

GENERAL LIBRARY,
UNIV. OF MICH.

SEP 23 1910

The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy &
A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana
LINCOLN STEPPENS, Connecticut
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island
HENRY F. RING, Texas
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio
FREDERIC C. HOWE, Ohio
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio

HENRY GEORGE, Jr., New York
ROBERT BAKER, New York
BOLTON HALL, New York
FRANCIS I. DU PONT, Delaware
HERBERT QUICK, Wisconsin
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Iowa
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri
C E S WOOD, Oregon

JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota
W. G. EGGLESTON, Oregon
LEWIS H. BERENS, England
J. W. S. CALLIE, England
JOSEPH FELS, England
JOHN PAUL, Scotland
GEORGE FOWLDIS, New Zealand

Vol. XIII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1910.

No. 651

Published by Louis F. Post
Ellsworth Building, 357 Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents Yearly Subscription, One Dollar
Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post
Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

Enemies He Is Making.....	889
President Taft's Double Weakness.....	889
Direct Legislation in Oregon.....	889
Tainted News from Topeka.....	891
Prostitutional Legislation in New York.....	891
Social Surplusage and Individual Earnings.....	891
Contrasts, Not Comparisons (Lewis Stockton).....	892

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

"It" at Work in Oregon (W. G. Eggleston).....	893
A Moving Picture (Emil Schmid).....	894
As a Man Thinketh, So Is He (George Hughes).....	895

NEWS NARRATIVE:

President Taft in Politics.....	895
Ex-President Roosevelt in Politics.....	896
Progressive Victory in Washington.....	897
Illinois Politics.....	897
The Initiative and Referendum in Arkansas.....	897
Direct Legislation in New Mexico and Arizona.....	897
Miscellaneous Political News.....	898
Socialist Politics	899
The Ballinger Case.....	899
The Anti-Imperialist League Honors William James.....	900
The British Land Question.....	900
The British Labor Parties.....	900
First Federal Parliament of South Africa.....	901
Finland Makes a Stand for Her Liberties.....	901
News Notes	901
Press Opinions	903

RELATED THINGS:

The Reporter's Envoy (Berton Braley).....	905
Japhet in Search of His Citizenship (L. F. P.).....	905

BOOKS:

The Classics	907
Pamphlets	908
Periodicals	908

EDITORIAL

Enemies He Is Making.

Roosevelt is sure enough making a very choice collection of very valuable enemies.



President Taft's Double Weakness.

A weaker man than Mr. Taft has probably not been President since James Buchanan; and his "spoils" letter, in the name of Secretary Norton, but with the President's sanction, is evidence of it.



That letter is a naïve confession of irresponsible weakness. It confesses, first, that President Taft dispenses patronage as party spoils; second, that he has been dispensing patronage as faction spoils, in an effort to defeat the Insurgents; third, that the triumph nevertheless of the Insurgents has frightened him into overtures looking to their getting a fair party share of spoils in the future; fourth, that he does not realize the lack of principle here involved; and, fifth, that he is, as the New York Sun might have described him in the days of Dana—and did describe Hancock—"a good man weighing two hundred and fifty pounds."



Direct Legislation in Oregon.

When such papers as the Oregonian of Portland, and its understudies elsewhere, including the New York Times (p. 698), are fostering ignorance of

the experience in that State with direct legislation, designing to create prejudice against it among the thoughtless, a letter such as this from William R. King, associate justice of the Supreme Court of Oregon, makes an instructive supplement to Senator Bourne's speech (pp. 616, 843). Judge King writes:

We deem the Initiative and Referendum amendment to the Constitution of this State a success. Some criticism arises, bearing on the fact that the people are compelled to vote upon a large number of measures. For example, at the next election the number is something like forty. But this criticism is not meritorious. Before election a pamphlet is sent out by and at the expense of the State to every voter, which contains a copy of all the proposed measures. The voters as a rule look it over and are thereby prepared to vote intelligently on election day. The laws passed thus far will compare favorably, if not more than favorably, with legislative enactments.

Another benefit derived from this system of legislation is that it makes the legislature more prudent and cautious. The members realize that if they do not pass a bill demanded by the people, the people will do so (with a vengeance), and as a result such measures as the legislature thinks the people demand are, as a rule, enacted. The same effect is derived from the fact that they know if certain measures are passed the people will invoke the Referendum. These two features are perhaps the greatest benefits derived from the direct system of law making, and we anticipate that it is only a question of time when but very few if any measures will be submitted to a vote of the people direct, for the reason that the legislature, knowing this power to be in the hands of the people, will, in order to avoid expense and delay, comply with their wishes.

The principle recognized by the Initiative and Referendum is without question the settled policy of this State. Many recognize that it may be improved upon. Some think the number of petitioners is too few, while others are inclined to favor the Nevada system, to the effect, as I understand it, that a measure must first be submitted to the legislature, and if rejected, then to the people. Personally I am inclined to believe that our system could be improved upon by increasing the number of petitioners required to initiate a bill to 10 per cent, and those invoking the Referendum to 15 per cent of the voting population.

+

That letter will prepare the reader to consider this misleading editorial statement of the New York Times of August 22, which it bases upon a quotation from the Oregonian:

Here is one of the amendments to the Constitution of Oregon on which, along with thirty-one other propositions, the voters are expected to express their desires by a simple "Yes" or "No."

For an amendment to Article IV, Constitution of Oregon, increasing initiative, referendum, and recall powers of the people; restricting use of emergency clause and

veto power on State and municipal legislation; requiring proportional election of members of the Legislative Assembly from the State at large, annual sessions and increasing members' salaries and terms of office; providing for elections of Speaker of House and President of Senate outside of members; restricting corporate franchises to twenty years; providing \$10 penalty for unexcused absences from any roll-call, and changing the form of oath of office to provide against so-called Legislative log-rolling.

The mere reading of this list of matters bunched in a single amendment is enough to make an ordinary man's head swim, and the more he knows about the complex subjects involved the harder it would be for him to embody his judgment in the affirmative or the negative.

Well may any one ask, as a startled reader of the New York Times asks us, if it is "possible that the Oregon plan works out in this absurd fashion." No, it is not possible—at least not true. Filterings from the Oregonian through the New York Times regarding the Oregon plan are useless for all purposes of information. The Oregonian would like to abolish the plan because it interferes with the Interests in Oregon; the Times opposes its extension to the other States because it would interfere with the Interests everywhere. And that is "the milk in the cocoanut."

+

Article IV of the Constitution of Oregon, which the Times mentions in the foregoing extract, is the Article defining legislative powers. It is entitled "Legislative Authority." The proposed amendment is a substitute for the whole of that Article; and while it embodies new provisions, it retains much of the original. This is in conformity with the usual procedure whenever and wherever constitutional amendments modifying an existing Article are submitted to popular referendum. The title of the proposed amendment, as stated on the Initiative petition in Oregon, is not as the Times seems to state it, but is in these words:

The Legislative Assembly: A Constitutional amendment to provide a plan for the election of members of the Legislative Assembly by proportional representation, increase the people's Initiative and Referendum powers, prevent logrolling and abuse of the emergency clause, and generally to provide for such organization of the Legislative Assembly as will fairly represent the people of Oregon and obtain efficient performance of legislative duties.

+

After quoting the Oregonian's misleading statement, the Times asserts that "the mere reading of this list of matters bunched in a single amendment is enough to make an ordinary man's head swim." That depends much on the specific gravity of the head. The full text of the proposed amendment

the title of which we have quoted—of the substitute, that is, for the present Article IV,—is sent to every registered voter in Oregon well in advance of the election; and any man of ordinary intelligence can read that text in half an hour and understand its provisions. If he does not like them or any of them, he may vote against the amendment. It is true that he must accept or reject it as it stands. But that was true of the original Constitution of Oregon when it was voted on. The people had to accept or reject the whole document, with its very much greater number and complexity of subjects. And has not that been true also of the constitutions of every other State, unless as in some States—and as the Oregonian, the Times and other reactionaries would doubtless like for all States—they were validated by autocratic constitutional conventions over the people's heads?

+ +

Tainted News from Topeka.

In an editorial last week on the "Constitutionality of Direct Legislation" (p. 869) we mentioned an absurd pronouncement of one "Justice Knowlton" of "the Kansas Supreme Court," whom a Topeka news dispatch of August 25 quoted against "William Allen White's plan" for the Initiative and Referendum in Kansas. We are now informed by Mr. White that "there is no Justice Knowlton in Kansas, or any other judge with a name like it," but that there is "a machine press bureau in Topeka, which makes a business of sending out all sorts of stuff to discredit all progressive movements in Kansas." These machine press bureaus are not confined to Topeka. Their trails cover the land. In one way and another, and in one place or another, they are all the time as busy as bees manufacturing tainted news, of which the Topeka dispatch in question is an instance. That dispatch is probably on its rounds yet in the newspapers of the country. Somebody is paid for this extensive and expensive service to the Interests, of course; and equally of course somebody does the paying. A California town contemplating municipal ownership has recently been victimized by one of these tainted news factories. Whether the local paper that featured its serial "epitaphs" was victimized or is a victimizer, we are not yet sure; but of the victimization we are sure, and shall have something to say about it anon.

+ +

Prostitutional Legislation in New York.

If Dr. Maude Glasgow is right in her recollection that Mr. Roosevelt, when Commissioner of Police

of New York, ordered that men as well as women be arrested when houses of ill fame were raided by the police, Mr. Roosevelt deserves the commendation she gave him in her speech on the 15th at a Madison Square meeting that had been called to protest against the Page law of New York, which subjects women of dissolute life, or so accused (p. 855), to a species of degradation that not only humiliates them but so brands them as to make escape from that life except by death virtually impossible. All the speakers at that meeting were women, most of them were physicians, and one, the chairman of the meeting—Dr. Anna Daniels—is a physician peculiarly qualified, by professional service at the Woman's Infirmary, to criticize such a law. Dr. Jane D. Berry of the Woman's Prison Association denounced this law, characterized by others as the "infamous Page law," as impotent for its ostensible purpose of preventing the spread of sexual disease. The frightful pressure upon ill-paid working girls, tending to lead and then drive them into a dissolute life, was described by Miss Margerie Johnson, a settlement worker; and some speeches urged woman's suffrage as a means of securing protection and of preventing sex discrimination in penal laws. The position of those public-spirited women regarding that law, is sound in public policy and in morals. The law as it is reported deserves all the denunciation that can be given it. The question of one of the speakers, "Do you men who have daughters as well as sons want to see these poor girls tortured while the men who are responsible for their fall go free?" must drive the merits of the issue home to every thinking man. The Rev. Anna Shaw exposes the vicious character of the law when she says: "If there existed on the part of the framers of this disgraceful bill an honest intention to mitigate the horrible results of the social evil, would their conception of its regulation be limited to women only?" Laws like this one are startling commentaries upon all those anti-suffrage arguments which assume that enfranchised men as a class protect unenfranchised women as a class.

+ +

Social Surplusage and Individual Earnings.

For several weeks the Chicago Tribune has been singularly direct, clear and sound in many of its editorial utterances. Yet the history of that paper is such that there is much wondering as to when the clamp will be applied. Here is an example:

Ask most men what they mean by "earn" and they will first be irritated at being asked to define such a

common, simple word. But they will end by giving it up. A generation ago, perhaps ten years ago, a definition would have come easier. Probably it would have taken some such form as this: A man earns what he can get without breaking the law. But this conception is no longer satisfactory. We are beginning to see that this question of earning has its roots deep in the soil of our social life.

+

Excellent, and bravo! Every word has the ring of pure gold on a marble slab. But the conclusion we reproduce below, what does that mean? After quoting from Roosevelt's Osawatomie confession the absolutely true deliverance that "every dollar received should represent a dollar's worth of service rendered," the Tribune editorial goes on:

We are beginning to realize nowadays the narrowness of the old theory that one earns whatever one can get under the law, under the rules of the game. We know now that many of us, quite honestly and lawfully, get more than we earn, the difference being that part of our acquisition we are enabled to make because of the co-operation of our fellows, because of that entity called the community or society. And for this surplusage we owe a return in the form of social and civic service at the least.

+

What can that mean—not the first sentence, which is fully up to sample; nor the last, which may be better than it looks, a sort of editorial "singe cat;" but the middle sentence? If it, too, is of the "singe cat" species, or a hostage to prudence,—good enough, good enough, and well done. If it implies that co-operation yields a social surplusage distinguishable from individual earnings—better yet. But if it means what some sociologists do mean when they write or talk in that way, that all difference between what workers in social co-operation acquire honestly and lawfully in excess of what they could acquire without social co-operation, is unearned individually—if this is what it means, then the writer responsible for the editorial had better think again at just that point.

+

Millions of men in co-operation, with all the varieties of knowledge each assimilates and the skill each acquires, produce immensely more of all the things that each of them wants than they could possibly produce without co-operation; but part of the increase is individual, for the power of each is greater. If one refused to contribute, the measure of the consequent lessening of the aggregate result would be, not his individual power under

primitive conditions but his individual power under civilized conditions. His individual earnings, then, are the value of that contribution, be it more or less,—and it could be easily measured, more easily than the "return in the form of social and civic service" he may "owe." But there truly is a surplusage—as easily measured, too, as individual earnings—and it does result from the "co-operation of our fellows because of that entity called the community or society." As society improves, not only does this surplusage increase, but individual earnings for work also increase. If this is what that Tribune editorial means, then more power to the writer's elbow; if it is not what it means, let the elbow power be turned in on his analytical faculties.

* * *

CONTRASTS, NOT COMPARISONS.

Whenever attempts are made to improve the methods of popular government, we hear from some fine old crusted tory pedant. Histories of ancient Greece and Rome are ransacked for awful examples. Comparisons are drawn, which fail to mention the widely different conditions that existed then from those that exist now. The fact that the principle of representation in governmental affairs was unknown to the ancient world, is ignored.

Modern electoral machinery did not exist in the ancient political systems. The secret ballot with modern safeguards as to registry, casting and counting the vote, insuring secrecy, preventing intimidation, and reducing opportunities for bribery (which are rightly considered indispensable now), were unknown to ancient Greeks and Romans. The ancients had relatively no standard of morality in public affairs. What is now known as public opinion was then a negligible quantity.

There were, of course, none of the modern methods of distributing intelligence, no modern means of locomotion or communication, no mails as we understand the word, and no press.

The existence of slavery in ancient Greece and Rome created institutions, customs, laws, and a situation politically, which should remind us that there was no democracy as we understand democracy. Gibbon, Merivale and Mommsen make plain the demoralizing influence of slavery on Greek and Roman. Americans should be chary, then, of comparisons drawn by the pedantic army which is in alliance with standpat commercial and political interests.

Certain remarks of President Schurman of Cornell made at Silver Lake last summer in opposi-

tion to direct nominations and direct legislation, as inconsistent with "representative institutions," are in point.

What are representative institutions? Should representatives of the people not represent the whole body of the people? If we have representative government why is there a general refusal of representatives to adopt a conclusive method of determining what the will of the whole body of the people on any given question, in any given district, is? Why do party press, partisan leaders and Big Business contributors to party campaign funds fear the real touchstone of public opinion—the referendum?

Is it of the essence of representative government that representatives shall be allowed to guess, and not be accurately informed, as to the public will? Is it essential to republican forms of government that corporation agents in press and in party machine shall alone have the power of informing the people's representatives?

Shall those who refuse to accept the situation be permitted to express their insurgency, or shall they be branded as dangerous demagogues because they demand authoritative expressions of public opinion?

Are republican government and representative institutions to be left to the mercy of party newspapers which suppress information as to the exploitation of the people? to party managers whose puppets in our legislatures easily pass measures in the interest of Big Business and defeat referendum measures? to corporate agents who alone can draft "safe, sane and well considered" legislative acts? to college professors whose prodigious learning prevents their seeing straight or thinking clear?

LEWIS STOCKTON.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

"IT" AT WORK IN OREGON.

Portland, Ore., Sept. 15.

If you have read Lincoln Steffens' article in the September number of Everybody's Magazine, you know what "IT" means. If you haven't read it, read it. Judge Lindsey calls "IT" the "Beast"; other aliases are "Franchise Big Business," "Special Privilege," the "Corporations," the "Money Power," the "Interests," "Capitalism"; and some call it the "Taxing Power," and "Private Monopoly." Whatever you prefer to call it, "IT" is busy trying to undermine and destroy popular government in Oregon, for the simple reason that popular government means "taxing power in the hands of the people," and when the people get the taxing power "IT" is going to have more trouble than it can attend to. Not that the people of Oregon have taken the tax-

ing power, but that under their system of popular government they are able to take it without asking the consent of the legislature, and they are getting ready to take it.

Therefore, "IT" is making an attack all along the line in Oregon on the Initiative and Referendum, the Recall, Direct Primaries, and everything else the people have won in the last eight years.

The attack is engineered, managed and financed by the private owners of public utilities or "franchise corporations."



The first gun was fired by the Pacific States Telephone Company. The voters had approved a bill, initiated by petition, for a gross earnings tax on telegraph and telephone companies. The telephone company refused to pay the tax. Beaten in the Circuit Court at Portland and in the Supreme Court of the State, it appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, where the case is now pending, on the ground that the Initiative power in the hands of the people destroys the "republican form of government" guaranteed to every State by the Federal Constitution.



The next point of attack was in the legislature, in 1909, when that body—alleged to represent the people of Oregon—submitted to the voters a bill to call a Constitutional convention to revise the State Constitution. It was suddenly discovered that the Constitution of Oregon was fifty years old, out of joint with the times. The advocates of a new Constitution do not state wherein the old document needs revision, and ignore the fact that any needed revision or amendment may be proposed by Initiative petition, as has been done at each election since 1902. It is as easy for a corporation as for citizens to have an amendment prepared and circulated for signatures, and then placed on the ballot for approval or rejection by the voters.

However, it is not that the corporations want an easy road to constitutional amendments. What they want is a Constitution that can't be amended without their consent. So they had the legislature submit that bill for a Constitutional convention, with provision for popular vote upon the Constitution that might be drafted by the convention.

It would seem, then, that if the voters approve the bill and order a Constitutional convention, they have it in their power to reject the proposed Constitution if it doesn't suit them. But, as is very evident, the tricksters behind this Constitutional convention scheme don't intend that the people shall have an opportunity to vote on a new Constitution.



Big Business employs shrewd lawyers who know that in six States, since 1890, Constitutional conventions have made new Constitutions and then "proclaimed" or "promulgated" them without giving the voters an opportunity to express their wishes.

That trick was worked in a particularly flagrant manner in Delaware, Virginia and Kentucky.

Under a law providing that the new Constitution should be submitted to popular vote, the Delaware

Constitutional Convention of 1896 prepared a Constitution and ordered it submitted to the voters, but before the election could be held the convention met again, cancelled the election, and "proclaimed" the Constitution it had made as the Constitution of Delaware,—and the people had no vote on it.

In 1900 the Legislature of Virginia submitted to popular vote the question of calling a Constitutional convention. The voters approved it. The legislature called an election for delegates to the convention and nominated it in the bond that "said revised and amended Constitution shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the Commonwealth as a whole or by separate articles or sections" at the general election in 1901. The convention met, wrote a new Constitution and "proclaimed" it without submitting it to the voters. The new Constitution was taken to the Supreme Court of the State on the ground that it had been put in force without being submitted to the voters for approval or rejection, as the law required (see *Taylor vs. Commonwealth, Va. Supreme Court Reports*, vol. 101, page 829), and the Virginia Supreme Court upheld the action of the Constitutional convention.

In the case of *Miller vs. Johnson* (92 Kentucky, page 589), the Kentucky Supreme Court made a similar decision, though the law creating the Constitutional convention had provided that the new Constitution must be submitted to the voters before it could be put into effect.

These infamous precedents, established by three States, are good enough for Big Business in Oregon or anywhere else. If the people of Oregon decide that they need a Constitutional convention, and vote for one, they may know now what to expect—a new Constitution written by corporation attorneys and put into effect by "proclamation" without giving the voters an opportunity to reject it if they wish to do so.

+

Yes, "IT" is very busy in Oregon this year, and its chief mouthpiece is the *Portland Oregonian*, the only morning paper of any size or circulation in Oregon. It has the Associated Press monopoly here, and faithfully does it serve all other private monopolies.

W. G. EGGLESTON.

+ + +

A MOVING PICTURE.

Pittsburg, Pa.

When Theodore Roosevelt spoke here, I sat at his feet—literally, I mean, and not altogether as Paul at the feet of Gamaliel. Through the courtesy of Allen T. Burns, secretary of the Civic Commission, I had a seat in the press gallery, which happened in this case to be in "the pit" and directly in front of the speaker. I could hear every word clearly, could see every gesture distinctly, and above all could observe in minute detail those curious facial contortions which make Mr. Roosevelt's oratory peculiar.

It was intensely interesting.

If I could, I wished to find out what the magic is of this man's clutch upon the popular imagination. And as I sat and looked and listened, those contortions, that square build, the bull neck and bullet

head, those grotesque gestures, those tupperian sentiments in stentorian tones and with the masterful manner of the inerrant, grew more and more luminous as interpreters to me of this singular man's singular popularity.

+

A brilliant preface in the daily press, always eager to exploit anything theatrical, and a startling index of contents, appear to be the qualities that make this animate book of platitudes a big seller with a people awaking from a long and stupefying lethargy.

I jotted down his phrases that "brought a hand",—and here are some of the characteristic ones:

The people that hurt Pittsburg are the people who are corrupt.

Don't attack a man unless you are sure he is a bad man, but when you do attack him, don't let up on him.

The greatest injustice that can be imagined, a greater injustice than any of the industrial system, would be in giving equal reward for unequal service.

Every man of us at times needs a helping hand. Stretch out that hand and help the man who has stumbled; but if he lies down, don't carry him.

If you don't go forward, you will slip backward.

Can you imagine William Jennings Bryan or Robert La Follette before an American audience giving voice to such sentiments as if they were novelties? Aren't the same things and better said from a thousand humble pulpits every Sunday? Yet the fact remains that the audiences go away from Roosevelt's meetings with smiles and head wags, saying: "Wasn't that bully!"

+

Are they hypnotized, or have they merely grown foolish?

A little of each perhaps. But I am now convinced that Roosevelt's popularity depends not upon what he says nor upon what he does, but upon a way he has of doing what he does and of saying what he says.

When the chairman at the Pittsburg meeting was reading his introductory speech—which by the way was infinitely more meaty than Roosevelt's—he was interrupted by an impatient and unthinking crowd. Roosevelt scowled fiercely, fidgeted in his seat, shook his head, and suddenly jumping to his feet and shaking his finger at the crowd, shouted: "You will not hear from me unless you hear the chairman first!"

Bully? Of course it's bully!

Then he talked. Every word, every syllable, slowly, diss-tinct-ly e-nun-she-a-ted, fairly hissed through a splendid set of formidable teeth. He began with a recital of the characteristics of the American people—"en-er-gy, pow-er, force, keen business intelligence, rigid industry, immense versatility of mind, a vigorous, masterful people." Over each word he lingered and gloated. They snapped and sizzled with electricity plus. Then his voice broke into a high treble. It quavered like a child's as he cried: "I wish I could stop!" To run out of adjectives seemed to hurt him.

And no matter what he said, light or heavy, trivial or important, he pounded every word, every phrase

as with a sledge hammer. Between whiles he clapped his hands, puckered his mouth, twitched his cheeks, as if about to say something startling; and throughout, his performance was interspersed with queer grins and grimaces and gargoyle attitudes. I had thought the caricatures of Roosevelt's facial expressions overdrawn, but they haven't approached the actual contortions.

The things he said? Platitudes. Platitudes. Not once did he lay down a principle and let it stand. Always modifying. "We must have ideals, but we must not forget to be practical." "Let us go after crooks, but be sure they are crooks and don't go too far." "The magazine writer can do much good, but he can also do much harm." "We are in very truth our brother's keeper, but we must not coddle him so he cannot keep himself." Forever "but"-ing—always leaving the door open to slip in or to slip out.

+

You may ask if it is possible the American people are taken in by mere mannerisms? Not all. Roosevelt's hold seems to me to be only on that part of the mass which is easily influenced by superficialities, which does not analyze, which admires bold strokes in outline, which moves by instinct rather than reason—that part, too, which is as quick to drop its hero as to take him up.

Roosevelt's hold on thinking men is not strong. I have talked with thousands in the past year, students of affairs, and almost without exception they rate him as a politician, never as a statesman.

+

Well, what of it?

Not much, perhaps. The strong undercurrent of democracy may carry Roosevelt farther than he intends going, and there will be no great harm in that. He may indeed appropriate the credit that belongs to genuinely democratic men like Bryan, La Follette, Bristow, Cummins and others; but realization of democracy is more important than personal credit for it. Yet if Roosevelt should regain the Presidential chair, what assurance is there that he, with his democratic plumage only borrowed, might not pawn it to plutocracy? Has he not heretofore given to democracy the enjoyment of his "bully" words, and to plutocracy the profit of his diplomatic deeds?

EMIL SCHMIED.

♦ ♦ ♦

AS A MAN THINKETH, SO IS HE.

Topeka, Kansas.

I sat twiddling my thumbs in a public place. The things which I had to pay filled my mind. For the time being society was barred, the field was purely personal.

A man I know, and who often discusses conditions with me in the hope of rendering me less visionary, came and sat down beside me. It seemed that that morning, a Readywriter had come out with an item in a column for which he frequently writes, called, "On Second Thought." I must read it, and condemn or defend it.

It was about Theodore Roosevelt.

The Readywriter had been called courageous, because he "picked at" T. R. occasionally. The Readywriter said it did not take courage, and that it paid better wages than to laud him. "I admire him; but he is becoming vain, and a bluffer in part. T. R. has always had the country with him. Some day T. R. will go up against a proposition bigger and stronger than he is. If he side-steps, then I will know that I had him sized up right."

Nothing very fierce or deep here: personal matters did not incline to let me fight for the rightness of this Readywriter.

So I turned the page and handed the paper back to my friend, with a thing for him to read in his turn:

"Cries of Pinchot came from every part of the house. He was finally dragged forward, and in a husky voice said: 'There are but few moments in a man's life like this. It is magnificent to hear the principle of conservation of natural resources acclaimed as you have done. I have fought many years for conservation, and Conservation has won. I thank you.'

When he read this by itself, my friend was silent.

Nothing of its kind beats this. It is a concrete though unconscious expression of the old Arena's motto as I remember it: "A man is the principles that move him; that force him into the arena to battle for them."

To free the earth for the equal use of all, we needs must put man in his proper place. Man is the machine merely; it is the glorious explosive Power before which we must bow down and worship. Hereafter in far distant years,

If this book, by some chance surviving, fall into the hands of curious readers,

They will smile perplexed, and say:

"How strange that in those barbarous times
It seemed worth while to write these simple, self-evident
truths,

And to solemnly set forth such wisdom as now our babes
are born with!"

Surely there never was an age when things so elemen-
tary were honestly gainsaid.

Oh the mystery of eyes that see not and ears that hear
not!

GEORGE HUGHES.

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, September 20, 1910.

President Taft in Politics.

Close upon the returns from the primaries and elections of last week (pp. 872, 897, 898), President Taft gave publicity to a remarkable letter—remarkable alike for its admission of his use of

Presidential patronage in the political interest of the Standpat Republicans and for the defeat of Insurgent Republicans at Republican primaries, and for its promise to hereafter use such patronage in the interest of leaders in both factions. The letter is addressed to an unnamed person in Iowa, and is signed officially by the Secretary to the President. Copies of it have been sent to the executive heads of all Departments in Washington, accompanied with a note that the letter had been written by authority of the President. The letter itself purports to be in reply to letters of the 9th. It is in these terms:

Your letters of the 9th are at hand, and I have delayed replying until after the primary elections. The President directs me to express to you and to your friends his deep appreciation of the work you have done and the powerful assistance which you have extended to the Administration from the beginning—an assistance that has contributed much to the legislative and other successes which have been secured. The President recognizes that your efforts have been wholly disinterested, that you have fought sturdily and generously for what you believed to be his interest and the welfare and success of the party. While Republican legislation pending in Congress was opposed by certain Republicans the President felt it to be his duty to the party and to the country to withhold Federal patronage from certain Senators and Congressmen who seemed to be in opposition to the Administration's efforts to carry out the promises of the party platform. That attitude, however, ended with the primary elections and nominating conventions which have now been held, and in which the voters have had opportunity to declare themselves. The people have spoken as the party faces the fall elections; the question must be settled by Republicans of every shade of opinion, whether the differences of the last session shall be perpetuated or shall be forgotten. He recognizes the danger that in certain cases expressions of feeling were so intense as to make it difficult in some instances for factions to come together and work for the party, but as he stated in his letter to the Republican Congressional Committee, he believes it can be done and should be done. The President is confident that you will yourselves meet your local and State situation in this spirit, and that you will write to your friends and ask them to do likewise. The President feels that the value of Federal patronage has been greatly exaggerated and the refusal to grant it has probably been more useful to the men affected than the appointments would have been. In the preliminary skirmishes in certain States like Wisconsin and Iowa, and elsewhere, he was willing, in the interest of what the leaders believed would lead to party success, to make certain discriminations; but the President has concluded that it is his duty now to treat all Republican Congressmen and Senators alike, without any distinction. He will now follow the usual rule in Republican Congressional districts and States and follow the recommendations made by Republican Congressmen and Senators, of whatever shade of political opinion, only requiring

that the men recommended shall be good men, the most competent and the best fitted for the particular office. Sincerely yours,

CHARLES D. NORTON,
Secretary to the President.

The new policy indicated in this letter began with the appointment on the 19th of George M. Hull, a progressive Republican, as postmaster at Salina, Kansas. The appointment is "charged" to Senator Bristow (Insurgent).

* *

Ex-President Roosevelt in Politics.

The struggle for delegates to the New York State Convention of the Republican party between "the old guard" (as the anti-Roosevelt and anti-Hughes faction in New York is called), and the Roosevelt-Hughes faction, over the temporary chairmanship for which Vice-President Sherman and ex-President Roosevelt are the contestants (p. 852), has grown more vigorous since Mr. Roosevelt's return (p. 875) from his speaking tour.

*

Mr. Roosevelt spoke at the Suffolk county fair at Riverhood, L. I., on the 15th, making no reference to the faction fight, but in explanation largely of the "new nationalism," which he defined as "the application of certain old-time moralities to the changed conditions of the day."

*

At the State fair at Syracuse on the 17th he defended his criticisms of Supreme Court decisions with the same quotations from Lincoln that Bryan and Altgeld quoted for their criticisms of this court in the early '90s. What is reported by the news dispatches as his only allusion in this speech to State politics is the following promulgation of the doctrine (originally proclaimed by ex-Mayor Tom L. Johnson of Cleveland in his political struggles with the late Senator Hanna):

It is necessary and desirable that there should be leaders, but it is unnecessary and undesirable that there should be bosses. The leader leads the people; the boss drives the people. The leader gets his hold by open appeal to the reason and conscience of his followers; the boss keeps his hold by manipulation, by intrigue, by secret and furtive appeal to many forms of self-interest, and sometimes to very base forms.

*

The "old guard leader," Mr. Barnes (pp. 824, 852), issued a statement on the 13th, in which, besides characterizing Mr. Roosevelt as "the most dangerous foe to the world of business and labor in the United States," he said that—some of the men who are urging Mr. Roosevelt's candidacy for temporary chairman of the convention against Vice President Sherman have little realization of the rising tide of popular disapproval

which Mr. Roosevelt's speeches in the west have caused. His assumption of power is looked upon with wonderment. His ability to arouse the passions of the mob is dreaded in every quarter of the State. Every day the menace of his political ascendancy to business and to labor is more thoroughly appreciated. I do not believe his name ever will be presented to the convention against the recommendation of the State committee for Mr. Sherman. If it is, it will as certainly be voted down in the cause of true Republicanism as that the convention will convene.



Mr. Roosevelt indicated his position regarding party loyalty on the 14th in an interview at Oyster Bay on the victory in Washington of Mr. Poindexter over the Ballinger faction. We quote the Oyster Bay dispatch:

Reports of the Progressive victory in the Republican primaries of the State of Washington reached Theodore Roosevelt tonight, and he immediately urged that all factions of the party unite to support Representative Miles Poindexter for the United States Senate and the three Progressive nominees for Congress. "Just as in South Dakota, where the Regulars won, I urged the Progressives to support the Regulars heartily," he said, "so I must earnestly urge that the Progressives in Washington, where, I am informed, Mr. Poindexter has been indorsed for the Senate and three Progressive candidates have been named for Congress, must be given loyal support by the Regulars."



Progressive Victory in Washington.

One of the most radical Insurgents in the lower house of Congress, Miles Poindexter of Spokane, won a sweeping popular victory on the 13th for the Republican candidacy for United States Senator from the State of Washington. His plurality was estimated at 30,000. He was opposed by Secretary Ballinger and President Taft; but Gifford Pinchot worked for him, as did Samuel Gompers.



Illinois Politics.

Cook county conventions of all parties were held at Chicago on the 19th, the delegates having been elected at the direct primaries (p. 873) last week. Mayor Busse controlled the Republican convention and Roger Sullivan the Democratic. The former recognized progressive tendencies in politics to the extent of demanding in their platform a corrupt practices act prohibiting misuse of money at elections and primaries, and requiring publication of sworn statements of receipts and expenditures both before and after election; also a Statewide civil service law. The Democratic platform makes a similar demand as to civil service, but makes no pledge for a corrupt practices law. It does, however (as the Republican platform does not), declare for the election of

United States Senators by the people, and pledge "best efforts to obtain mandatory legislation establishing the initiative and referendum as a fundamental part of the laws of Illinois."



The Socialist convention met pro forma and adjourned sine die without action, the declared intention being, as reported, to ignore the direct primary law in every way possible without violating its requirements.



At the Prohibition convention only formal action under the law was taken.



The Initiative and Referendum in Arkansas.

Complete returns from the vote in Arkansas on Amendment No. 10 to the State Constitution (p. 872) providing for the Initiative and Referendum, are still lacking. Even in Little Rock complete returns from only 15 counties were at hand as late as the 16th. These showed a total vote of—

30,014 for Governor.

20,942 for the Amendment.

6,476 against the Amendment.

For its adoption the amendment must receive a majority of all the votes cast at the election. Assuming that the vote for Governor is the highest, the amendment has 5,934 votes to spare in those 15 counties; and George J. King, who canvassed the State for the amendment, concludes from these complete returns and "fragmentary reports and general statements" from the rest of the State that the amendment has been adopted "beyond all doubt."



Direct Legislation in New Mexico and Arizona.

It is conceded by the Republicans of Arizona that the Democrats, pledged to the Initiative, Referendum and Recall (p. 873), have carried the Constitutional Convention by a large majority of the delegates, and that these provisions are certain to be embodied in the Constitution that will be voted upon by the people and then be submitted to Congress.



In New Mexico (p. 873) the Republicans have elected a large majority of the delegates, but some of them are pledged individually for the measure by their constituents, notwithstanding the hostility of the Republican leaders, to vote for direct legislation; and there are besides a group of fusionists who are also pledged to the measure. The fusionists were elected without opposition upon an understanding that they would support direct legislation. If all pledges are kept, there will be a majority of 2 for direct legislation in the convention. But it is not expected that

all the pledges will be kept. The hostile pressure—corporation at home and political at Washington—is reported to be very insistent. It is believed, however, that the opposition of direct legislationists, if the Constitution comes to the polls without a direct legislation clause, will be strong enough to defeat it; and as influential aspirants for Gubernatorial, Senatorial and Congressional honors are extremely solicitous for Statehood, it is expected that a compromise may be made—probably for some form of Referendum without the Initiative.

* *

Miscellaneous Political News.

Later returns from the Maine election (p. 872) give the Democrats only two of the four Congressmen, but their legislative majority assures the election of a Democrat to the Senate. The plurality for Governor-elect Plaisted was 8,114. Except at the Presidential elections of 1880, 1884 and 1888, the total vote was the largest ever cast in Maine.

*

The Connecticut Republican convention nominated Charles A. Goodwin for Governor on the 14th, and unqualifiedly endorsed the Taft administration.

*

In Missouri on the 14th the Republican convention endorsed Gov. Hadley's administration, and favored conservation of the public domain, home rule for cities, a public utility commission and an employers' liability law. A bitter fight between Progressives and Standpatters was compromised. The Democratic convention declared for a tariff for revenue only, and named for the Democratic candidate for President (pp. 627, 633) Joseph W. Folk.

*

Gov. Shafroth of Colorado was renominated by the Democratic convention on the 14th, after a hard fight with the Denver delegation. All the candidates of that delegation were defeated by Shafroth supporters, except the candidate for railroad commissioner—Alex. Davidson. Mrs. Katherine M. Cook is the candidate for Superintendent of Public Instruction.

*

A Tennessee convention of independent Democrats, which met at Nashville on the 14th, ignored a harmony resolution of the regular Democracy of the State, by referring it without discussion to the Independent's executive committee when appointed; and endorsed for Governor the Republican nominee—Ben W. Hoopes, who appeared before the Independents and explained the Tennessee situation by saying:

We have seen in this State for the last four years the assembling of the vicious and criminal elements

of all races and parties under the banner of an unscrupulous organization, an intensified imitation of the Tammany Democracy of New York and the Republican ring of Philadelphia. We have seen the laws of this State trampled under foot. We have seen the pardoning power of the Governor converted into a political asset and used for the financial enrichment of his henchmen and the political aggrandizement of himself. We have seen the streets of our State capital crimsoned with the blood of political martyrdom. Do you ask who is the leader of this Democratic revolution? I answer that it is not any of the Independent leaders whom I see before me here today. Edward W. Carmack's body lies moldering in the ground, but his soul goes marching on.

Captain Hoopes' remarks about the pardoning power and martyrdom are allusions to the Carmack tragedy (p. 369), which has forced Governor Patterson's withdrawal for renomination (p. 878). A "gentlemen's agreement" between the Independents and the Republicans is reported, to the effect that neither party will invade the other's "safe" legislative territory, thus assuring a Democratic legislature.

*

The Democratic committee of Minnesota has chosen James Gray, formerly mayor of Minneapolis as the Democratic candidate for governor in place of the regular nominee, ex-Governor John Lind, who had declined (p. 878). Mr. Gray has accepted.

*

The New Jersey Democratic convention divided almost evenly in its vote for governor, but Woodrow Wilson, president of Princeton University, received 749½ (43 more than necessary for nomination), and his nomination was at once made unanimous. The platform demands various reforms of only local interest, together with conservation of water rights and all other natural resources still within the control of the State, a public service commission with ample powers, an employers' liability law, an 8-hour work day for all public workers, and a corrupt practices law. George Harvey, of Harpers' Weekly (p. 674), appears from the dispatches to have been Dr. Wilson's personal representative at the convention. He is reported to have said that the direct primary plank in the platform was not acceptable to Dr. Wilson, being contrary to representative government (Dr. Wilson is a pronounced opponent, for that reason, of the Initiative and Referendum); but the direct primary plank, as adopted and apparently accepted by the candidate in a speech to the convention, is reported to be as follows:

Such a simplification of the electoral machinery of the State as will make possible the effectual exercise of the right of direct nomination of all elective officers on the part of the voters and the enactment

of laws which will secure to them that right in the most effectual manner.

Dr. Wilson was born in Staunton, Va., in 1856.

+

The primaries in Illinois on the 15th resulted in the defeat for Congress, by the Republicans, of Congressman Boutell (Standpat), and the renomination of Congressman Foss (Standpat), and of Speaker Cannon (Standpat). Lee O'Neil Browne, the Democratic leader in the legislature who brought over Democratic votes to Lorimer (p. 867), was renominated by a tremendous majority. So was Speaker Shurtleff, the Lorimer Republican. (For legislative nominations, the voter in Illinois has three votes, all of which he may give to one candidate, or one and a half each to two candidates, or one each to three candidates, as he pleases; and much "plumping" of three votes for one candidate is said to have been done in favor of the "machine" candidates of both parties). Of the Democrats who voted for Senator Lorimer in the last legislature (vol. xii, p. 537), 26 are renominated and 5 defeated; of the Republicans, 18 are renominated and 12 defeated. Andrew P. Canning (p. 810) was defeated for the Democratic nomination in the Foss district.

♦ ♦

Socialist Politics.

At a Socialist party picnic at Chicago on the 18th, Eugene V. Debs spoke to 5,000 persons or more on political questions. He is reported to have characterized the Constitution of the United States as a "class document"—

prepared by the Colonial capitalists with the distinct idea of keeping the working classes down—

and the Supreme Court of the United States as "a capitalist organization"—

made up of nine corporation lawyers, and its master is the trusts who control the government in every department. During its existence it has annulled—vetoed—twenty laws enacted by Congress and more than 200 laws enacted by the States. Its hand is always against the worker. It has outlawed the strike and the boycott. It is the only court in the world that has the power to negative legislation.

Of the trade union, Mr. Debs said:

It was a good thing once, but now it is the tool of the capitalist and of the capitalist politician. The so-called labor leaders are misleaders. We see Sam Gompers and John Mitchell sitting down to the same table with August Belmont and other rich enemies of the working class. Of the two men—Belmont and Gompers—I have infinitely more respect for the former, plutocrat and plunderer though he is, than for the latter, a man who betrays the people he has been chosen to serve. The workers must stop being led like sheep and do things for themselves. Only when they act for themselves can they attain freedom from their bosses. The thing for the workers to do—the thing that they some day will do—is to organize in one great industrial organization. I mean

by this one great organization embracing all workers, not a collection of labor unions jumbled together haphazard and so divided that they are incapable of real progress.

Of ex-President Roosevelt, Mr. Debs is reported as saying:

In their stupidity the American people worship this arch enemy of the working class almost as a deity. The man is a coward and a braggart. He shot a Spaniard in the back and boasted of it. When the Chicago teamsters were striking they went to Roosevelt to demand relief. He ordered them back to their slavery and said: "If you don't go back, back of the Mayor is the Governor, and back of the Governor is the President and the standing army of the United States." He went to Egypt as the guest of the British aristocracy, and when the young Egyptians looked to him for aid, publicly denounced them. He is an arch hypocrite. He is a dishonest man. He advocates publicity for campaign contributors, but ignores the New York World challenge to publish the names of the trusts that contributed money to elect him in 1904. In that campaign George B. Cortelyou, a Roosevelt lackey, went to the trusts and used the information he had to hold them up for millions. Roosevelt was the same kind of a President that Grosscup is a Judge—and if there is any form of judicial turpitude of which Grosscup hasn't been guilty it's because he doesn't know about it.

♦ ♦

The Ballinger Case.

Unable to get a quorum at their meeting at Chicago, the members of the Ballinger investigating committee (p. 874) who have been regarded as supporters of Secretary Ballinger, issued an informal statement on the 13th, in which they recited that there was no opportunity and no attempt to have the committee meet for the purpose of consultation upon the evidence or to report its findings to Congress prior to the adjournment of the session, and that it determined to devote some of the time during the recess of Congress to this work and decided to meet in Minneapolis on September 5; but that the day of the meeting found only seven of the twelve members present; that Senator Flint was in Europe and Senator Root on the sea, returning from arguing a case for the government before The Hague tribunal, and the other three were detained by brief but peremptory engagements; that upon reassembling two days later eight gentlemen were present and two more were reported on the way; and that "the eighth member to appear happened to be a Democrat and the members of that party found themselves in temporary control and promptly proceeded to turn the circumstances to what seemed to them a party advantage." The statement proceeds then to charge against that accidental majority that—in advance of any consultation whatever upon the evidence, which had never been weighed and discussed in committee, they demanded the passage of

resolutions of the most sweeping character formally finding Secretary Ballinger guilty not merely of charges which had been made but of charges which had been only implied and of things which had never been charged but which persons appearing at the hearing had alleged against him. Other members of the committee present protested against such proceeding, which would dispose of the case in the absence of four of the twelve members, making it possible for a minority of the committee to find the committee's verdict, and this, too, without any consultation or discussion. But the partisan political end to be gained by the Democratic minority became all the more urgent in proportion as the railway trains bearing other members of the committee were approaching Minneapolis. The minority refused even to take a recess, and the other members, protesting against the evident determination to take a snap judgment by a minority in the absence of a third of the whole tribunal, and declining to bear any responsibility for thus converting the investigation into a travesty and for a violation of the fundamental principle which should govern the whole proceeding, withdrew from the meeting, and thus deprived the Democrats of their temporary control of the committee.

Denouncing this procedure as unlawful, the statement goes on to explain that—

every effort was made to induce the minority members to agree to a meeting on some day at Minneapolis or Chicago as might suit their convenience, but without avail. The chairman thereupon called the present meeting. The members whose names are hereto attached have spent the day reviewing the case, but being without a quorum are powerless to act and have adjourned subject to the call of the chairman. The report of the committee cannot be made until Dec. 5, when Congress meets, and the meeting called for Sept. 5 was for the purpose of considering and discussing what the report to be made three months thereafter should be. There was, therefore, no haste or pressure for time.

The statement was signed by Senators Nelson, Sutherland and Root, and Representatives McCall, Olmstead and Denby.

+

Replying to the above statement, Congressman James is reported from Louisville on the 14th to have said:

The statement issued by Senator Nelson and his colleagues in Chicago yesterday is only positive proof of what we saw demonstrated in Minneapolis, and that is, that the Republican members of the committee did not desire to make a report upon the Ballinger case until after the elections. Their attempt to prevent a report was accomplished by breaking the quorum. The statement made by the gentlemen that the meeting called for Sept. 5 in Minneapolis was for the purpose of considering and discussing what the report to be made three months thereafter should be is far from the truth. It was specifically agreed, when we adjourned in Wash-

ton to meet in Minneapolis Sept. 5, that it was for the purpose of making up our report and giving it to the public.

+ +

The Anti-Imperialist League Honors William James.

At a stated meeting of the Executive Committee of the Anti-Imperialist League held September 8th, the following minute was adopted, to be placed upon the records of the Committee, communicated to the family of the late Professor James, and published in the usual manner:

As one of the most important in that group among the faculty at Harvard university which has done so much to redeem the academic type from the reproach of isolation and remoteness, Professor William James is a great loss to the Anti-Imperialist League, of which he was a vice-president.

He could hardly be otherwise than a strong adherent of the League since he was by nature an irrepressible champion of the weak and the wronged, but he brought to our councils not only enthusiasm but the most practical wisdom, and in speech and writing his firm temper carried conviction by its union with a habitual cheerfulness of mind and equanimity of spirit.

MOORFIELD STOREY. ERVING WINSLOW.
President. Secretary.

+ +

The British Land Question.

Conservative newspapers in Great Britain have for weeks exhibited much uneasiness on the part of land monopoly interests regarding the valuations for land taxes under the Lloyd-George budget (p. 417), which are now in process of adjustment. "The Tory papers continue," as one observer has stated it, "an active campaign against Lloyd-George's land taxes, and the Daily Telegraph and Mail are filled with columns of daily letters from all kinds of persons, including that historic figure, the desolate widow with small means, who figures in every such controversy, and the militant army officer who makes a resounding call for passive rebellion against the wicked budget and predatory chancellors." This outcry appears, now, from the following comment in the cable letter of T. P. O'Connor, M. P., to the Chicago Tribune of the 18th, to have—

received a severe blow by the courageous action of Lloyd George in summoning all of his enemies and critics to a public conference. This conference blew sky high many of the stupid or hypocritical criticisms, and Lloyd George is more confident and courageous than ever.

+ +

The British Labor Parties.

A recent decision of the British courts has put the Labor parties at an unexpected and serious disadvantage (vol. xii, pp. 515, 1256), since they are dependent for financial support upon trade union assessments. The crisis through which they are consequently passing is thus ex-

The Public

plained by T. P. O'Connor, M. P., in his weekly cable letter to the Chicago Tribune of the 18th:

The crisis has been induced by what is now the historic case of Osborne. Osborne is a workingman and a member of a trades union, who, for some reason or other, appealed to the law courts against a decision of his union which decreed a compulsory subscription toward the expenses of a member of Parliament. The law courts held that the union had no right to compel such subscriptions. One would have thought that the trades unionists of England, like the Socialists of Germany, or the Nationalists of Ireland, would not have found any insurmountable difficulty even after such decision. But for some reason or other the English workingman has not learned yet the art of free giving to those who fight for him. Their first idea, of course, was to resort to legislation and to have the same course adopted in this case as in the Taff Vale decision. It will be remembered that the Taff Vale decision by the judges enabled a railway company or any other corporation to pursue a trades union for damages if given by the courts. After some pressure and some changes of purpose, the Liberal ministry resolved to pass a law which would make trades union funds immune from attack, and the House of Lords, avowedly because it did not want to come into conflict with the millions of working men and also, perhaps, because it did not consider it its special business to look after the business of the great employers of labor, many of whom are pronounced Liberals, allowed their remarkable bill to pass into law. The trades unionists now hope to induce the Ministry to act in the same way regarding the Osborne judgment and to give to trades unionists the right of a compulsory levy for Parliamentary purposes on their members. But the Ministry, for the moment, do not see their way clear to propose a bill so drastic. Nor, indeed, would the trades unionists themselves be quite unanimous in advocating such a proposal. Strange though it appears, there is a considerable number of trades unionists who are also Conservative. This is especially so in Lancashire, where the large Irish immigration in the late forties produced a permanent estrangement between English and Irish labor which has not yet entirely disappeared, though it is now disappearing. The Ministry proposes to meet the difficulty, as is known, by passing a measure for the payment of members. It is strange that such a measure should have remained so long delayed, seeing that there are now so few countries that do not give a salary to their Parliamentary representatives.

+ +

First Federal Parliament of South Africa.

The general elections for the House of Assembly (the lower house) of the first Parliament of the Union of South Africa (Cape of Good Hope, Natal, Transvaal and Orange Free State (p. 541), were held on the 15th. The dispatches report that the most dramatic result recorded was the defeat of General Louis Botha, the Premier and minister of agriculture (p. 491), in the east-

ern division of Pretoria, at the hands of the Unionist, Sir Percy Fitzpatrick. The Associated Press dispatch thus sums up the party situation: "The chief parties in the campaign were the Nationalists, representing the Dutch interests, under the leadership of Premier Botha, and the Unionists, representing the British and mining interests, under the leadership of Dr. L. S. Jameson, former Premier of Cape Colony. Both racial and political issues have been so confused, however, that they had little real influence on the results, which thus far assure the Nationalists of a majority. Dr Jameson and many other prominent candidates have been re-elected or returned unopposed."

+ +

Finland Makes a Stand for Her Liberties.

It will be remembered that a bill for the suppression of Finland's ancient and constitutional rights of autonomy was passed by the Russian Douma (pp. 543, 563) and the Council of the Empire (p. 686) in the summer just closed, and that the political significance of it all was expressed in the now historic phrase of a member of the Douma who when the Government's victory was announced triumphantly shouted: "Finis Finlandiae!" (p. 563). But Finland has not lost her ancient sturdy courage. When the Finnish Diet (p. 444) met on the 15th it proceeded to re-elect its former President, Mr. Svinhufvud (p. 179), who represents resistance to Russia. In his speech upon re-election, Mr. Svinhufvud boldly said: "We are still to undergo a more severe trial than ever, as the Diet has been asked to sanction terrible inroads in the constitution. Hard times face us, but we shall survive, handing to the generations to come the most precious treasure—a spotless standard, refusing to negotiate the sale of our liberties."

NEWS NOTES

—The autonomy committee of the Young Egyptians (vol. xii, p. 541; vol. xiii, p. 591) met at Geneva, Switzerland, on the 14th.

—The voters of Shreveport, Louisiana, on the 15th adopted the commission form of government at a special election, by a majority of 557.

—By a vote of 530 to 267, San Luis Obispo, California, adopted on the 13th a charter embodying the main features of the Commission plan.

—Although scattering cases of cholera (p. 879) are appearing in various European countries, among which Hungary is now to be included, the epidemic is on the whole abating.

—The British Trades Union Congress, sitting in Sheffield, on the 13th, adopted by a large majority, resolutions authorizing steps to ascertain the practicability of combining all trades unions in the kingdom under one supreme control. The purpose is to

form a more effective organization for bringing about a general strike.

—An early abolition of the death penalty (vol. xii, p. 63) in Spain, was announced by the Spanish minister of justice, Mr. Ruiz Valarino, in reopening the courts on the 15th.

—Zeppelin VI, the latest of Count Zeppelin's dirigible balloons (pp. 614, 684), on the 14th was torn by the explosion of one of its three motors, and three of the crew were seriously injured.

—The Orinoco claims case in dispute between Venezuela and the United States (vol. xii, p. 175) is to come up before the International Court of Arbitration at The Hague (p. 877) on October 28.

—The first passage of a living man through the Whirlpool rapids at Niagara in an open boat was made on the 18th by Captain Klaus Larsen, of Cleveland. The voyage was made in a little motor boat.

—Harrison B. Riley, of Evanston, president of the Chicago Title and Trust Company, has been appointed a member of the special tax commission (pp. 542, 564) by Gov. Deneen, in place of Alderman Charles E. Merriam, resigned.

—By a vote of 432 to 72 the city of Modesto, California, adopted its new charter (p. 511) on the 15th, which establishes the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. The Modesto method of recall differs from the usual form, in that it separates the election Recall balloting from the election to fill the vacancy if there is a recall.

—At the Pan-American Congress held this summer at Buenos Ayres (p. 855) the reorganization of the Bureau of the American Republics, which has its headquarters at Washington, was arranged for. The Bureau will hereafter be called the Pan-American Union, and the United States Secretary of State will be its president ex officio.

—Charles R. Heike, former secretary and treasurer of the sugar trust (p. 587), was sentenced on the 19th by Judge Martin in the United States Circuit Court at New York City to eight months' imprisonment in the New York penitentiary and to pay a fine of \$5,000. A stay of execution of the sentence was granted pending an appeal to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

—The little Emperor of China (vol. xi, p. 879), now nearly five years old, is no longer attired in the silken robes of immemorial custom. He has been lately made to wear a smart little military uniform of European cut, representing in Western symbolism his rank as head of the Imperial Army of China. The Prince Regent is reported as having taken a stand against another Chinese antiquity—the pigtail, which, like the bound feet of the women, is doomed.

—The Committee of Seven of the Peoria Conference (p. 802), consisting of Walter S. Rogers, chairman, of La Grange, and Dr. George Tupper, of Mount Vernon, F. C. McFarland, of Galesburg, Frank N. Bode, of Springfield, and Fletcher Dobyns, and George E. Cole, of Chicago, has decided to center its efforts in the Illinois campaign upon the three "little ballot" propositions for which its petition (p. 873) is on file—a civil service act, a corrupt prac-

tices act, and an initiative and referendum amendment to the State Constitution.

—At the Chicago Federation of Labor on the 18th, John Fitzpatrick was re-elected president. Among other officials elected were: Elizabeth Maloney of the Waitresses' Union, and Gertrude Stoetzel, of the Garment Workers' Union, on the Finance Committee; Margaret Haley, of the Teachers' Federation, on the Legislative Committee; Mrs. Raymond Robins and Florence Donaghue, on the Executive Board; and Anna Willard as a delegate to the Convention of the Illinois Federation of Labor. At this election, all the Socialist candidates were defeated.

—President Taft and ex-President Roosevelt met on the 19th by telephone appointment, at New Haven. It was their second meeting since Mr. Roosevelt's return from Africa, and the Associated Press dispatches say of it that "while it may have been successful in its 'scenic effect,' and of moral advantage to the Roosevelt leaders in New York State, it was absolutely barren of results as to any better understanding between the President and Col. Roosevelt as to national issues or their personal relations in view of many recent events. Something in the nature of a truce seems to have been arranged regarding the New York State situation. After that is over, events will shape themselves."

—Two more bombs, numbers 40 and 41 (p. 160), in the gamblers' war in Chicago between the professional gambler group, which the police protect, and the group they suppress, were thrown on the 19th. They were thrown almost simultaneously five miles apart, one at a notorious dance hall, the other at a "cafe" and both from elevated station platforms. The buildings were injured, but nobody was hurt. Following is the reported record down to date of this systematic bomb-throwing which it is reported the police dare not prosecute because it would expose a pre-election deal with the political managers of Mayor Busse when he was a candidate in 1907: 1907, 13 bomb explosions; 1908, 15; 1909, 6; 1910, 7.

—The sixteenth conference of the Interparliamentary Union (vol. xi, p. 471) was held at Brussels from August 29 to September 2. According to the report of the Advocate of Peace "the resolutions indorsed the Knox plan for the institution of the Court of Arbitral Justice, and recommended to all the governments the creation of national commissions similar to the peace commission authorized by the United States, such commissions to report to their governments and parliaments within two years, with a view to promoting the solution of world peace problems. It was said to be the unanimous opinion of the delegation that the Panama canal should not be fortified, but that the expense of its fortification should be saved."

—By a majority of more than 7,000, Caleb Powers defeated Congressman Don C. Edwards for the Republican nomination in the Eleventh Congressional district of Kentucky in a primary election on the 15th, carrying all but four of the nineteen mountain counties which comprise the district. Powers was Secretary of State at the time of the assassina-

tion of Gov. William Goebel, in 1900, and was confined in jail during eight years, his first three trials resulting in conviction and the fourth in a disagreement. Last year Gov. Wilson (Republican) swept the court records clear of all the cases remaining untried in connection with the Goebel murder by granting pardons to Powers and several others (vol. xii, p. 420). The campaign between Powers and Edwards was a spectacular one and evoked marked bitterness. The Eleventh district has a nominal Republican majority of upward of 20,000.

PRESS OPINIONS

Publicity in Politics.

The Chicago Examiner (Hearst), Sept. 20.—Arizona seems to have decided for organic democracy. A majority of the fifty-two delegates to the Constitutional convention were elected because they stood pledged to the principle that direct primaries, the initiative, the referendum and the recall must be wrought into the fundamental law of the new State. Wise men from the East have told the Arizonans that such matters ought not to be put into a State Constitution, that they should be left lying about loose as materials for future partisan controversy. But the people of Arizona have rejected this advice and have decided to so settle their fundamental law in the beginning of their Statehood, that politics in the new commonwealth will have to be a public affair.

+ +

Blazing the Way.

The Johnstown (Pa.) Daily Democrat (dem. Dem.), Sept. 14.—That was a greater victory for real democracy in Arkansas than the one scored by the Democrats in Maine. . . . The Arkansas triumph attracts less attention; it is less sensational in character and its political effects are not so immediate as that won by the Democratic party in the pine tree State; but measured by its broader possibilities it throws the other far into the shade. For the victory in Arkansas was for fundamental democracy rather than for mere party democracy. It was a triumph of the democratic idea rather than of the Democratic party. Yet the Democratic party has the credit and it deserves the plaudits of real democrats everywhere for the service it has done the cause of genuine democracy. As a result of Tuesday's balloting Arkansas joins Oregon with the People's Power. The heart and center of the fight was on this issue; and the people carried the day against the forces of privilege, Mr. Bryan. . . making a magnificent campaign in behalf of the Amendment to the Constitution which restores the government to the governed through the Initiative, the Referendum and the Recall.

+ +

How the World Moves—Gently But Firmly.

Emporia Weekly Gazette (William Allen White), Sept. 15. Two months ago the conservatives expected to control the Conservation Congress and to humiliate Gifford Pinchot. Instead he controlled

the Congress and they left it beaten and disgruntled. Two months ago the standpatters said that progressive Republicanism was a product of the West. Since then New Hampshire has spoken and has proved that all the people of this nation feel alike. What two months in recent history have done so much? Cannon gone. Aldrich done for. Ballinger going. Sherman discredited. The tariff bill deserted. Republican leadership changed. Taft given a short shrift in the Republican conventions of five States. On the other hand Murdoch has become a national Congressional leader. Stubbs has become a national figure. Roosevelt has taken control of the majority leadership of the Republican party. Pinchot has been endorsed by the conservation forces. La Follette has triumphed over his enemies. And all in sixty short days. We are moving gently but firmly to the time when this nation will pass from the control of the great interests into the hands of the people.

+ +

The Irrepressible Conflict.

The Milwaukee Journal (ind. Rep.), Sept. 15.—Senator Elihu Root shows the usual blindness of tory leaders when he says that the result of the Maine election will cause the two factions of the Republican party to "get together better." In the very nature of things it is impossible for them to get together. Not in the whole history of the country have two distinct parties been divided on sharper lines than those which cleave the Republican party today, and the breach is gradually widening. The Progressives are opposed on principle to everything which the tories preach or practice. The Progressives cannot "get together" with the tories unless they sacrifice principle. They cannot compromise without discrediting themselves, and to do this would kill the great movement to regenerate the Republican party. The fight is one to the death. Either the movement to make the Republican party progressive from top to bottom must succeed or the party will cease to exist. The question is beyond the power of the tory leaders or even the progressive leaders to settle. If Senator LaFollette, for instance, were to "get together" with Aldrich and Cannon, he would lose his power in Wisconsin. The people would regard him as they now regard President Taft. It is the people, not politicians, like Senator Root, who are going to settle this question.

+ +

Spoilsmanship at the White House.

The Chicago Record-Herald (ind. Rep.), Sept. 16.—A most painful impression will be created by the letter which Secretary Norton has written to "a Republican leader" of Iowa to explain the President's actions and purposes with regard to Federal patronage. It contains the confession that patronage has been withheld from the Insurgents. . . and the intimation that the President has now been whipped into line by Insurgent victories and so is willing to divide the spoils. . . . We might conceive of a great emergency during which plausible excuses could be offered for using the patronage to coerce spoils politicians into the support of some vital principle, but

in this case the Insurgents went further for principle than the President, who prates of his duty to party and country. Mr. Taft was holding back so as to assure himself of the support of the regular machine. . . . The assurance in the midst of repeated drubbings that the pie counter is now open to all must arouse the contempt of those who have fought for principle and won.

+

The Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Sept. 17.—It was a matter of common notoriety that Federal patronage had been withdrawn from certain Republican Senators and Representatives. Bestowing patronage to get votes and withholding it to punish men who do not "vote right" are old Presidential practices, but other Presidents have not taken the public into their confidence on the subject. It would have been more tactful for President Taft to have kept silent. . . . The President's letter has delighted his enemies. It has grieved his friends. It has angered the men he wished to mollify. It has provoked the derision of his old allies, all practical politicians. The only thing which can be said in the way of excuse for a letter which was meant for an apologetic explanation, but which is in some places almost insulting, is that the President's intentions were good. But it takes something besides good intentions to make the complete letter writer.

+ +

Politics in the Home, and the Home in Politics.

The Chicago Examiner (Hearst), Sept. 12.—Here is a new argument for woman suffrage. It is presented by the Governor of Wyoming, who has had plenty of opportunity to study the subject and draw conclusions. The Governor says that instead of disrupting the home it elevates it. "Politics is talked freely in the family circle and political questions are settled by intelligent discussion. The children grow up in an atmosphere that encourages debate of public questions." In other words, the day of the monologue is over and father is no longer the lecturer on politics and political economy. As for mother, she is presumably able to hold up her end of the argument in questions apart from domestic science, the government of children, the regulation of servants and the encouragement of the latest fashions. And as for the children, they absorb unconsciously, even if they are not profoundly interested. The table and the family circle become the arena of political debate, and the results are healthful and stimulating. So says the Governor of Wyoming, who speaks as one having authority and not necessarily as the scribes. Politics, then, is to become a natural avocation and not merely a special business.

+ +

Hankering for a Ruling Class.

The Chicago Examiner (Hearst), Sept. 15.—Lyman Abbott, in his series of articles in the Outlook on the principles of government, continues offering amendments to the Declaration of Independence with great animation. In his most recent article he proposes a radical reduction in the right of suffrage.

The old axiom of the Declaration that "Governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed" he proposes to amend by substituting his own axiom, "No man has a right to take part in governing others who has not the intellectual and moral capacity to govern himself." The proposition certainly has all the dignity of great antiquity. All through the ages, in every land, some men have claimed the necessary intellectual and moral capacity to govern and have denied that other men had it. And the pivotal question has always been—Who is to be the judge of capacities and how may capacity be determined? Following along Mr. Abbott's article we discover that he has no solution for this problem but a property qualification, an educational qualification and the payment of taxes! In brief, we distinguish in Mr. Abbott's article a cautious advance toward an idea which of late has been growing among a certain school of political doctrinaire—the idea of establishing in America a ruling class! The doctrine is an insidious one. An amount of property which may qualify one as a good citizen this year might be deemed insufficient next year. The same might be true of educational standards—and thus we would be started upon a process of progressive disfranchisement which would gradually erase every principle of the good old Declaration!

+ +

Back to the Land.

(London) Land Values (land value taxation). September.—The land question is extending and confirming its hold on the mind of the country. We are only at the beginning of the valuation and already it is engaging more serious attention than any other subject in the world of politics. This is a reason for satisfaction, as well as an inspiration towards further efforts. The power of landlordism has covered the face of this land completely; it has pressed heavily and disastrously on the industry and life of the nation. But the valuation is an attack on this power, wide enough to touch it at every point, if not strong enough to break it. In and through the valuation itself relief and security can be obtained for the men and women who maintain the nation by their services. Therefore, the deep and wide interest which is being taken in this subject is one of the most blessed and hopeful activities to which a country could give itself. The valuation is proceeding, and the most prominent incidents connected with its progress are the fierce and angry protests of its opponents. This is good. The controversy over the actual operation and administration of the Budget is deepening the impression that was made by its discussion last year.

+ + +

"Life is sweet, brother."

"Do you think so?"

"Think so! There's night and day, brother, both sweet things; sun, moon and stars, brother, all sweet things; there's likewise the wind on the heath. Life is very sweet, brother; who would wish to die?"—*"Lavengro,"* by George Borrow.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

THE REPORTER'S ENVOY.

When earth's last paper is printed, and the forms and the metal are cold,
 When the newest scandal is ancient, and the latest extra is sold,
 We shall loaf—and, Lord, how we need it!—with nothing at all to do
 Till the boss of the perfect paper shall call us to work anew.
 And then we shall work as we'd like to, each on his own machine;
 And the truth shall be in our copy and nothing shall intervene;
 We shall write real stories about them—beggar and millionaire—
 For an editor keen and fearless, a paper that's on the square.
 We shall work in a rush and a hurry, for that is the goodly Game,
 But we shall not dig in the gutter for stories of filth and shame;
 And the copy-readers above us shall leave our "features" alone,
 And the stories that fill the columns we shall recognize as our own!
 We shall have no fool assignments, no cruel missions of pain,
 To torture the broken-hearted or blacken the sinner's stain;
 We shall scoop and be scooped a-plenty, we shall love the flurry and noise,
 We shall fight with the business office and fuss with the copy-boys;
 But each of us shall be human, and each of us shall be free
 To write the thing as he sees it for the Paper That Ought to Be.

—Berton Braley in Puck.

* * *

JAPHET IN SEARCH OF HIS CITIZENSHIP

For The Public.

*

After Voting Perfunctorily, Japhet Begins His Momentous Search with a Plunge in the Dark, and Is Almost Instantly Rewarded with a Civic Adventure.

*

In his search for his citizenship (p. 328), Japhet's business experience served him very well. It had made him methodical. It had also revealed to him the secret of successful investigation. He

might have stared helplessly if you had told him to proceed from the known to the unknown, for he wouldn't have recognized the secret by that off hand explanation; but as this method had become habitual with him in business matters he adopted it instinctively for his present purpose.

To be sure, the "known" in this affair of his was little enough, in contrast with the "unknown," but he made the best of what little there was. This lay entirely outside the larger learning; which was fortunate, perhaps, since it prevented his floundering about in the subtleties of statesmanship. It held him down to the simplest facts for a beginning.

Those facts he had to develop out of his own limited political experience. Books were of no use to him. His schooling had been so badly managed that he didn't know how to dip into books, nor even how to study them. That also was doubtless a very good thing for Japhet, in so far as the beginning of his search for his citizenship was concerned. It threw him back upon business methods, which had taught him, though only by rule of thumb, how to study men and their ways.

Yet he began slowly. Vast and mysterious seemed the regions he was about to explore, and a considerable time elapsed before he had quite made up his mind to start. He didn't know how. No way seemed open from any of the few things he knew about citizenship to those unknown depths beyond. It was not until election day of that memorable Presidential year that his momentous search really began, and then it began with a plunge in the dark.

Knowing already that the registration place would also be the voting place, Japhet had no trouble in finding out where to vote. When he came to the barber shop where the election officers were again assembled, the working man's morning had gone and the early business man's morning had begun. So the rush of voters of the working class was over. The voting line, therefore, was not very long, and Japhet had stood in it but a little while awaiting his turn when he was pronounced "next."

The election officer, the same who had taken official charge of his registration two weeks before, asked him where he lived, somewhat curtly Japhet felt, and Japhet meekly told him. The street number was quickly found in the registration books, with Japhet's name written under it. There also was all the personal information he had given when he registered, and in one of the columns, headed "Qualified Voter," the entry "Yes" was written opposite his name. Since he thus appeared officially to be a qualified voter in that voting precinct, a great broadside of paper was handed him by one of the election officers who said to him in delivering it:

"Here's your ballot. You'll find an empty booth over yonder."

Japhet had been through this experience be-

fore—though perfunctorily, as he supposed becoming to a business man—and he followed the directions easily enough. Entering one of the three or four booths designed for allowing voters to mark their ballots in secret, Japhet spread his ballot out upon an improvised shelf, lighted with a tallow candle, for the booth was curtained and dark, and there he marked it according to his choice of candidates.

This didn't take him long. Although there were several lengthy columns of names to choose from, with a little square opposite each in which to indicate his choice by making a cross with a pencil, there was a circle at the top of every column opposite the name of the political party that had nominated the long list of candidates immediately below in the same column. That circle was for the convenience, as Japhet knew, of "straight ticket" voters, these being the voters who "stand pat" by voting for their party whether or no and right or wrong. Yet Japhet knew also that he could be independent even though he made a cross in the circle at the top. For if he were to put a cross also immediately opposite the name of a candidate in another column, the effect of it would be to give his vote, for the office for which that particular candidate stood, to the candidate for that office of another political party, while leaving his "straight" vote to count for each of the remaining candidates of his own party. Japhet might have voted independently in this way for as many candidates of other parties as he pleased, without affecting his "straight" party vote in other particulars.

But in fact he had only one choice at variance with the nominations his party had made. It almost surprised him that he had any at all. For his party was the respectable party, and Japhet was intensely respectable in those days. So he voted the "straight" ticket of this respectable party by making a pencil cross in the circle at the top of the column headed by that party's name, and then hunted for the name of an aldermanic candidate in one of the other columns. As he put a cross in the circle opposite this candidate's name, he applauded his spirit of independence for having thereby "scratched" a bad candidate of his own "good" party. The "old man" had advised him to do this, and the newspaper he trusted had confirmed the "old man's" advice.

Japhet was now happily conscious of having so marked his ballot as to vote for the "safe" candidate for President, the national nominee of the "good" party, and for a business man's candidate for alderman, who happened to have been nominated by the "bad" party. As for the rest of the candidates he had voted for "straight," he knew no more than that their party was respectable whether they were or not.

Folding his ballot according to instructions, he then withdrew from the booth and handed the bal-

lot to the election officer, who dropped it into a square glass-sided ballot box through a slit in the top. Japhet had exercised the supreme right of American citizenship, and done it intelligently according to the leaders of the respectable party.

But as he stepped out of the voting place, his resolve to make a search for his citizenship thrust itself upon his attention; and the more he thought the more conscious he became of his civic ignorance—the more impressed with the notion that in voting he had acted more like an automaton than a citizen.

Even of the ballot he had cast, he was in the densest ignorance. A strip of paper with printing on it and places for making pencil marks indicating a choice of candidates—of course he knew that—but back of such commonplace externalities what was it and why was it? This was the kind of ignorance that annoyed him. He knew nothing of its history, except that he had heard it called the Australian ballot, which seemed as absurd in American politics as an Australian member of Congress; and for the life of him he couldn't see, anyhow, why there should be so much red tape about voting. As "a plain business man"—a favorite expression with "the old man" and Japhet,—he had a contempt for red tape. "Straight to the point," that was his motto as it also was "the old man's."

By this time, however, Japhet's reflections upon the search he had resolved to make, had carried him far enough along to give him the hint that possibly there were reasons, whether good or bad, for all these formalities, and that he must know those reasons and find out for himself whether they were good or bad in order to be in truth an American citizen.

Stimulated by such reflections Japhet determined to take advantage of the fact that election day is a legal holiday—something else he had never seen any sense in,—to begin his search in earnest. With this determination he threw off some of his business-man reserve of manner, and, stepping back into the polling place—there was a lull in the voting and only the officials and the party workers were there—he surprised its occupants and shocked himself with an attempt at the "hail fellow well met" style of address.

"Say, boys," he exclaimed, "what are the boundaries of this voting precinct?"

The friendly response surprised Japhet as much as his unaccustomed familiarity surprised them. Every election official, every party worker, every politician in the room, all of whom he and "the old man" had been in the habit of regarding as "bad citizens," showed a genuinely friendly disposition to help him. For the first time in his recollection Japhet felt like a fellow citizen. And the sensation seemed far more delightful than his now battered pride of "pure and intelligent citizenship," as the "old man" called it, which had

gently swelled his chest two weeks before, had ever seemed.

This was his first lesson in civics. Though it taught him the meaning of *fellow citizenship* only slightly in his head, he had at any rate got from it the sensation in his heart.

L. F. P.

BOOKS

THE CLASSICS.

The Classics—Greek and Latin. The Best Translations of the Masterpieces of Greek and Roman Literature, with Introductions by the Leading Classical Scholars of Great Britain and America. Marion Mills Miller, Litt. D. (Princeton), Editor-in-Chief. Fifteen volumes with index, illustrated. Sold by subscription. Vincent Parke & Co., 32 Union Square, New York City.

The word "classics" has been much abused by publishers who have presented literature of every period and kind under the name. Properly speaking, however, the true classics are the writings of Greece and Rome, which form the foundations of all modern literary culture. It is most interesting to trace in the volumes before us the sources of almost every important theory that has played a part in the civilization of the world. Even the philosophy of the Single Tax, the view that the expenses of society should be paid by the idlers who possess privileges in valuable land, and not by the workers whose labor creates these public values, is found clearly set forth by Dio Chrysostom, a democratic counsellor of the Emperor Vespasian, in his charming romance, "The Hunter of Euboea," here for the first time translated into English.*

While the better known classic authors, Homer, Plato, Virgil, Cicero, Horace, and others, are fully presented in the work, it is the inclusion of the works of unfamiliar authors, such as Dio, that is the unique and valuable feature of this collection. A few of these should be mentioned: Plotinus and the Emperor Julian, who were the classic "Theosophists," or esoteric interpreters of the religion of the time; Longinus, the sane and catholic literary critic, who, though a pagan, recognized the sublimity of the Hebrew Scriptures, and whose estimates of the great authors of classic times remain unchallenged today; Polybius, the historian, who wrote from the standpoint of a military expert; Hippocrates, the founder of medicine, to whose hygienic methods the medical science of our own day has barely attained; Strabo, the geographer, who declared the rotundity of the earth, and said that all material substances were attracted to its center; Lucian, the skeptic, who, like

Voltaire and Paine, attacked the superstitions and abuses of his day; "Longus," the unknown author of "Daphnis and Chloe," the model of "Paul and Virginia"; Helidorus, the Christian bishop, who was expelled from the church for his romance, "The Aethiopica"; Seneca, the Stoic moralist, who wrote in the high strain of a Christian divine; Quintilian, the greatest pedagogue who ever lived; Tertullian, whose graphic picture of the early Christians is a call over the centuries for a return of the church to its earlier ideals of brotherly love; Ulpian, the Roman jurisconsult, whose "Digest of Roman Law" tells us the exact status of Roman society, such as the view of slavery, divorce, etc.; Petronius and Apuleius, the Roman novelists, who make the temper of the time a vivid reality to us; and last and most important of all, Suetonius, the "Paul Pry of History," whose lively gossip about the personalities of the Roman Cæsars, from the great Julius to the infamous Nero, has forced its acceptance as fact despite the assertions of many serious historians to the contrary.

The translations have been selected with evident thought and taste. Some are rare and valuable landmarks of English literary history, e. g., the translations, by North of Plutarch, by Adlington of Apuleius, by Holland of Suetonius, which formed a part of Shakespeare's library and of which he made so splendid a use. Probably as a concession to the popular indifference to verse in large quantities the editors have preferred prose to verse in the rendition of many of the poetic originals, such as Homer and Virgil. To those of us who enjoy the nobility of measured cadence this will not seem a praiseworthy concession. We will still prefer to make occasional pilgrimage to the inspirational fount of Chapman's Homer—those of us who are not able to drink at the original source. Certainly this concession to popular taste cannot have been the personal preference of the accomplished editor-in-chief, whose own translations of Sappho and Theocritus display unusual mastery of metrical forms, while at the same time they give a charming impress of fidelity to the spirit of the originals.

All the translations are accompanied by critical interpretations, and by appreciations of the authors, rendering the work a comprehensive history of classical literature. The index gives it the utility of a dictionary of classical authors and antiquities. The library affords, in short, a fairly complete classical education in everything but linguistics, which is the only moribund element in classic studies. Language dies, but literature, by the transmission of the vital spark through translation lives forever.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.



This farm that now goes by Umbrenus' name,
And by mine went till recently, no one may claim
As exclusively his. —Horace, "Satires."

*This romance will shortly appear in The Public, reprinted from "The Classics" by the courteous permission of the publishers.

PAMPHLETS**Recreation in Arden.**

An artistic and charming souvenir of an interesting event is the "Book of Arden's Town Fair and Pageant," for September 3 and 5, decreed by proclamation of the people of the village of Arden—near Grub Station, Delaware—a village which differs from other villages in but one respect, that "its land is held in common."

PERIODICALS**Legislative Bulletins.**

"The Initiative and Referendum State Legislation," by C. H. Talbot, contains in its 43 pages, a very complete legislative history of direct legislation with minute references. It is one of the Comparative Legislative Bulletins of the Wisconsin Library Commission. All questions regarding the progress of this movement, officially, throughout the United States are answered here.

+ +

Atlantic.

The leading article in the Atlantic for September, "The Ladies' Battle," nominally in opposition to woman's suffrage, reads in its argumentative parts as if it might be an ingenious satire upon The Outlook's theory (pp. 577, 601, 723) that government should not derive its powers from the consent of the governed, or Elihu Root's that "voting is not a natural right but simply a means of government." It develops those theories to their logical conclusion that government, so far from being a means for the fair adjustment of social life on the basis of equal rights, is an instrument for despotic control by "men higher up." Replete with fantastic arguments and rich in facts to fit, this nominal assault upon woman's suffrage has much of the delicious flavor of the "Comic Blackstone." Whoever has a sense of humor will find it not only diverting to read, but rather convincing of the unsoundness of its writer's ostensible contention. To regard it, however, as a

satire upon The Outlook and Mr. Root, strong as much of the internal evidence is, would not be quite consistent with other indications. On the whole it must probably be regarded as a sincere contribution to anti-suffrage literature. In that case its peculiarities may be accounted for by its author's explanation of the "rashness, ignorance and presumption" of her deciding to embark upon a literary career, namely, her retired life "in the library of an old Virginia country house and in a community where conditions more nearly resembled the eighteenth than the nineteenth century." But read the article. If you take your own opinions over-seriously, it may make you mad; but it will make you smile, if you are not over-serious and can read the signs of the times. Either way it will interest you. If it does not, you may forget it in reading John Galsworthy's story in the same issue of the Atlantic.

+ +

The Outlook.

Lyman Abbott's views on some of the fundamentals of government may be found in The Outlook of September 10. If Robert Toombs were alive he could clasp Mr. Abbott's hand and enthusiastically exclaim: "Why didn't you write that before the Civil War? I might then have made good my boast about calling the roll of my slaves on Bunker Hill." Senator Toombs would not have objected to Mr. Abbott's characterization of Negro slavery as despotism; he would have defended it on the ground that it comes within Mr. Abbott's categories of "a benevolent" and "a just despotism." Upon Mr. Abbott's "axiom" that "no man has a right to take part in governing others who has not [in the opinion of the "benevolent," or "just," or other despot in power?] the intellectual and moral capacity to govern himself," Mr. Toombs would have had no difficulty in erecting a logically unassailable theory in support of Negro slavery. Suffrage is not a right, says Mr. Abbott. But this begs the question; for the right to suffrage rests upon the broad, natural right to civil liberty, which the suffrage is necessary to secure. When Mr. Abbott comes to the point of applying his suffrage theory to women, he argues that "the duty of protecting persons and property" ought not to be imposed upon woman "except upon the most conclusive demonstration that she desires to assume it," and that "at present all the evidence points us to the conclusion that she has no such de-

The Public Microbe

Inoculation with this microbe has produced some astounding results.

You have observed them.

But perhaps have not realized how much you could assist the spread of the contagion by soliciting your friends to subscribe.

Daniel Kiefer.

Cincinnati, Sept. 18th.

Real Estate For Sale and Exchange
EDWARD POLAK
4030 Third Ave. New York City

Real Estate and Investments
R. E. CHADWICK
1141 D Street San Diego, Cal.

sire." Pray who is this Woman? who is this She? Not Anna Shaw certainly, nor Mrs. Catt, nor Mrs. Upton, nor Mrs. Potter, nor Alice Stone Blackwell, nor Jane Addams, nor Mrs. Raymond Robins, nor any other of the scores of thousands of women who are demanding the suffrage. It must be that those women desire it, however it may be with Woman. And how can it be known to Mr. Abbott or anyone else that the abstract Woman, this abstract She, does not wish the ballot, unless women individually are free to express themselves by voting? What the Outlook of the 17th says of democracy, that "the

remedy for the evils in democracy is more democracy," is much better than Mr. Abbott's view in the issue of the 10th. It would completely answer him if it were altered to "the remedy for the shortcomings as well as the evils of democracy is more democracy."

+ + +

The Bookseller: "This, sir, is an excellent book on swimming, and a very useful one, too."

The Customer: "Useful?"

The Bookseller: "Yes, sir. If ever you find your-

The Story of My Dictatorship.

The Taxation of Land Values clearly explained, by Lewis H. Berens and Ignatius Singer. ¶ A concrete, first-person exposition of the Georcean economics. One of the most popular economic books ever written. ¶ New, unabridged English edition, in red covers. Price: Five cents a copy, postpaid; fifty cents a dozen, post-paid.

THE PUBLIC, Book Dept., Ellsworth Bldg., CHICAGO



The Franklin Society

¶ If you are looking for an absolutely safe, convenient, profitable investment for your savings, large or small, acquaint yourself with the methods of the Franklin Society of New York.

¶ Subject to the strict supervision of the State Banking Department: ¶ Lends only on small first mortgages in New York City and immediate vicinity: ¶ Has handled millions without ever losing a cent of anybody's money: ¶ Has maintained consistently a dividend rate one per cent more than the best New York savings banks with equal security to the depositor.

¶ Begin now. Send \$1 or more and get a mailing size Pass Book or write for Booklet.

**THE FRANKLIN SOCIETY
FOR HOME BUILDING AND SAVINGS.
FOUNDED 1888**

5 Beekman St., New York

4½ PER CENT

The New York Observer

makes a concise and perfectly fair statement of the general character of

Social Service

when it says, in its issue of June 30, 1910, that

— the underlying philosophy of this book is the teachings of Henry George. Commencing with the mutuality of service and its indispensability, owing to the complex social organism of civilized life, our author goes on to consider both the use and abuse of money in social service. From this he argues that the primary impulse for social service is individual self-service. Demand and supply, trading, credits and accounting, with land values, are considered until finally through feudalism and capitalism he is led to consider the social service law of equal freedom. This can be had, according to Mr. Post, only when the people themselves, all together and in common, are the "land capitalists," while each for himself is a "machine capitalist," either alone or in voluntary co-operation with others. This can be brought about through the single tax. The book is diffuse, at times even prolix, in style. Mr. Post admits this, but thinks it necessary. In form, the discussion is colloquial and is addressed to an imaginary individual known as "Doctor." It is interesting and easily understood.

PUBLISHED BY
A. WESSELS, New York

SOLD BY
A. C. McCLURG & CO., Chicago

ALSO BY
THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Building, Chicago

Price, One Dollar, Postpaid

self drowning, you have only to turn to pages 38 and 39 and there you will find full instructions how to save yourself."—The Sketch.

* * *

"Yes," said the man in the mackintosh. "I once paid to see a professional rainmaker perform."

"Where?" queried the man who had his feet on the table.

"Out in Arizona. It took place in a baseball park,

and the admission was 25 cents. There was a big crowd, too."

"Did he make it rain?" asked the man with the green goggles.

"He did not."

"Did you get your money back?"

"No; he gave us dry weather checks."—Chicago Tribune.

* * *

"In choosing his men," said the Sabbath-school superintendent, "Gideon did not select those who laid

The Land for the People! The Land Value Tax Party is gradually organising all believers and making new ones. You are urged to help. Send 10 cts. in stamps for Platform, Constitution and other literature. Buttons 25c. B. T. Sample, President Sec'y, 13 Cranberry St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

DR. CHARLES L. LOGAN OSTEOPATH

Suite 701, Cable Building
20 Jackson Boulevard
Tel. Marion 6298
Hours: 9 A.M. to 5 P.M.

CHICAGO

Suite 66, Hotel Warner Annex
Cottage Grove Av. & 33d St.
Tel. Douglas 673
Evenings by Appointment

Hard Times: The Cause and the Cure.

An A, B, C, of Political Economy, by James Pollock Kohler, a lawyer of New York.

"It is no disgrace to be poor." ¶ The disgrace is in not knowing *why* you are poor.
¶ This book will tell you why.

Land	Rent
Labor	Wages
Capital	Interest

Second Edition, Corrected and Enlarged: Price, 15 Cents, postpaid.

THE PUBLIC Book Dep't, Ellsworth Bldg., CHICAGO, ILL

The Tariff: What it is; How it Works; Whom it Benefits. Protection; Revenue; Free Trade.

By Lee Francis Lybarger, of the Philadelphia Bar. Author of "Land, Labor, Wealth."

Sold by The Public's Book Department for 30 cents, postpaid.

Do It Now.

Numbers do not indicate the influence of a journal any more than the physical size of a man indicates his.

THE PUBLIC is read by one person where many another publication is read by a hundred. But consider its power compared with that of any number of periodicals that come readily to your mind.

Editors, jurists, men high in all professions, students of politics and sociology, accord THE PUBLIC a high place in the councils of the nation.

It isn't necessary to convert each member of a mass to the acceptance of a proposition before it can be enacted into law.

Comparatively few men direct the thought of a nation. The mass—whose heart is right, tho its reasoning may be damnable—adopts by instinct the thought that strikes rock bottom.

THE PUBLIC, we believe, is planting "rock bottom thoughts." It is for us to find readers who can appreciate, adopt and spread them. The mass will follow.

If you know of such in your community, let us have their names so that we may try to interest them. But far better is to interest them yourself and send us their subscriptions. They will thank you later for your effort.

EMIL SCHMIED,
Manager.

aside their arms and threw themselves down to drink; he took those who watched with one eye and drank with the other."—Herald and Presbyter.

* * *

The Doctor—Of course, if the operators in the anthracite and bituminous fields form a coalition—

The Professor—Then there will be nothing for the consumers to do but to coalesce.

(Slow curtain.)

—Chicago Tribune.

The Public

The Public is a weekly review, giving in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value.

It is also an editorial paper, according to the principles of fundamental democracy, expressing itself fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without regard to any considerations of personal or business advantage.

Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department entitled *Related Things*, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest in relation to the progress of democracy.

We aim to make *The Public* a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Published weekly by Louis F. Post, Ellsworth Bldg., 357 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago, Illinois, Postoffice as second class matter.

Terms of Subscription

Yearly	\$1.00
Half yearly50
Quarterly33
Single copies05
Trial subscription—4 weeks.....	.10

Extra copies in quantity, \$2.00 per 100, in lots of 50 and upward; if addressed to individuals, \$3.50 per 100.

Free of postage in United States, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week, or 50 cents per year.

All checks, drafts, postoffice money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of Louis F. Post. Money orders, or Chicago or New York Drafts, are preferred, on account of exchange charges by the Chicago banks.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Receipt of payment is shown in about two weeks by date on wrapper, which shows when the subscription expires. All subscribers are requested to note this date and to remit promptly for renewal of subscription when due or order it discontinued if the paper is no longer desired.

Advertising Rates

One page, each insertion.....\$15.00

Half page, each insertion.....8.00

7 inches, single column, each insertion.....6.75

Quarter page, each insertion.....4.00

One inch, each insertion.....1.00

Half inch, each insertion......50

10% discount for 6 months' insertion of one advertisement.

5% discount for 3 months' insertion of one advertisement, or 6 months' insertion every other week.

8% discount allowed for cash payment in 5 days from receipt of bill.

Two columns to the page; length of column, 8½ inches; Width of column, 3 inches.

Advertising forms close on the Monday preceding the Friday of publication.

Are you reading Lincoln Steffens' "It" in Everybody's?

If so, you want to read as a handbook to Wall Street, Frederic C. Howe's "Confessions of a Monopolist," for Dr. Howe tells you just how the monopolist gets to be a monopolist, and just how his monopoly power grows, and fattens, and devours.

The Confessions of a Monopolist by Frederic C. Howe

Here is what William Marion Reedy said of this book in his "Mirror":

"If you want to catch on to the 'great game' of getting rich quick and easy; if you would know the secret of getting things for nothing and having a whole community work for you without pay; if you want to catch the real esoteric inwardness of city politics and ascertain how to boss the bosses, read 'The Confessions of a Monopolist,' by Frederic C. Howe. Here are the very guts of success laid bare. . . Mr. Howe does a round unvarnished tale deliver, with no maudlin love motive, no long arm of coincidence, no climaxes. His book is the deadliest text book of practical politics that ever was printed. It is the story of the men of affairs in your own city, ward and precinct, of the successes who simply rob the community by taking toll of its life, its increase, its activities. It murders the fiction that the people govern themselves, for it deals with things that you see, but do not heed, going on around you every day. . . Anyone can understand it. No one can refute it. It should open men's minds to the infamy of the methods of privilege, with startling light. It is the world of graft in microcosm."

This clothbound book was at first sold at a dollar. To close out the edition we are now offering it at 65 CENTS. This price includes postage.

THE PUBLIC, Book Dept., Ellsworth Bldg., Chicago