The city of Boston can't enact a charter. The legislature alone has that power. It acts for the State, and from the viewpoint of State policy. The city of Boston cannot deprive it of its functions or its responsibility. All the citizens of Boston could do would be to approve or reject the act of the legislature in imposing a charter upon it. But it should be at liberty to do this according as the city, by vote of its citizens, regards the charter as fit or unfit for its needs as a city. This would not supplant the legislature; it would co-operate with it. What Mr. Olney was proposing was that the city of Boston should be deprived of the essential democratic right of independence, of self-rule, of the right to pass on its own fundamental law, of the right to disapprove of a charter if it did not find it satisfactory.

How much better for Boston to educate its electorate up to a good charter, or for its electorate to educate the State legislators up to the will of Boston, than to be obliged to live under a charter for which it is not responsible. How much better for the citizens of Boston—the some time cradle of liberty—to feel that they have a voice in the making of the fundamental law of their city, than to allow themselves to become obedient subjects.

Let us recognize that the cause of bad government must be reached if we would have good government. Let us realize that the cause of bad government comes from a false attitude of the people toward government. Let us understand that the men who sow these seeds of bad government, are treacherous to American principles, even if they are the men higher up—even if they are the men highest up.

LEWIS STOCKTON.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. Duncan (p. 441) has answered an article which I contributed to your valuable paper last March (p. 269). I regret that he has misunderstood my position. He represents me as excusing the Church from taking any part in social reforms. My plea is quite the other way. Had Mr. Duncan read my article more carefully he would not have fallen foul of me. He has quoted one or two sentences, taken them apart from their context, and given them a different meaning from that which was intended. We ought to guard against this kind of thing in all our reading.

The Church that refuses to recognize and condemn existing social evils and call for repentance, is self-condemned. The Church did her duty in the fifties and sixties in not only condemning the principle of