

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 P. 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 POWLDS, New Zealand

Vol. XIV.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, AUGUST 4, 1911.

No. 696

Published by Louis F. Post
Elmhurst Building, 537 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents Yearly Subscription, One Dollar

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1893, at the Post Office at
Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

President Taft's Defense.....	793
Presidential Possibilities	795
A "Progressive" Ticket.....	795
"Progressive" Combinations	795
The Fitness of Things.....	795
Big Booze and Big Business.....	795
John Z. White in New Jersey.....	795
A Distinction With Some Difference.....	796
For An Intelligent Suffrage.....	796
Hot Weather Dress for Men.....	796
Aviation	796
The Future of Civilization.....	797
The Man Without a Party (Lona Ingham Robinson).....	797

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

Bryan, Nebraska, and the Interests (D. K. L.).....	799
--	-----

NEWS NARRATIVE:

President Taft's Alaska Policy.....	800
The "Dick to Dick" Scandal.....	802
Government Ownership in the Alaskan Northwest.....	802
Canadian Reciprocity	803
The Wool Tariff in Congress.....	803
Presidential Politics in Nebraska.....	803
Republican Progressives in Illinois.....	804
Death of Edward M. Shepard.....	804
Commission Government in Passaic.....	805
War Shivers in Europe.....	805
Russia an Enemy to Constitutional Government in Persia	805
News Notes	806
Press Opinions	807

RELATED THINGS:

Lazarus (Chas. Fred'k Adams).....	808
The Parable of the Weed Patch (E. D. Martin).....	808
People's Power (John Z. White).....	809
The Newsmongers (Langdon Everard).....	813

BOOKS:

"What Is a Living Wage?".....	813
"The Universal Consciousness of Life".....	814
Practical Philosophy	814

President Taft's Defense.

There are two horns to the dilemma in which Mr. Taft has got involved with reference to the Controller Bay affair. The first relates to the "Dick to Dick postscript;" the second to Mr. Taft's generous gift of government land to Mr. Ryan.

+

He meets the "Dick to Dick postscript" with as comprehensive a denial as could be made by any one, whether innocent or guilty. It is general, and it is specific. It denies for himself, and it denies for everybody else concerned. Nothing that might be denied by any one of Mr. Taft's connections appears to have gone undenied by him. Coming from a President of the United States in office, Mr. Taft's denials are likely to be generally regarded as conclusive. And this is doubtless as it should be. Nearly 100,000,000 people can never be expected to call on their Chief Magistrate to do more than deny scandalous accusations. His word must be taken as conclusive. This allows President Taft's denial much greater value, of course, than Miss Abbott's assertion, notwithstanding that her reputation for truth and veracity appears as yet to be as good as Mr. Taft's, simply as a matter of personal reputation, and notwithstanding that she has not been shown to have had an adequate motive for forgery or falsehood in originally making her assertion, whereas

everybody whose denial Mr. Taft has o. k.'d has the highest kind of motive for denying. This is true also of Mr. Taft himself. But we are assuming that he is sufficiently appreciative of his exalted office to make him falsehood-proof against the most tempting motives. In respect, however, of Mr. Taft's denial in behalf of the other persons concerned, such as Ryan, "Brother Charles," Ballinger, and the various department subordinates—and these are the really important denials so far as Miss Abbott's assertions are concerned—the Glavis case of two years ago must not be forgotten. It lends color to the present controversy. For in that case not only did Mr. Taft do much comprehensive denying for others, but he got himself into the pickle of having cooperated in concealing facts and documents and of lending his official power to the degradation of department subordinates who didn't keep silence when their superiors denied. In respect of Glavis, the country took Mr. Taft implicitly at his word, and got stung. Shall they heedlessly risk a similar sting in Miss Abbott's case?

More important, however, than the issue of veracity between Miss Abbott and the Alaska ring, is the question of President Taft's action, for which he himself assumes full responsibility. Whether Ryan, the applicant who certainly did get what he wanted, and on Mr. Taft's own initiative—whether Ryan, and "Brother Charles," or any one else, in interest or only from amiability, did or did not induce Mr. Taft to act in Ryan's behalf, in consequence of the "Dick to Dick postscript," or otherwise, is matter of mere detail, except to the persons whose veracity is in question. The substantial thing is Mr. Taft's act.

If that act is not clearly shown by Mr. Pinchot to have been culpably improvident, then there is no such thing as culpable improvidence. Mr. Taft had been put on inquiry months before, and by a serious experience, as to all future Big Business projects in Alaska. The presumption was established that they would probably proceed from the Morgan-Guggenheim monopoly makers. Ryan was a petitioner for water front land in Alaska. Of course he did not march up to the White House under Morgan-Guggenheim banners or to the drumbeat of Morgan-Guggenheim music; but his coming at all necessitated more Presidential prudence in considering and less secrecy in deciding than Mr. Taft discloses in his defensive message.

Mr. Taft says, No! to the secrecy charge, because the newspapers got the fact immediately after his order. But this denial of secrecy, like so many of Mr. Taft's denials, is charmingly irresponsible. Publicity in such a matter does not consist merely in publication. It consists in such timely publication as to give everybody a chance. Time is of the essence of it. But Mr. Taft gave nobody a chance except Ryan. Hardly was the ink dry on his order before Ryan had appropriated all the land he wanted. And secrecy or no secrecy, it does not yet appear why any such Presidential action as Mr. Taft's in this case was necessary for public reasons.

Was there any such public urgency as to make even the certainty of no monopoly a sufficient justification? If there was, it nowhere yet appears. But in spite of all Mr. Taft's denials as to the possibility of a resulting monopoly, Mr. Pinchot asserts that Mr. Taft's own map proves that the President has given Ryan the key to the Alaska coal situation. Mr. Pinchot's judgment on such a point is probably better than Mr. Taft's. "Brother Charles," or Brother Henry might know as well as Pinchot, and so might Mr. Ryan; but they would not be as likely to be so candid.

Mr. Taft thinks that if the thing turns out to be a monopoly, the government can get possession again by condemnation! Wonderful watch dog of the public interests is Mr. Taft, isn't he? Give away government lands with all the improvidence you please, for you can get them back again by condemnation. *But at a price!* And what price? "All that the traffic will bear." Not the price alone of actual improvements, but the price also of the monopoly value. Haven't the courts of New York—and Mr. Taft venerates the courts—haven't they decided that a franchise cannot be expropriated for public use by condemnation without payment of its full market value as a monopoly?

We are not disposed to characterize Mr. Taft's Alaska performance. But if some poor "chump" of a "panhandler" had passed a counterfeit coin under circumstances analogous on the question of "scienter" to those Mr. Taft himself discloses as the circumstances under which he opened that Alaska land to entry by Ryan et al., that "chump" of a "panhandler" would now be in a Federal prison as a "crook." We do not imply that Mr. Taft is either "crook" or "chump." If we did.

we should not imply either criminality or idiocy; we could plead that there is nothing necessarily criminal in the one word, nor of the fool foolish in the other. Anybody who does things by indirection is "crooked," in the slang of the time, without being necessarily a rascal. Diplomats are apt to be "crooked." And who may not be a "chump" on occasion? Only those persons that are too superhumanly wise ever to have anything "put over" on them. Some time we hope to write a lay sermon on "crooks" and "chumps," from the text about the wisdom of serpents and the harmlessness of doves. It may possibly have some value for honest persons of both classes. But not now.

* *

Presidential Possibilities.

John T. Fort, a predecessor of Governor Wilson in the gubernatorial chair of New Jersey, has recently returned from abroad across the Western States. He reports the outlook for Democratic nominations next year as Wilson and Harmon or Harmon and Wilson, with a shade of difference in favor of the former. Mr. Fort must be cross-eyed politically or he wouldn't get these two men mixed. Maybe, as a partisan Republican, he would like to see Harmon strapped on to Wilson; or possibly he got his news in Japan.

* *

A "Progressive" Ticket.

For President and Vice-President in 1912: Taft and Hearst! Why Not?

* *

"Progressive" Combinations.

The latest "get-together" program of the reactionary Progressive Republicans of Illinois, according to the Chicago Tribune of the 28th, is a "combination of the forces of Gov. Deneen and the 'Federal crowd' led by United States Senator Shelby M. Cullom." If now the Cullom-Deneen forces could get United States Senator William Lorimer also into their leadership, what a fine combination of "progressive" forces it would make! And would it be such a very incongruous crowd?

* *

The Fitness of Things.

"The Lincoln Protective League" is the name the Lorimer Republicans of Illinois have adopted. In itself a good name, it is peculiarly appropriate for the purpose—appropriate, that is, as a white horse is an appropriate match for a black one when you want a cross-match. And then this Lorimer-

ized "Lincoln League" denounces the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, which is as it should be, precisely.

*

If Governor Deneen is to lead "progressive" Republicanism in Illinois—and that's the way it looked to some wise men until Senator Jones came into the gubernatorial field—Republican progressives, and progressive Democrats, too, might do worse than wait for something to turn up. They certainly couldn't do worse by falling in behind the Hearst-Harrison aggregation, nor much worse by making Sunday-school terms with Roger Sullivan, et al.

* *

Big Booze and Big Business.

It is entertaining to find the New York Times applauding Dahlman of Omaha, the man who, when he thought he had been elected Governor of Nebraska, publicly declared that he would kick out of the Governor's office every member of the W. C. T. U. who might approach him on the "booze" question. Mayor Dahlman's declaration was well enough for him, for on the "booze" question he has the advantage of the W. C. T. U., he being an expert; but when the New York Times, spokesman for Big Business, glories in Dahlman, it is to laugh. The Times told a few days ago of "the severe denunciation of Bryan and his political methods in his own State," expressing its hope that the effect would be "wholesome in other States." It thought, or pretended to think, that it was talking about the Nebraska convention. In fact, it was talking about Dahlman's Omaha (Douglas county) convention, which stood for Big Business, Big Booze and Harmon of Ohio. But the State convention strode over Dahlman, so dear to the editorial heart of the New York Times and its Wall Street clientele, and while naming no names, ignoring Harmon's, the only name that had been proposed, it adopted a Bryanistic platform. We commend our readers to D. L. K.'s fine letter on the subject in this week's Public.

* *

John Z. White in New Jersey.

The speech of John Z. White at Passaic, N. J., reported stenographically and in full by the Passaic Daily News of July 24, ranks high among the convincing elementary presentations of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall as safety devices for representative government. It was delivered on the 22d in advocacy of the New Jersey commission form of city government, which was adopted by the people of Passaic at

the referendum election on the 25th. We reproduce parts of this impressive speech, regretting that we cannot produce it all; and we venture the hope that after the editing which is always necessary to correct crudities of extemporaneous speaking, but which would be slight in this case, it may be reproduced in pamphlet form and widely circulated. As a Congressional document it would make a most useful companion-piece to Senator Bourne's famous speech on People's Power in Oregon, and to Senator Owen's exposition of the general subject.

+ +

A Distinction With Some Difference.

No, sir; nothing of the kind. We do not say that everybody who is against the Initiative, Referendum and Recall is a plute. A good many are only ignorant, and some of these are stubborn. What we do say is that every plute is against those reforms—penniless plutes and all. There is some difference. And yet men really must be judged, by and large, by the company they like to keep.

+ +

For an Intelligent Suffrage.

Educational tests for the suffrage have been popular with suffrage restrictionists these many years, but they have always contemplated restraints by one set of persons upon another set. The proposed tests have ranged, explicitly or in effect, from reading and writing to a college education, according to the educational equipment of the restrainer, who has usually aimed to draw the line of exclusion just below himself. But now that the best kind of educational test is coming in vogue, an automatic test—behold! the very classes that would limit the suffrage by arbitrary tests are in opposition and on the express ground that the unintelligent don't vote. At the Trenton election, for example, at which the commission form of government was adopted, it seems that only two-thirds of the voters who had voted for Governor, voted on the Commission form plan, and that, as the New York Sun expresses it, "something like 33 1/3 per cent of the normal voting population determined this important issue for the whole city." But that was because the *unintelligent* voting population were disfranchised—by themselves, as incompetent. If only two-thirds voted on the question, then only two-thirds were sufficiently educated on the subject to take enough interest in it to vote. This is the way the argument runs, at any rate, when suffrage restrictionists give reasons for disfranchising women. Now, isn't it better to

let citizens disfranchise themselves by the truly civic educational test that was applied in Trenton, than to have disfranchised them arbitrarily? And if only two-thirds did vote, upon what theory can any person object that a minority determines an important issue for the rest, if that very person advocates the alternative method of electing a few "representatives" to determine it for all? Is it democratic to compel all to delegate power to a few, but undemocratic to allow all to participate or not as they please, if it so happens that some decide for themselves that they don't know and don't care how to vote on the question at issue?

+ +

Hot Weather Dress for Men.

C. W. Andrews, librarian of the Crerar library in Chicago, has explained a question of masculine dress in response to a criticism of library rules, which is broader in its application than to reading-room etiquette. A reader in shirt sleeves and suspenders, claimed that he had been required by the rules to put on his coat, whereas other readers were undisturbed though they also were in shirt sleeves but without suspenders. Mr. Andrews very sensibly and conclusively replied that the difference is one "between dress and undress." That phrase presents the whole case. It needs no elaboration and there is no answer to it. But the important point is that as to shirt-sleeve "dress" (in contradistinction to shirt-sleeve "undress"), no effort is made to popularize it. If suspenders remain out of vogue as a part of external dress, why not some sort of shirt-blouse or "jumper" that could be worn over them conveniently and usually, in warm weather? This would solve more questions than those of decency in reading rooms. There are decent persons and many who cannot afford, with reference to time as well as money, to wear two kinds of clothing on the same day, one kind from which they may remove the coat and still be dressed and another from which they cannot remove the coat without being undressed. A warm-season style of dress for men, to be worn with or without a coat at pleasure, would put them on an equality with women in a respect in which they are now pathetically and often aggravatingly inferior.

+ +

Aviation.

It is but barely probable that aviation can come into very general use, no matter how efficient the mechanism of flight, until two supplementary inventions are made. One of these is a life preserver—something to give the operators and pas-

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

sengers a chance at least for safety in case of accident. The other is devices for regulating automatically the relation of the artificial bird to its medium under all circumstances of change. As yet we hear of no experiments looking toward life preservers, but the idea of automatic regulation of movement has been getting attention. Herbert Quick faced the latter problem in his "Virginia of the Air Lanes," and solved it, for fiction, with an ingenious adaptation of the gyroscope. Whether the gyroscope would work as well in the upper air as in a novel, or for aviation as for one-rail traction purposes, has yet to be demonstrated. But a French invention has just been reported which indicates successful experimentation in the direction of the automatic idea. The report appeared in the Paris dispatches of the 22d, crediting the invention to a Mr. Doure. Its reported effect is to maintain equilibrium automatically, so far at least as to prevent capsizing in the course of descent.

* *

The Future of Civilization.

France, says a Paris dispatch, is "at the height of a great wave" of vandalism incited by anarchistic-minded citizens. If this were true, the civilization we know would be presently submerged. When any such wave does come to its height in any large nation, representing our civilization, our civilization will be at its end. For better or for worse another will have begun. We do not believe that such conditions exist anywhere, not even in France. All the indications point to development of higher types of social life from the type that is, rather than to an overwhelming revolution and a fresh start. Yet this is probably the alternative.

* * *

THE MAN WITHOUT A PARTY.

Party rule is supposed to be the only method through which people of a would-be republic can get laws made and public things done. And it cannot be denied that if the two leading parties really embodied the two eternally opposing principles, order and freedom, and could have sway alternately, the resultant would be about as much government as we could tolerate and as much freedom as we could have and "keep school."

But unhappily the human mind, trained for ages in quickness to seize its prey, moves as yet but slowly on the unaccustomed track of mass consciousness in collective action for the common good. For brief periods, when some supreme collective effort, some French or American Revolu-

tion, starts a whole people on the terrible road of justice long deferred, thought is fluid and progress rapid; but the high spirit of fiery patriotism that conquers, soon cools, runs slow, congeals, till the walls of custom, prejudice and self-interest bound it on all sides and it is a party tending by every condition to perpetuate itself indefinitely.

Parties are first radical, then conservative, and then rotten. The party that bursts into power through dire necessity and does the great deed will never do another; its vital Spirit is already taking flight. In vain the administrative officeholders try to conceal her departure by platitudes of honesty—with their hands behind their backs; it will leak out as a more radical party is seen already gathering strength. The party that wrote the "Declaration of Independence" had to go down defeated by the party that liberated slaves. The doom of this long entrenched party is likewise coming, on schedule time.

*

Unhappily the defects in our representative laws prevent the growth of a third party into a second, slowly by littles. It must take its place as second at a bound. If it take time to build clean new walls of its own it is lost. Thus it may be driven to occupy the outside husk of a party from which the life principle has already fled. Hearst's epithet for Bryan, "hermit crab," was not inapt.

After desperate cleansing and the final purity inseparable from repeated defeat, no great party had been so clean for forty years as the Bryan Democracy at the last Presidential election. But how punctilious were the leaders on the opposing side suddenly grown! Themselves reeking with corruption they could not abide a speck of dust on their antagonists' banner! It was as though, wallowing in plunder themselves, they pointed out with great concern that such and such a constituent of Bryan was known to be on speaking terms with a city boss! Conscious of their sorry plight, multitudes among the ranks longed for reforms—for practically all, indeed, in their opponents' platform—but they would not cross the wall! They knew that their party had long ago left even conservatism behind and were plunging headlong on the new path of destruction; that Congress was but a calamity; that their easy-going fat-faced man was not only insolently selected but corruptly nominated; that he had no logical passports to their favor. And yet when the Interests emitted the miasmie idea that a really good candidate must be well tainted before you can safely

swallow him, these fellows obediently passed on the words "safe and sane." They sniffed at him, indeed, and looked wistfully at the candidate of unquestioned high purpose and ability, but they could not cross the wall.

Now in the first year and a half, Taft had "done for" himself in the minds of the country at large. He had filled the cabinet with corporation lawyers, mostly highwaymen aiding other robbers in Congress and out of it. Worst of all they were being found out! In the thick of the stampede from the Republican camp when not only Taft but the Senate and the House were loudly repudiated, one life-preserver was left.

Oh! if only Roosevelt were back from his elephant killing! Surely the man who gave us Taft could tell us what to do with him. They toss high the ready caps in air, cheering platitudes that on their merits would not win a newspaper job. Crowds, crowds, everywhere he goes!

And then this grand-stand hero of evasive "policies," after swinging around the West among adoring Insurgents to show his masters what an adversary he might make, turns tail and goes back to the Standpat fold, indorses Taft and all his accomplices!

So here were the Insurgents, high and dry, without a party to their names! Their bridges were burned behind them. The hope of Roosevelt's leadership in a purified party had vanished. They suspected he had killed the Republican elephant. They grimly faced the situation; they were men without a party.

Meanwhile, among Democrats, the curious "get-togethers" in various States showed unmistakable signs that some hungry hordes in this camp were not pounding the piles of principle more solidly under their platform; they were only bent on making Democratic hay while the sun shone through the Republican breach. Instead of hammering down their own copper-riveted principles to win Progressives, they began bidding for the Standpat contingency.

Surely the slimy Beast that Judge Lindsey has fought so long is doing its best to occupy both parties. While its head is in one party, its tail is in the other. It snubbed LaFollette, the great Republican, in the last national Republican convention at Chicago; it has baffled Bryan in Nebraska; it controls both parties in New York, Illinois and other States. Last fall's elections doubtless found thousands of Democrats as well as Republicans literally without a party.

+

But right here, in what bids fair to be the

darkest place in our political history, is the dawning of a new era in popular government. The dyed-in-the-wool Republican and the tanned-in-the-hide Democrat are giving way under the constant battering of plain facts in the periodicals and the daily press. "Party whips" are in despair. How can they much longer hope to hold in check voters with their ear to the receiver?

The Denver election, two years ago, defeated the efforts of both old parties combined, and gained control of a municipal utility. The Milwaukee Socialist sweep was won by aid of Republican and Democratic votes in the interest of good city government. The Maine and Massachusetts Democratic victories were won by good Republican voters. The La Follette landslide could only have been achieved by the aid of Democratic and probably socialistic voters. Unmistakably, party walls are breaking down.

This medieval custom of governing by clans or parties, each following blindly the banners of the "White Rose" or the "Red," has long survived its companion-piece, the walled city which centuries ago yielded to the impact of powder. The invisible walls of political parties, though tougher than brick or stone, are at last beginning to give way. People are at last putting two and two together—the two of yesterday and the two of today. They are tired of voting for the man who will vote for the man who will vote for the man who, if his party wins, will vote *somehow* on the measures that vitally concern them. They are clamoring for Direct Nominations and Direct Legislation. They would write their desired measures on their ballots instead of in the platform of a party that may be defeated or whose representatives when in power may betray them. In ten States of the Union the Initiative, Referendum and Recall are either in the Constitutions or in amendments to be submitted, or have been indorsed at the primaries by both parties.

The whole fabric of party walls rests on the glacial slowness of public opinion. Moving an inch in fifty or a hundred years there was time for party politics to be transmitted from father to son. But electricity—rapid thought transmitter—has for some time been melting this sullen flow till the once dense minds of men are growing so fluid that one may now revise one's opinions every few years without fear of ridicule; or vote outside of one's party without shame. Even changing one's party is not an indictable offense.

+

A hypochondriac was urged by a friend to come

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

out for a walk in the sunshine. "I know what you want to do," the invalid replied, "you want to take me out in the middle of that field and then leave me." Timid mankind, fearful of being left out in a wild field of choice and responsibility, but yesterday sighed and sought for a king, emperor, president or party to lead them by the hand to political and economic safety. But they are learning that the only true safety is in themselves; that trusting to a party is like hitching to a derelict. They would fain pass from party rule to People's Rule.

Already in Oregon, which elects Democratic reform Senators by Republican votes, the platforms of candidates and the arguments on measures to be voted upon are mailed to each elector and brought to his very door. This new method not only breaks down party walls but threatens to keep them down. Every election must be practically a new alignment. Even the House of Representatives has adopted a bill to nominate Senators by popular vote, and many States are preparing to enact some of Oregon's other reforms. This indicates that one day every election will be as every election should be, up to date, and show practically a new party alignment.

Will not the shells of the old parties fly then? Will it be so very bad then to be a man without a party? The truth is, parties, usually, are like breakfast eggs: the only good party is the fresh one, and the fresher the better.

LONA INGHAM ROBINSON.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

BRYAN, NEBRASKA AND THE INTERESTS.

Sioux City, Ia., July 27.

It was my privilege to attend the Democratic State convention of Nebraska, held at Fremont on July 25. The duly advertised repudiation of Mr. Bryan's leadership and the indorsement of Judson Harmon for President failed to materialize, although the plutocratic Eastern press had confidently predicted that both were bound to happen.

An effort is being made now to make much of the "failure" of the convention to indorse Mr. Bryan. But Mr. Bryan asked for no indorsement at the hands of the convention. He did not even attend it. He is a candidate for no office, and an indorsement is not necessary to him.

Nobody doubts seriously that he will head the Nebraska delegation to the next national convention, and that he will have a delegation in sympathy with him. An effort will be made by the Dahlman faction of Omaha either to indorse Harmon or to prevent Mr. Bryan's election as a delegate, but either effort is doomed to failure.

In view of the present effort of his enemies to prove that Mr. Bryan has lost the leadership of his party in his home State, a plain recital of a few facts in connection with the situation in Nebraska may be of interest.

In 1909 the Democratic legislature failed, through the machinations of the Omaha brewers, to submit a Direct Legislation amendment, to which the party was pledged in its platform. After the regular session had adjourned, Mr. Bryan secured pledges from enough members to submit the amendment if an extra session were called. Ashton C. Shallenberger, then Governor, refused to call the extra session. It was subserviency to the brewers that actuated Governor Shallenberger (for he had signed an 8 o'clock closing law over their violent protest), as it was a temperamental failure to rise to the occasion.

Failing to have the amendment submitted, Mr. Bryan declared that it was necessary to drive the brewers out of politics, not so much on their own account, although they were bad enough, but because for years they had been part of a railroad and corporation combination which had sought to throttle all progressive legislation. He allied himself, therefore, with the temperance people, who were advocating county option. The Republican State convention indorsed county option, and the Democratic convention did not.

Governor Shallenberger, with the support of most of Mr. Bryan's friends, was a candidate for renomination. Opposed to him, as the candidate of all the vicious elements in the State, was Mayor Dahlman of Omaha. Dahlman was nominated, but it will not be seriously claimed that he won fairly. The Democratic primaries in Omaha were invaded by Republicans interested in the defeat of all liquor legislation, and this element gave to Mr. Dahlman considerably more than the narrow margin of a few hundred votes by which he was nominated over Shallenberger.

Mr. Bryan refused to support Dahlman at the polls. He was absolved from giving him support for two reasons. The first one was the unfair and fraudulent manner in which he secured his nomination. The second was that Dahlman defiantly proclaimed from every stump in the State that he would not only veto any new liquor legislation, but that he would not enforce the laws already on the statute books.

Dahlman's character was fully demonstrated in a speech which he made on a public street in Omaha the night of the election. Early returns mistakenly indicated his election, and he was highly jubilant. He invited a ribald crowd to attend a free beer barbecue which he declared he would give on the State House grounds at Lincoln on the day of his inauguration. Lincoln was then "dry," and the laws of Nebraska forbade the sale or giving away of liquor within its corporate limits; but Mr. Dahlman averred that if the people of Lincoln didn't like the idea of his proposed beer orgy, "they knew what they could do."

This sterling patriot, who is now being hailed as the redeemer of the Nebraska Democracy from the incendiary dictatorship of Mr. Bryan, did not stop there. He informed the applauding multitude, recruited from Omaha's notorious Third ward, that "if any member of the W. C. T. U. tries to tell me how to run the office of Governor of Nebraska, I'll kick her out of my office."

The next day the full returns showed the election of the Republican candidate, and Mr. Dahlman retired to the calm of Excelsior Springs to recuperate.

+

Nebraska elects minor State officers this year, and county and State conventions were duly held for the purpose of promulgating platforms and electing party committees. The Douglas county (Omaha) convention was controlled by Mayor Dahlman. It passed a resolution denouncing Mr. Bryan as a party traitor. It indorsed Governor Harmon for President. Many of Mayor Dahlman's alcoholized followers had never heard of Harmon before, but they accepted "Mayor Jim's" assurance that he must be all right because Bryan was against him.

Dahlman gave out that he would force the ratification of the Douglas county resolution at the State convention, and the Eastern organs of plutocracy featured him in headlines. They waited expectantly for the forthcoming indorsement of Harmon by "Bryan's own State," and preparations were made to beat the tom-tom over Mr. Bryan's utter defeat and humiliation.

When the delegates got together at Fremont, Dahlman's nerve weakened. He was the first to suggest "harmony." He was one of the first arrivals on the ground, and at once declared to the newspaper men that no effort would be made to pass the Douglas county resolution in the State convention. The leaders of the party got together and agreed upon a platform that dealt solely with issues and not with personalities. By common consent all references, either favorable or adverse, to Senator Hitcock, Mr. Bryan, and the Nebraska Democrats in the lower house of Congress, were omitted. The principal feature of the platform was an unqualified indorsement of the Initiative and Referendum amendment, which will be voted on in 1912, and to which Mr. Dahlman's liquor and corporation sponsors are violently opposed.

In a sense, the liquor issue is temporarily eliminated from Nebraska politics. The temperance people are showing a disposition not to force it until the Direct Legislation amendment is adopted. Then they will submit county option to the voters under the Initiative. The brewers and the railroads are preparing to fight the proposed amendment. They may succeed, because it must receive a majority of all the votes cast in the election, and not a majority of those voting directly upon the amendment.

+

Herein is set down the simple tale of the Fremont convention and the events which led up to it. The dominating spirits of that convention were ex-Governor Shallenberger, whom Dahlman hates bitterly and who is a candidate for the United States Senate, and M. F. Harrington, of O'Neill, a former Populist and a staunch advocate of railroad regulation and control. Mr. Harrington presided over the convention as its chairman, and delivered a speech which had the genuine Progressive ring. He is openly committed to the support of Woodrow Wilson for President, while ex-Governor Shallenberger says he favors either Wilson or Champ Clark.

Nebraska Democrats, as well as Republicans, will vote directly in the primaries next April on their

choice for President. Mr. Dahlman hopes to secure an indorsement of Harmon through the division of the opposition, but the anti-Harmon men say they will agree on a candidate long before the primaries. Mr. Bryan will be on the stump pleading the cause of progress and for a progressive candidate, and there is not one chance in a million that the party will fall into the hands of the reactionaries.

D. K. L.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, August 1, 1911.

President Taft's Alaska Policy.

Responding to Senator Poindexter's resolution of June 27 calling for all letters, maps, etc., bearing on the reopening to entry of certain lands in the Chugach national forest, President Taft sent a special message to the Senate on the 26th, in which he assumes full responsibility for his Executive order opening for settlement and development the 12,800 acres of the Chugach national forest reserve in Alaska. [See current volume, page 779.]

+

After explaining that Secretary Ballinger, the Secretary of Agriculture and the general land office had in May, 1910, recommended to him that 320 acres, with a frontage of 160 rods on the northwest shore of Controller Bay, be ordered, on the application of Richard S. Ryan, representing the Controller Railway and Navigation Company, as opened for settlement for a railroad terminal, etc., and that after an interview with Mr. Ryan in June, 1910, he had in August so ordered, but that nothing was done in the matter until October, 1910, when the formal order was laid before him. Mr. Taft states that "the question finally came before the Cabinet late in October," and then proceeds:

I expressed dissatisfaction with the order because it purported on its face to make the elimination for the benefit of a railroad company of a tract of land which the company could not secure under the statute for it was a tract 320 acres in one body, when only 160 acres could be thus acquired. In the second place, I preferred to make a much larger elimination of a tract facing the entire channel, and with sufficient room for a terminal railway town. I was willing to do this because I found the restrictions in the law sufficient to prevent the possibility of any monopoly of either the upland or the harbor or channel by the Controller Railway and Navigation company or any other persons or company. For lack of time sufficient to draft a memor-

andum myself, I requested the Secretary of the Interior [Mr. Ballinger], who, with the Secretary of Agriculture, after full discussion, had agreed in my conclusion, to prepare a letter setting forth the reasons for making the large elimination, so that it might become a part of the record. . . . I wish to be as specific as possible upon this point, and to say that I alone am responsible for the enlargement of the proposed elimination from 320 acres to 12,800 acres, and that I proposed the change and stated my reasons therefor, and while both Secretaries cordially concurred in it, the suggestion was mine. The statement of Mr. Ryan, who had been properly vouched to the Forester by two gentlemen whom I know, Mr. Chester Lyman and Mr. Fred Jennings, and who had produced a letter from a reputable financial firm, Probst, Wetzler & Co., was that the railway company which he represented had expended more than \$75,000 in making preparations for the construction of a railway from Controller Bay to the coal fields, 25 miles away, but that they were obstructed in so doing by the order reserving the Chugach Forest Reservation, which covered all of the Controller Bay shore. He, as well as Probst, Wetzler & Co., gave every assurance that the Copper River Railway Co., owned by Messrs. Morgan and Guggenheim, had no connection with them, and that they were engaged in an independent enterprise in good faith to build an independent railroad. No evidence to the contrary has been brought to my attention since. Of course, it was possible that the owners of the Copper River Railway company [Messrs. Morgan and Guggenheim] might attempt to buy this railroad [Ryan's] when and if it was built. It was possible that Mr. Ryan was acting for the interests of the Copper River railroad, although I did not believe it; but whether this was true or not it was clear that the order of elimination by reason of the restrictions of the act Congress would not permit the owners of either railroad to shut out any other capitalists. . . . The rates of freight for coal to be charged, of course, would always be subject to Congressional control, and if government ownership seemed a wise policy under the peculiar circumstances, ample land for right of way, harbor frontage, and terminals must always remain available under the law for government use, or if it is preferred to take over to the government a railway built by private enterprise, condemnation is easy. . . . No more than 160 acres can be entered in any single body. . . . No location of scrip along any navigable waters can be made within the distance of 80 rods of any lands already located along such waters. No entry can be allowed extending more than 160 rods along the shore of any navigable water; and along such shore a space of at least 80 rods must be reserved from entry between all such claims. Moreover, the statute expressly provides that a roadway, 60 feet in width, parallel to the shore line as near as may be practicable, shall be reserved for the use of the public as a highway. Nothing in the act contained is to be construed to authorize entries to be made or title to be acquired to the shore of any navigable waters. . . . The first limitation . . . would prevent the possibility of any one person or any one interest acquiring an entire tract like that of 12,800 acres. The second limitation is important in that . . . the consequence is that in the 7 miles of the frontage of this eliminated tract

there must be reserved for Government control and use, and such disposition as Congress may see fit to make, and free from private appropriation, a frontage aggregating about 2½ miles and so distributed along the shore in frontages of 80 rods as to make certain of a public frontage of this width having all the advantage that any private frontage can have. . . . These two restrictions necessarily prevent a monopoly of land abutting on the shore. . . . Of the shore frontage which may be appropriated by scrip, there remain six frontages of 160 rods each . . . facing the bay and channel. . . . But there is a third reason why the opening of this tract to settlement and limited private appropriation cannot lead to a monopoly in the Controller Railway and Navigation Company or any one else. The distance from . . . the line of highwater mark to the line of low water mark, is between two and three miles, and the distance to deeper water is about a mile farther, making it necessary . . . to construct a viaduct or trestle three or four miles long from the shore to the channel. . . . The owners of the upland, by virtue of the title they have acquired from the government, do not acquire a vested right of access to the deep water and have no right or easement to build viaducts or trestles across the flats or wharves along the deep channel, which Congress may not regulate or defeat. . . . The order has been criticised because it was not in form a proclamation instead of an order. . . . In law there is in effect no difference. . . . In practice the same publicity is given to each. . . . Each is merely handed to the representatives of the press after being executed, and is sent to the large mailing list of the State Department. That course was here pursued in respect to the Executive order of October 28, 1910. . . . That this was a secret order . . . is utterly unfounded. . . . That it did not contain a provision delaying its taking effect for thirty days after its local publication, as orders restoring land to homesteaders frequently do, . . . was really not important in this case, for in now nearly nine months only the Controller Railway & Navigation Company has made any scrip entries on the eliminated tract, and this although 12,000 acres and about 2½ miles of water front still remain open to entry.

Mr. Taft's message is accompanied with documents, reports, and maps bearing on the case.

+

Gifford Pinchot, as president of the National Conservation Association, issued a statement on the 27th in which he declares that President Taft "leaves the root of the matter wholly untouched" in his denial of the possibility of monopolizing the water front of Controller Bay. Mr. Pinchot explains that—

Mr. Taft, in opening the lands around Controller Bay without notice to the public gave the interests behind Ryan an opportunity to acquire the key to the channel of Controller Bay before the public knew what was going on.

The so-called Ballinger-Pinchot investigation opened the eyes of the public to the extensive and successful efforts which are being made to monopolize the resources of Alaska. The facts developed by this investigation constituted a solemn warning

and a call upon the Executive for special watchfulness in protecting public property in Alaska. In view of the need for a firm and careful policy thus emphasized, it was the President's duty to hold the terminal lands around Controller Bay in government ownership. As with the coal lands, the title to the harbor lands, which are the key to the coal lands, should have been held, in any event, until Congress could act. In the meantime, contrary to the general impression, the very fact that these lands were in a national forest made them fully and promptly available under lease for every proper use, yet held them subject to governmental supervision and control.

The map, which is a part of the President's message, supported as it is by the testimony of Mr. Graves of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, appears to show that the mile and a half of harbor front taken up by Ryan, together with the tracts which the government retains and on which it prohibits private entry, does effectually control the valuable portion of the channel. But whether the President is right or whether the map is right, and whoever Ryan and his associates will be shown to represent, it is true, and will remain true, that the lands about Controller Bay should never have been let go. The public will agree with Col. Roosevelt that these terminal lands ought to have been kept in the public hands.

The President is right when he says that what Alaska needs is development; but no legitimate development of the harbor front on Controller Bay has been and can be proposed that could not proceed as well and as rapidly under suitable lease on government land as on private land. So long as these terminal lands remained in government ownership no one could monopolize the harbor. The moment any of them passed into private hands the danger of monopoly began. The public will not forget that before the Executive order of Oct. 28, Controller Bay was both available for development and safe against monopoly. Now it is no longer safe. This is abundantly proved not only by the general history of commercial consolidation, but in particular by what the Morgan-Guggenheim syndicate has already done in destroying or absorbing possible competitors. The president denies that in granting Ryan's request for the opening of Controller Bay by the Executive order of Oct. 28 there was any element of secrecy, and quotes a press dispatch of the same date announcing his action. But Mr. Taft does not mention that on the day he signed the order and notified the press in Washington, Ryan's surveying party was ready in Alaska, and that by Nov. 1, or four days after the order was made, and before the government officials in Alaska had been notified of the order, they had begun a survey of the Ryan claims on Controller Bay.

The omission of the customary thirty days' notice to the public that the land would be open to entry gave Ryan what he wanted. It cut off all chance for any competitor to locate on the terminal lands until after Ryan had made his selection. No amount of newspaper notice to the country after the Executive order was signed could in any respect interfere with the prearranged work of Ryan's agents or enable any rival to enter a foot of land on Controller Bay

except what was not wanted by the people whom Ryan represented.

It is unfortunate that the friends of conservation, in their efforts to bring about the development of Alaska for the benefit of the people, are continually obliged to expend their strength against the men who ought to be the protectors of the people's property. It looks to me like unnecessary duplication of work —when we must first fight the policemen before we can get a chance to stop the looting.

+ +

The "Dick to Dick" Scandal.

In the same message to the Senate in which he explains this side of the Controller Bay development opening in reply to the Poindexter resolution, President Taft makes specific reply to the "Dick to Dick" postscript which Miss Abbott has reported as having come under her eye in the Interior Department while investigating the Executive order regarding Controller Bay. [See current volume, page 779.]

+

On that point, the President says:

The postscript is not now in the files of the Department. . . . The statement in so far as my brother is concerned . . . is utterly unfounded. He never wrote to me or spoke to me in reference to Richard S. Ryan or on the subject of Controller Bay or the granting of any privileges or the making of any orders in respect to Alaska. . . . Mr. Ballinger says . . . he never received such a postscript. . . . Mr. Richard S. Ryan . . . says that he never met my brother. . . . The . . . letter of July 13, 1910, to which this postscript is said to have been attached . . . was sent to me by Mr. Carr, Secretary Ballinger's private secretary. . . . Mr. Carr saw no such postscript when he sent the letter to me. I did not see it when I read it. No one saw it in the executive office. . . . Mr. Brown states that there was no such postscript in the papers when he showed them to the correspondent and that he never saw such a postscript. Similar evidence is given by Mr. Carr and other custodians of the records in the Interior Department. Stronger evidence of the falsity of the alleged postscript could not be had.

The remainder of the Presidential message on this point is devoted to a general criticism of scandal-mongering. It concludes:

The helpless state to which the credulity of some and the malevolent scandal-mongering of others have brought the people of Alaska in their struggle for its development, ought to give the public pause. For until a juster and fairer view be taken, investment in Alaska, which is necessary to its development, will be impossible, and honest administrators and legislators will be embarrassed in the advocacy and putting into operation of those policies in regard to the Territory which are necessary to its progress and prosperity.

+ +

Government Ownership in the Alaskan Northwest.

Reporting progress upon the Oregon petition for government coal mining and railway opera-

tion in Alaska, the Portland Daily News of the 18th said that although the petitions had been in circulation only a day, the returns already showed "that the State is aroused to its opportunity, and that tens on tens of thousands of names will flood President Taft's holy of holies, each name being the demand of one citizen that the government give a square deal to Oregon, and Alaska coal from government mines at cost." [See current volume, page 782.]

+

Quiet opposition has set in, however, under the leadership of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Coast. As the Secretary is reported in the same issue of the Portland News, this alliance is "pledged to a scheme to have government coal mined and sold to 'operating companies upon a royalty basis.'" Its policy is reported to be silence. But the News of the 22nd reports that—

Governor Oswald West, hearing that a movement was under way in California and Washington to circulate similar petitions, naming principal ports in those States as places at which government coal bunkers are desired, issued a statement welcoming any aid that the Governors of those two States might offer and inviting the people of the whole Pacific coast to join in this demand on Washington for the rescue of the public coal fields from the maw of the Morgan-Guggenheim octopus. Organized labor in Portland got behind the project solidly, the matter being brought before the meeting of the Central Labor Council Friday night by Councilman William Daly, who was plentifully supplied with petitions. Daly explained the nature of the project, how Congress could, if so disposed, enact a law providing for the forming of a Coal Mining Commission which would have complete supervision over the producing and delivery of Alaska coal to government bunkers to be located here in Portland, from which it could be purchased by the people direct at the cost of production. Then he asked for volunteers to pass petitions and every member of the Central Labor Council responded, each agreeing to circulate one among the members of his organization.

This Pacific coast movement is not reported across the Rocky Mountains by the Associated Press, or if reported the reports are suppressed by the newspapers belonging to that Association.

+ +

Canadian Reciprocity.

After a brief debate the Dominion Parliament has been dissolved, the Laurier ministry having decided that the reciprocity agreement with the United States could not be brought to a favorable vote without an "appeal to the country." General elections are therefore to be held September 21st for the election of a new Parliament to assemble early in October.

+

On the 26th President Taft signed the Congress-

sional bill confirming the reciprocity agreement. [See current volume, page 777.]

+ +

The Wool Tariff in Congress.

A wool tariff bill representing a compromise between the original La Follette measure in the Senate and the Underwood bill of the House, was passed by the Senate on the 27th by 48 to 32. The affirmative vote came from 11 Progressive Republicans, 2 Standpat Republicans (Nelson and McCumber), and 35 Democrats; the negative from 30 Standpat Republicans and 2 Progressives (Borah and Dixon). [See current volume, page 610.]

+

The Senate caucus of Democrats unanimously agreed on the 31st to support the House "farmers' free list bill," and, if defeated, to offer it with a modification excluding from the "farmers' free list" imports from countries which impose duties on American corn, oats, wheat, hay, cotton, horses, cattle and hogs. The Democratic members of the House committee on ways and means decided on the 31st to recommend a conference of the two Houses on wool tariff revision.

+

When the House bill came before the Senate for action, the House bill was defeated, 39 to 39, owing to the defection of Senator Bailey of Texas, he alone among the Democrats opposing it. Senators Brown, Gronna, McCumber, Nelson and Poindexter (Republicans) voted for it; Senator La Follette (Republican) voted against it, but immediately moved reconsideration. His motion being adopted, Senator Kern (Democrat) thereupon moved the amendment of the Democratic caucus noted above, and this amendment was adopted by 49 to 29, the Democrats and the Republican progressives voting for it. As thus amended, the bill was carried by 48 to 30. Joining the Democrats in support of the amended bill were the following Republicans: Borah, Bristow, Clapp, Crawford, Cummins, Dixon, Gronna, Kenyon, La Follette, McCumber, Nelson, Poindexter and Towles.

+ +

Presidential Politics in Nebraska.

Judson Harmon of Ohio was slated for recommendation at the Nebraska Democratic convention as Democratic candidate for President; but when the convention met at Fremont on the 25th it made no recommendations of persons. Its declarations were confined to principles. Pointing "with pride to the leadership the Democracy of Nebraska has taken within the last quarter of a century in reforms already accomplished, as well as those that are in process of accomplishment," the platform recites these in detail in terms that

seem like echoes of Bryanism; and while regretting that there is "not a Democratic President and a Democratic Senate to make possible a beginning of tariff revision by striking a first blow at the protection accorded all trust products in the present tariff bill," this platform "points to the reciprocity measure as proof that the Republican party is now abandoning even the pretense that its protective policy is for the benefit of the American farmer." An excellent outline of the situation will be found in our Editorial Correspondence, from the pen of "D. K. L."

+

At the Republican convention at Lincoln, also on the 25th, a committee endorsement of Mr. Taft was adopted. The Associated Press reported it in this wise:

The Insurgents lacked a leader and were out-generated by Victor Rosewater and his delegation from Omaha. Before the Insurgents could get a chance to introduce resolutions from the floor, the Regulars had rushed through a motion providing that all resolutions should be referred to a committee which was given power to draw up a final report. A. W. Jeffers of Omaha, chairman of the convention, then named a committee of seven members of whom five were strong friends of Mr. Taft. Mr. Rosewater was made chairman of the committee. From this point the possibilities of the fight on the floor over the indorsement of Mr. Taft went glimmering.

The platform rejoices "in the glorious record of the Republican party which has given the nation the illustrious names of Lincoln, Grant, Garfield, McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft," and reaffirming "devotion to Republican principles," congratulates "the country on its continued peace, progress and prosperity under the wise guidance of our Republican President."

+ +

Republican Progressives in Illinois.

At East St. Louis on the 29th Senator Walter Clyde Jones and Professor Merriam, opened the Progressive Republican campaign for the primaries of next April. [See current volume, page 778.]

+

Senator Jones struck the keynote of his campaign on nomination for Governor in these words:

This is a war to restore popular government. It is a war to destroy the boss and his machine based on the power of patronage and pelf. The spoils system must go. This is a war upon predatory business and its lure of lucre. The special interests must go out of politics. The Progressive movement has for its object the accomplishment of three definite results: First, the restoration of popular government; second, the destruction of the spoils system, and, third, the elimination of corruption from political life. These three things are intimately related. . . . The progressive movement proposes effective legis-

lation to destroy each and all of these sources of the boss's power.

Senator Jones mentioned as features of that legislation, the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. He closed by saying:

We have enlisted in this war to win, and we are going to fight until we finish. We are going to fight until popular government is restored in Illinois, as it has been in Wisconsin and Oregon and California and New Jersey and other States where this battle has been fought, where the issues have been squarely presented to the people, as we propose to present them, and where the people have voted at the ballot box overwhelmingly for Progressive measures to take back into their hands the control of their own government.

Professor Merriam, speaking in the same strain, said:

The Senatorial scandal could not have occurred if we had been able to use the system of direct election for Senators. There would have been no secret contributions to the "jackpot" and no secret distribution of that fund of shame if the people of Illinois had been able to use the Initiative and the Referendum. And if the people today could use the Recall the seats of members of the Illinois legislature who opposed the mandate of the voters of Illinois in respect to the Initiative and Referendum or who took cowardly refuge in silence would now be vacant. The Initiative, Referendum and Recall prevent the sale and delivery of political influence and are necessary checks upon the political hucksters who sell public rights for private gain.

+ +

Death of Edward M. Shepard.

After an illness of several weeks, Edward M. Shepard, of New York, died at his summer home at Lake George, at the age of 61. [See current volume, pages 195, 206.]

+

Mr. Shepard was primarily a lawyer, and he stood easily in the front rank at the New York bar. But he was also a man of public spirit with the democratic trend. Under more favorable political circumstances, he was the kind of man to have made a great democratic leader in legislation and administration; and notwithstanding his temperament, a popular leader too. In partisan politics he was affiliated with the Democratic party. He came first into national prominence after the Bryan campaign in 1896, in which he was associated with the "gold" Democracy against Bryan. The following year, when Henry George was a candidate for Mayor of New York, Mr. Shepard supported Seth Low, the Republican and "good government" candidate against George of the Jeffersonian Democracy and Van Wyck of Tammany Hall. But in 1898 Mr. Shepard supported Augustus Van Wyck for Governor against Roosevelt, and in 1900 he supported Bryan both for nomination and election. In

these changes, Mr. Shepard was governed by his financial views in 1896, by his municipal government views in 1897, and by his anti-imperialist views in 1900. He was a candidate for Governor of New York last fall, and would doubtless have been nominated and elected but for his connection as a lawyer with the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, of which fact the friends of special privilege corporations availed themselves to defeat him at the convention; and in the legislature last winter he was a candidate for the United States Senate, but failed through the same kind of opposition. Mr. Shepard will be remembered in his profession as long as great lawyers usually are remembered. But his most enduring monument is likely to be one that he erected while yet a young man. It is his story of Martin Van Buren, in the "American Statesmen" series—a veritable oasis of democracy in a "strong government" desert.

+ +

Commission Government in Passaic.

Passaic has followed Trenton's example, not Jersey City's, in its action on adopting or rejecting the commission form of city government under the Governor Wilson plan (the Walsh act of last winter) with Initiative, Referendum and Recall safety appliances. The referendum election on the question of adoption came off on the 25th. It showed 59 per cent of the vote last fall for members of the lower house of the State legislature, which was 4,506. In fact, the total percentage was over 60 for there were 96 defective ballots. As the affirmative vote was more than 30 per cent of the vote of last fall, the minimum affirmative percentage required by the New Jersey commission-plan law, the conditions of adoption were secured, provided the negative vote fell below the affirmative, and it did. Following are the returns as reported by the Passaic Daily News of the 26th:

Vote for Assemblyman last fall.....	4,506
Minimum therefore necessary for adoption.....	1,352
Affirmative vote	1,789
Negative vote	859
Affirmative majority	930

The opposing vote was cast under the leadership of party Democrats, party Republicans, and party Socialists. [See current volume, page 779.]

+ +

War Shivers in Europe.

The Mohammedan, barbarous Moorish state of Morocco, in the northwestern corner of Africa, with one short seaboard on the Mediterranean and another long one on the Atlantic, is once more a bone of contention to the European Powers.

+ +

In 1904 Great Britain and France came to an

agreement over Morocco, Great Britain recognizing France's right to assist in the administrative, economic, financial and military reforms in Morocco, but reserving the rights by treaty or usage that she was herself already exercising; Great Britain's especial interest in the matter being that on the other hand her interests in Egypt needed conservation against possible interference on the part of the other Powers. A more general agreement as to foreign rights in Morocco was entered into by representatives of a number of European Powers, the United States and Morocco itself, at Algeciras, Spain, in the spring of 1906. Since then France has exercised all powers permitted to her in policing and controlling Morocco, spurred on to activity by the necessities of the development of the contiguous state of Algeria, now a dependency of France. Latterly she has taken a hand in trying to reduce the disorders of the country consequent upon the inability of Mulai-Abd-el-Hafid, Sultan since 1907, to hold his throne against revolting tribesmen. When at last this summer French intervention seemed to approach French dominance, Spain, which has stations and business interests, especially upon the Atlantic side of the coveted country, put out a tentative hand; upon which Germany, also anxious for ports and hinterlands, if not for permanent occupation at least for material with which to dicker for Congo or other desirable African regions, also stretched out her hand—or her mailed fist, since she sent gunboats—to Agadir on the Atlantic coast. [See vol. viii, p. 692; current volume, page 638.]

+ +

On July 21 Lloyd George, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a speech at the annual banquet of the Lord Mayor of London—a speech the serious portions of which were read from manuscript—gave what was regarded as a warning to Germany to go slow in interfering in Morocco. In the House of Commons on the 27th the Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, read carefully from a manuscript what is regarded as a similar but plainer warning to Germany in regard to keeping hands off for the sake of preserving the balance of power in Europe. A sensitiveness on the part of Germany to this not undiplomatic but positive coercion of program, has raised fears of European war, in which Great Britain and France would be pitted against Germany. Activity in the war offices of Europe immediately resulted, and anxieties and war risks were augmented thereby. As yet the German government has made no official response to the British warnings.

+ +

Russia an Enemy to Constitutional Government in Persia.

The ex-Shah of Persia, Mohammed Ali Mirza, backed by tribesmen of the neighborhood of Astra-

bad, is marching on Teheran. The Russian government, which seems to have connived at the ex-Shah's return to Persia, is reported as refusing to join England in representing to him that he must withdraw from Persia. Russia, in alliance with Belgium, is also stirring up trouble in the financial complications of the present constitutional government of Persia. It will be remembered that a commission of Americans went over last spring to reorganize Persian finance, and that one of the commission, W. Morgan Shuster, was created treasurer-general of Persia. The Russian minister and the Belgian director of customs at Teheran are reported to have refused to allow customs and other charges to be paid through the new treasurer-general. [See current volume, pages 351, 585, 779.]

NEWS NOTES

—The coal miners' long strike at westmoreland, Pa., has been called off. [See current volume, page 580.]

—Ground was broken on the 31st at Sixty-seventh street and Lexington avenue, Manhattan Borough, New York City, for the Triborough traction system. [See current volume, page 784.]

—A. B. Farmer, of Toronto, will speak on "The Progress of the Single Tax Propaganda in Canada" before the Chicago Single Tax Club (508 Schiller Bldg.) on Friday evening, the 4th.

—A common market place was opened on the City Hall lawn at Des Moines on the 25th by Mayor Hanna, and it is reported to have been highly successful in reducing the prices of farm and garden produce.

—A bill has been enacted in New York and approved by Governor Dix which provides for a system of State farm colonies for the detention, humane discipline, instruction and reformation of male adults committed as tramps and vagrants from any section of the State.

—The Haytian revolution gains strength and territory. The leader of this particular revolution is General Cincinnatus Leconte, who aspires to the presidency; but there are other aspirants in exile, and General Leconte may not be permitted to reap the fruits of victory. Four United States warships are now in Haytian waters. [See current volume, page 779.]

—A bill prohibiting the employment in any capacity of persons under 16 years of age by the government of the United States or any government contractor, and providing that special delivery letter carriers shall not be less than 18 years old, was introduced in Congress on the 28th by Representative Berger, the Socialist member. Mr. Berger has also introduced an old-age pension bill.

—At the national convention of the American Osteopathic Association at Chicago last week, a challenge to drug-physicians was made for a test with osteopathy on the cure of both chronic and

acute diseases—pneumonia and typhoid fever being offered for the latter test. They also declared against the national health department bills now pending in Congress. [See current volume, page 85.]

—A league for a "sane Christmas" has been organized in Indianapolis, with Bruce Calvert, publisher of The Open Road, as president, and Joseph Leiser, of Allentown, Pa., as secretary. The League opposes what it regards as a modern commercialization of Christmas, and demands a return to the old-fashioned Christmas, with distribution of presents confined strictly to the immediate family circle.

—Defendants recently indicted in the Federal court of New York for maintaining the wire trust, entered pleas of "nolo contendere" on the 25th, and were sentenced by Judge Archbald to pay fines of from \$1,000 to \$1,000 each. There were 37 in all. Judge Archbald explained that he had imposed these light sentences on the distinct understanding that all efforts to control prices and output would be abandoned. [See current volume, page 638.]

—A French lieutenant, Mr. de Conneau, who raced under the name of A. Beaumont, won the Great Britain aviation race of 1,010 miles around England, taking the race in sections. Another Frenchman, J. Vedrines, arrived second at the goal. Beaumont's total time was 22 hours and 27 seconds. Vedrine's total time was 22 hours, 56 minutes and 55 seconds. The prize of the race was \$50,000 offered by the London Daily Mail. [See current volume, page 784.]

—The receivership of the Chicago Union Traction Company, originated by Charles T. Yerkes, came to an end last week, the property and affairs of the company being taken over by the Chicago Railways Company. The receivership was created in order to enable the company to obtain the protection of the Federal courts in the fight over the ninety-nine-year franchise claims, in which the city of Chicago was finally successful before the United States Supreme Court.

—Edwin A. Abbey, illustrator and great mural decorator, died at his home in London on the 1st. Mr. Abbey was born in Philadelphia in 1852. He had made his home in England since 1878. Some of his most notable works are a series of large decorative panels in the Boston public library, entitled "The Quest of the Holy Grail." These mural paintings have great historical and illustrative value, and are of extraordinary brilliance and impressiveness as works of art.

—Fifty editors of labor publications from all parts of the country, headed by Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, held a conference at Chicago on the 31st and outlined a programme to be followed in connection with the defense of the McNamara brothers, in Los Angeles, commended Mr. Gompers, John Mitchell and Frank Morrison for alleged contempt of court in Washington, and organized to oppose the proposed raise of rates for newspaper postage.

—Fuller particulars in regard to recent changes in the incidence of taxation in Spain, reported in last week's Public (page 785), have been received from Mr. Antonio Albendin. Mr. Albendin explains that the "consumos" tax which was discontinued July 1, was a tax on food consumption. The press dispatches called it a "town tax," and it was without doubt in

the nature of an "octroi," or tax on food as it enters the gates of a city. For the "consumos," according to Mr. Albendin, have been substituted seven other taxes, among them taxes on spirits, theaters, dwellings (as reported last week), and most important of all, a tax on fifty per cent of the selling value of undeveloped building land.

—The first annual conference of the Men's and Religious Forward movement at Silver Bay, Lake George, last week, was attended by 450 delegates from 36 States and 75 of the largest cities of the United States and Canada. At the head of the movement is J. G. Cannon, president of the New York Clearing House. The principal speaker on the 25th was Raymond Robins. Other speakers were Dr. Lansing of the reform bureau at Washington, the Rev. Charles Stelzle of Brooklyn, and Dr. H. F. Lafalmat, leader of the Layman's Missionary movement. A notable fact reported in regard to the conference is that this is the first time that every Protestant religion has been represented at a single gathering of the kind.

PRESS OPINIONS

Judson Harmon.

The (St. Louis) Mirror (Wm. Marion Reedy), July 27.—A reader asks me what kind of a Democrat is Judson Harmon, of Ohio. He's the kind of a Democrat who never was on the same side of any democratic question upon which Tom L. Johnson was to be found. You can build up a political character-photograph of Harmon from that.

+ +

Coronation Contrasts.

(New York) Mother Earth, July.—At the coronation banquet the guests ate out of gold plates valued at \$15,000,000. At the same time the pariahs of London were ransacking the swill barrels to still their gnawing hunger; at the very moment thousands of British subjects were walking the streets, destitute, in tatters. While the wealth and glory of England was being toasted at tables laden with rich viands and costly wines in priceless plate and cut glass, thousands of little children fought in the dirty alleys of the coronation city over a piece of rotten fruit rind. All zones and climes contributed dainty dishes and rare luxuries to the Lucullus gluttony of the coronation, but the number of cases of starvation in London will not be diminished in this year of grace. It usually goes above the hundred mark.

+ +

A Northern Light.

The (Seattle) Pioneer Magazine, July.—The railroad makes rich mines accessible, but for whose benefit? There are many who believe the real solution of the Alaska coal question is to be found along the lines of the Singletax system of taxation, which has been so successful in Vancouver, B. C.; that is, stop interposing objections whether well founded or frivolous to patenting coal lands; but prevent the possibility of monopoly by taxing all coal lands at their actual value, whether used or idle. What Alas-

ka and the whole Coast needs is the development of the coal lands. Few will be benefited if patents are granted and the patentees allowed to keep the mines closed. But if a substantial tax is imposed on land values alone and all improvements and personal property exempted from taxation, the coal will be mined and monopoly made impossible.

+ +

Direct Legislation in Massachusetts.

The Boston Common (ind.), July 1.—While disappointing, the defeat of Direct Legislation this year should not discourage its friends. The people have it in their power to elect representatives who will comply with their will; and it is their business to see to it that what they want shall be accorded to them. With direct nominations it will be possible to raise this issue definitely in every district, debate it before the voters and commit each candidate. There has been no such State-wide campaign, and in its absence dodging was to have been and is to be expected. A militant campaign throughout Massachusetts for popular rule would be wholesome. Let us, therefore, have a stirring referendum on whether the people or the privileged classes are to have control of the people's affairs.

+ +

Negroes and Crime.

The Newark (N. J.) Crown, July.—The reader sees after the name of a lawbreaker the word "Negro," or "colored." He sees this word day after day, and almost always associated with crime. He never sees the word "white" in this relation. And thus little by little, without his being aware of it, the impression is made on his mind that the Negro is a great criminal. . . . A crime by a Negro is put to the account of the Negro race; but a crime by a white man is not put to the account of any race. It is credited simply to individuals, criminal individuals. The Negro murderer is a brutal Negro; but the white murderer is simply a brutal Murderer, a term that reflects on no race or color. The white murderer is merged with the criminal class, whereas the Negro murderer is identified, not with the nondescript criminal class, but with the Negro race. . . . Any other class could be discredited in the same way. Suppose that it was the Italian lawbreaker whose nationality alone was designated in the newspapers. The Italian thug, the Italian kidnapper, the Italian assassin, the Italian thief, the Italian forger, the Italian street car rowdy, let them all be designated as "Italian" every time their names occur, and the like mental relation will follow, and the like injustice will be done our Italian population, unless every other nationality were to be designated in like connection. All or none would be the fair rule. . . . Take it in another field. Suppose that the newspapers thought it important to indicate the division of crime between Protestants and Catholics (never mind the Jews just now). And suppose that because the Catholics are so much fewer the papers should do as they do with the Negro, that is, indicate the word Catholic, but leave the word Protestant to be inferred. Would any papers dare do this? And why not? Because the Catholics would not stand it; and they would be right. They would see at once that a gross injustice

was done them by the exclusive association of crime with "Catholics," because little by little the public would come to think of that relation as at once natural and unique. . . . Now that is the way the newspaper practice works to the disadvantage of the Negro.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

LAZARUS.

From the London Spectator.

"Remember that thou in thy lifetime receivest thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things."

+

Still he lingers, where wealth and fashion
Meet together to dine or play,
Lingers, a matter of vague compassion,
Out in the darkness across the way;
Out beyond the warmth and the glitter,
And the light where luxury's laughter rings,
Lazarus waits, where the wind is bitter,
Receiving his evil things.

Still you find him, when, breathless, burning
Summer flames upon square and street,
When the fortunate ones of the earth are turning
Their thoughts to meadows and meadowsweet;
For far away from the wide green valley,
And the bramble patch where the whitethroat
sings,
Lazarus sweats in his crowded alley,
Receiving his evil things.

And all the time from a thousand rostrums
Wise men preach upon him and his woes,
Each with his bundle of noisy nostrums
Torn to tatters 'twixt ayes and noes;
Sage and Socialist, gush and glamour,
Yet little relief their wisdom brings,
For there's nothing for him out of all the clamor,
Nothing but evil things.

Royal commissions, creeds, convictions,
Learnedly argue and write and speak,
But the happy issue of his afflictions,
Lazarus waits for it week by week.
Still he seeks it today, tomorrow,
In purposeless pavement wanderings,
Or dreams it, a huddled heap of sorrow,
Receiving his evil things.

And some will tell you of evolution
With social science thereto; and some
Look forth to the parable's retribution,
When the lot is changed in the life to come,
To the trumpet sound and the great awaking,
To One with healing upon His wings
In the house of the many mansions, making
An end of the evil things.

In the name of Knowledge the race grows healthier,
In the name of Freedom the world grows great,
And men are wiser, and men are wealthier,
But—Lazarus lies at the rich man's gate;

Lies as he lay through human history,
Through fame of heroes and pomp of kings,
At the rich man's gate, an abiding mystery,
Receiving his evil things.

+ +

A Reply.

For The Public.

In Loving Memory of Leonce Coudert Fuller, Ever
a Fearless Champion of the "Under Dog" and
the Oppressed, These Lines are Inscribed by
His Lifelong Friend, Charles Frederick
Adams, July 12, 1911.

Others may clamor, each with his "nostrum"
(Not all agreeing on what to do!):
Has this last "preacher" to mount his "rostrum,"
By sneers accomplished the end in view?
"By fruits" he judged them: what fruits has he?
"Relief" they brought not, of course he brings?
Now surely! Lazarus will no more be
"Receiving his evil things!"

Brilliant discovery! Ignored prescriptions—
Advice not followed—have failed to heal!
Sharp-eyed "Spectator"! full rich subscriptions
Should aid thy work for the common weal:
But—oh, wise Oracle! pursue thy teaching—
Let it not end with mere rhythmic "flings":
Help us to adopt, from out all the "preaching,"
The cure for the evil things!

If not your "Socialist's" mayhap your "Sage's"—
The Western Prophet's—programme might work:
With "Rent" for all, and fair-bargained Wages,
Desert might prosper, where, now,—the Shirk!
Show poor robbed Lazarus the true solution:
"Make Dives cease from his pilferings!"
That would accomplish the Revolution,
Giving, to each,—Just things!

+ + +

THE PARABLE OF THE WEED PATCH.

From a Sermon Delivered by the Rev. Everett Dean
Martin, in the First Unitarian Church
of Des Moines.

Once, on the southern slope of a hillside where the first warm rays of the returning sun awoke the life of spring, there was an old fashioned garden. Here all the flowers of springtime were at home. Hyacinths were never more fragrant, and the violets and narcissus, lilacs, lilies of the valley, and roses, each in their proper time and place, added their fragrance and their beauty to that garden and seemed to become the lovelier in the sweetness of all the rest.

Then in the long, quiet summer days the marigold and the phlox might be seen; poppies danced in the sunshine, and hollyhocks grew tall by the garden wall. Here many quaint, old fashioned species were remembered and preserved, for an old Gardener might be seen bending tenderly over each one. All day he toiled patiently until the

shadows grew long at the setting of the sun. Never in a hurry, he seemed to incarnate in himself the calm spirit of the garden, where each lived for all and all for each.

One day the old Gardener was absent from the scene of his labors. He never came there any more. Many days went by. At first the flowers that had known him so long did not miss him very much, but after a long time when he did not come, they became restless and tired. The earth in which they grew seemed to become hard and cruel. And it seemed that something of the meaning of their lives had gone.

One day an Evil Spirit, passing by, breathed upon that garden, and said:

"You are losing your opportunities. Each of you is missing his success. Why do you languish here in idleness. The Gardener is dead. It was he that restrained you. Now you may live. You might be the tallest of all in the garden. Don't let others put you in the shade. Life is the survival of the fittest. Every one see how tall you can grow. There is always plenty of room at the top."

Then a miracle happened within those low walls. All grew up as in a night. A new spirit of enterprise had taken possession of every living thing. This was progress. How different from the sleepy old days with the Gardener. Even the grass understood, and grew long and tangled and tough. All the plants sent up their stocks as tall and strong as they could. They sought to spread their leaves over one another's heads. Their branches grappled in a life and death struggle for light.

Sunshine that had once flooded all the place was now at a premium. They crowded so close together that the little spring flowers grew faint and pale and soon withered and died. Even the stronger summer flowers forgot to bloom.

Then the weeds, which were not encumbered with flowers, knew that their day had come. They crowded to the wall all who did not adopt their methods.

And now the struggle became more sordid still. The weeds began a battle among themselves. They had a less delicate sense of honor than the former sentimental occupants of the garden; they resorted to cunning and underground devices to gain advantage. The battle went on to the death. With deeds of darkness they undermined one another's strength, and made one another hideous. Their ugly, deformed stems scraped and sawed one another when the wind blew. The birds and butterflies and bees became frightened and came no more. Instead, spiders made their webs and awaited their prey among the broken ragged stalks.

Only the top leaves were now green, and before the summer was half done they drank up all the

moisture from the ground, and they all died together.

The Spirit had promised the survival of the fittest, but it was only the survival of the rankest. "Who hath ears to hear, let him hear!"

+ + +

PEOPLE'S POWER.

Portions of a Speech Delivered by John Z. White at Passaic, N. J., on the Eve of the Adoption by Passaic of the Commission Form of Government. From the Passaic Daily News of July 24, 1911.

In presenting this matter, I wish to warn you that I make no effort to reach your belief. I would recommend you very carefully not to believe me, or anybody else who talks to you. My effort is not to arouse your faith but to reach your understanding. When you shall observe the nature of Commission government, and if it shall fail to convince you, then you may very properly advise me to add to my remarks the words the merchant did at the close of his advertisement. He said, "Don't go elsewhere and be cheated; come here." If you find that the idea of Commission government does not agree with your judgment, reject it, but do not reject it unless you understand it.

Everywhere over the United States it has been the practice to find out which particular party endorsed any particular idea, and then depend upon which particular party may have furnished its endorsement, to determine where you would place the weight or emphasis of your vote. If you happened to be a Democrat, and the Democratic party said the thing was good, lo and behold, it was holy in your sight. If you happened to be a Republican, and the Republican party said anything was good, lo and behold, that thing became holy in your sight. Now, why should we not have a judgment of our own, individual, regardless of what our neighbors or our party associates may determine? This has gone on so far that a great many citizens have lost their judgment politically. We are getting into the habit of condemning everything and are arriving at the same state of affairs as our good friend the darky when he was ill. Friends said: "Sam, you ought to have a physician, and if you will tell us what kind of a doctor you want, we will get it—allopath, homeopath or osteopath." "Well," he said, "it doesn't make any difference. All *paths* lead to the grave." . . .

Not merely to be perfectly frank, but so you won't think I am trying to conceal anything from you, I wish to advise you that I am a Democrat. And the reason I am a Democrat is that my father was one. And that's about the only good reason for being a Democrat. Now, if any of you gentlemen happen to be Republicans, and seriously contemplate your own consciousness—

which would be very unusual—you will discover your reason for being a Republican is identical with mine for being a Democrat. There is no difference between the Republican and Democrat today. You cannot tell them apart in broad daylight. . . . Have an opinion of your own. Act upon your opinion; do not just agree with me or anybody else.

What is Commission government? What is the proposal?

It is the proposal that we from now on conduct and administer our public affairs in exactly the way we always do conduct and administer our private affairs. That's all. To apply to public affairs exactly the same method that we every day apply in the administration of our private affairs. . . .

Now, how do we administer our private affairs? Why, if I have more work than I can do, and I want some one to assist me, I employ some one willing to work. In other words, I engage an agent. That agent I want to do what I want done, not what he wants to do, not what he thinks ought to be done. I employ this agent to accomplish a result that I desire. I want him to represent me, not some one else, not himself, but me. I want a representative. I am not able to do everything that I desire to have done. I must have help. How do I secure a representative in private life? Why, when I employ this individual to assist me, I reserve certain powers. If this agent does not do what I want done I can go and do that particular act myself. If the agent insists upon doing something I do not want done I have the power to stop him from doing that particular thing. If the agent becomes generally unsatisfactory I reserve the power to dismiss him and get some one else. That is the way your employer makes his employees represent him. And without these reserved powers you cannot get representation in any relation of life.

Those three powers are known as the Initiative, the Referendum and the Recall when introduced into public affairs.

The Initiative is the method whereby we compel the doing of a thing we want done, even if our agent does not desire it or fails in any way to perform it.

The Referendum is the method whereby we prevent an agent from doing what he wants to do in violation of our desires.

The Recall is the method whereby we dismiss an unsatisfactory employe.

These three powers are reserved to the people, who are the principals, and they place our government affairs in exactly the same position relatively to the people as that of an agent to his principal in the affairs of private life.

I see some ladies here. Suppose one of our ladies has an assistant at home, a cook, for in-

stance, and that your cook doesn't do what you want—won't make an angel cake; you can go into the kitchen and make the angel cake yourself, can't you? That is Initiative. It is the reserved power whereby the principal, the employer, can get done what he wants done, even though the agent fails. It is the same way in our city government. We elect a Commission. Suppose they do not do what we want done. Then it is proposed that the people do for themselves what their officials do not do.

Now, the method, involving a larger number of people than are generally engaged in private enterprises, is a trifle more elaborate, but it is exactly the same thing. Suppose we have a government of three, or five, or six men, employed to run the city, but with this reservation on the part of the people, that if the people want anything done that these commissioners do not do, then the people may proceed to do that thing themselves, without reference to their government. The process is this: We draft a law expressing our idea, our notion, determining what we want. If we are wise we will go and see our legal friends to get it in proper form. Having drawn it in the shape in which we believe it ought to be passed, we go to our neighbors who are voters, and ask them to sign this proposal. That is, we make a motion, and every man who signs it seconds the motion. It is usually provided that 5 per cent., or sometimes 8 per cent., or 10 per cent., of the voters must sign this proposed law before their signatures become authoritative. But with the necessary percentage of signatures we go to the city clerk and file the document with him. We say, Here is a proposal that certain things be done in a certain way. This proposal is signed by 5 per cent., or 8 per cent., or 10 per cent., or whatever other percentage you may agree upon, of voters of this city. Therefore, we demand that either our city government put this into operation at once, without changing a solitary word, or that they submit it to the people to be voted upon at the next election. And if the majority of the votes cast upon that measure are in the affirmative, then the measure is adopted, irrespective of whether the officials desire it or not.

Now, would you think of hiring me to run your business on any other basis? Would you think of hiring a man and putting him in any business to run it, on any other basis? You hire a man to do something. Suppose he does not do it? Suppose he partly does it. Suppose some one part of the enterprise is left unattended to? Don't I reserve the power to go and attend to that particular proposition myself? Why, certainly I do. Every employer in the United States always reserves the same control, and by virtue of reserving that power the agent, the employe, knows that he must make good or lose his job. Put your public officials in exactly the same position that every private employe holds,

one of reserved power on the part of his employer, whereby he must make good.

Suppose your official or your employe does something you do not want done. Referring to our simile of the lady's cook in the kitchen, suppose the cook, instead of failing to do something, does something you don't want done, like putting salt instead of sugar in the angel cake. Don't you reserve the power to go into the kitchen and insist upon the substitution of sugar for salt? You prevent your employe from doing something you don't want done. You reserve that power, and by virtue of that reservation your employe becomes your representative. He represents you. Now that power reserved on the part of the people is known by the long word "Referendum." The people reserve the power to refer any particular thing the officials may do back to themselves. The method is a little more elaborate than in dealing with the cook in the kitchen. Suppose your city government passes an ordinance which will work out in a given way, and you don't like it. Ordinances do not go into operation for a period of some thirty or sixty days after enactment. During that time any citizen may propose that this particular ordinance or any part of it shall not become operative until it has been submitted to the people to be voted upon. Again he goes to his neighbors, who are voters, and asks them to sign this petition, for this proposed reference to the people. If he gets enough signatures, usually 5 per cent., he files it with the city clerk, during the period of thirty or sixty days, as may be determined, and if this paper is filed and so signed, then that law is held up and cannot be made operative or put into execution until the people themselves have had an opportunity to vote upon it, and if the majority agree with the signers the law is vetoed, destroyed, annulled.

Do you not see that under these two measures—first, your officials cannot prevent you from having any law you want, and, next, your officials cannot put upon you any law you do not want. It makes you the master. Now, do you know of any private enterprise that is conducted anywhere in the United States, upon any other basis? Are there any ladies in this city who will attempt to run a household with assistants upon any other basis than the reserved powers to make their assistants do what they want done and to prevent their assistants from doing anything they do not want done? Is there any woman who will attempt to run a household on any other basis than that? Is there any man who will attempt to conduct business on any other business basis than that? . . .

Yet, when we are trying to establish a method . . . of that kind, then we "destroy representative government."

Why, gentlemen, you cannot destroy that which does not exist. Destroy representative government! When did you ever have it? Does Lori-

mer represent the people of Illinois? Do you think the people of Illinois would have elected Cullom if they had had a chance? Does Senator Stephenson from Wisconsin represent the people of Wisconsin? Does Cox represent the people of Cincinnati? When have you had representative government? There is one way to secure representative government in this world, and only one, and that is to retain the power to compel our representatives. Is there any man that you know of in the good City of Passaic that will consent to run his private affairs in the way he does his public business? . . . Is there any gentleman you know of in Passaic who will give me an irrevocable power of attorney for two years to run his business? During two years he cannot interfere with me at all unless he can prove in a criminal court that I have violated the criminal law. At the end of two years he cannot take possession of his business himself. He must appoint me for another two years, or some one else in my stead. If he is tired of me, and I am pretty sure he would be, and he appointed some one else, what would that some one do? He would look over what I had done and improve on my methods. And at the end of two years the employer would want to get rid of this agent. If I happened to be a Democrat, he would get rid of Democrats and put in a Republican. He would not need much experience before he would get tired of that. That's what happened in San Francisco. Out there they tried a labor fellow named Schmidt, a poor, upright laboring man and they have got him behind the bars now, haven't they? It does not matter who you put in, it is the fact that he is not held to responsibility that brings him to rascality. Put in others and they will get everything that is loose, would they not? Finally an agent would come in and there is nothing to take, then what would he do? What would that man do? Why, he would pledge the future income of the concern; he would put it in debt. Is not that a fair description of practically every municipality in the United States? Is not that exactly what has happened? You have changed agents, you have had Republicans, Democrats, Citizens' Movements, Commissions of Honor, Labor people, and now they are having Socialists out in Milwaukee. The new broom is sweeping clean, but what will happen when that broom gets old?

Now let us look at the Commission itself for a little while. Suppose you wanted to go to Europe and leave your business in some one's hands. What would you do? Would you not appoint some one to look after your business and give them the necessary authority? If you did not give them the necessary authority, would you expect them to manage your business well? Certainly not. Put a man on an ocean liner to go across the ocean, and we give him authority to run that boat, and then if anything goes wrong

we do not call up the steward, we do not call up the purser, we do not call up the mate. We do not call up any officer except the captain. He is the man upon whom responsibility rests. That is the way you do everything in private life. You go to the man to whom you gave instructions, and in every place there is some man who has the duty and he is responsible. It is that fact that causes every individual all through the organization, no matter who, to realize that he has got to make good. Now in order to establish that condition, you must give the man power. We have been so afraid to give any one power here in the United States that we have invented a practice or system that is popularly known under the description of "checks and balances." Nobody knows exactly what this is, but it sounds good. . . .

With this system of checks and balances, as has been said, when all the checks are pledged and the balances adjusted, we discover the result is the people are checkmated. Instead of inviting our institutions to carry on this great, awkward, cumbersome machine that no one knows anything about, that you cannot get a line on, that you cannot endow with responsibility, we propose that in the commission we elect a few men, ordinarily five, giving each one of these men a department in the city government, and no orders can be issued in any one department except upon the responsibility of the official at the head of that department. If anything goes wrong with the streets, there are not twenty or thirty or forty councilmen to interview. There is just one man. No one else in the city has any power to fix the streets. If anything goes wrong everyone knows that that man is responsible. No one else can be talked to because no one else has any authority. That is exactly how you run a railroad. You make a general manager, who is responsible. He can employ a superintendent of rolling stock, a superintendent of traffic, he can employ a master mechanic, but he is responsible for what they do. In this way you can fix personal responsibility, and in no other way. That is the way we do everything in private life. That is the way we get personal responsibility. Why, you would not ask that lady to go into the kitchen and cook an angel cake unless you gave her sugar, would you? You would not expect her to produce angel cake without sugar. Give her power and then hold her to results.

That is the way we do everything. And if you place the same conditions around public officers you will have the same results in public life as you do in private affairs. . . .

We agree with Mr. Lincoln, that no man is good enough to rule another man. Self-government is the only sort of government that can endure. Every other sort of government must be kept down. Now, why? Simplest thing in the world. Nothing profound. The only fellow that cannot understand it is the statesman, the great

lawyer, the great educator. Everybody else understands self-government—if they want to. Your Governor Wilson is apologizing all over the country for what he has been teaching for years past at the university. Isn't that true? He is out today mixing with the common people, and he is therefore becoming educated. If he keeps on mixing with the common people long enough he will actually acquire an education. He says himself that all of these years in the university have been years of error. He says so—not I. We want to make people self-governing. Why? What is the reason? For this reason: You must have government. That is true, is it not? Every one except those gentlemen called philosophic anarchists will agree to that, and there is not enough of them to count. That being true, that government must rest ultimately in the hands of all of the people, or else in the hands of part of the people. If the government rests in the hands of part of the people, that part can swindle the whole to its own profit. It *can* do so. I don't say will. It can swindle the whole to its own profit, and the temptation to misuse the powers of government to personal profit are so strong that no group of men have ever been assembled in this world that have proven themselves able to resist that temptation. Individual men have resisted it. George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson—men of that type, we know to be able to resist all manner of temptation to go wrong in public office.

But you cannot point me to one group or to one legislative body in the history of this world that were long continuously in power that did not in greater or less degree prove traitors to those they were supposed to represent. If you know of such a body, will you name it to me? Where did it live and when did it rule? You cannot trust sovereign power in the hands of any *part* of the people. They will misuse that power. Not because they are bad men, but because the temptation is greater than human nature is fitted to resist. That is the explanation of the wrong. That is the explanation of our muck. That is the explanation of government. Not that men are bad, but that they are weak. You have no right to place this temptation on the shoulders or the consciences of your officials. You read the Bible, do you not? You know the Lord's Prayer? It says, "lead us not into temptation." Do you believe that, or when you say it are you joking? If you believe it, then will you explain to me how you satisfy your consciences with the responsibility and temptation you place upon each public officer in the United States? What right have you to place men in this position?

If you have government by all of the people, I mean where the ultimate power rests with all, where you have the Referendum, where you have the Initiative, the Recall, in the hands of the

people, where they can use their power if they want to, then the ultimate responsibility is with the people. Are they wiser than before? I don't think so. Are they more virtuous than before? I certainly do not believe so. If not wiser or more virtuous, then upon what ground have they better results? Just one. All of the people cannot profitably swindle themselves. That is the reason they won't do wrong. Because it is not profitable to do wrong. . . .

I do not pretend to say it is the only ground. There is a moral power, but there is the influence of profit, and any governmental arrangement that ignores the fact is founded on a false basis. And our government is ignoring it and always has. I am not interested in revolutions or interested in destroying government. I am interested in attempting to do something that folks have been trying to do for fifty years through the Federal government. We will rule by Commission government, coming back to the city at the other extreme of governmental arrangement, and begin to correct things at home.

* * *

THE NEWSMONGERS.

Langdon Everard in London Labour Leader.

We are the nation's eyes and ears;
We mould the nation's thought;
We feed its follies and its fears,
And bring its hopes to naught.

Our arms, like tentacles, are girt
Around the throbbing earth;
We handle burning truths, unhurt;
Our pens to lies give birth.

We sow, and lo, the people reap
The harvest of our tricks:
Rechauffé of the garbage-heap
And sport and politics.

We fan the fires of Ignorance
And Hatred with our breath,
Till Madness rides astride Romance
And War stalks forth with Death.

With lies the people's path we've paved;
They'll turn on us some day—
On us, who, knowing we're enslaved,
Are greater slaves than they.

We've sold our souls, to gain a crust
From those whom we despise:
Some day, thank God, we shall be dust,
And dust our frauds and lies.

* * *

Chatty Lodger (to Landlord): "You seem to have seen a good deal. What are you?"

Landlord: "Well, sir, I were a lion tamer, and I'd be there now if I 'adn't a-married. But you see, my wife were a knife-thrower in the same show, and she got to practicing her turn on me. Well, thinks I, life ain't too long to run no risks, so I took on a safe job and become a steeplejack."—Punch.

BOOKS

"WHAT IS A LIVING WAGE?"

The Standard of Living Among the Industrial People of America. By Frank Hatch Streightoff. Published by Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston and New York, 1911. Price, \$1 net.

Most Americans know, whether they admit it or not, that several million people in the United States are starving. This truth is bearable only when denied, or scientifically analyzed.

Yet there is room for just such an honest and able study of starvation as this essay by Mr. Streightoff which took first prize in the Hart, Schaffner and Marx economics competition for 1909. In the presence of this book fewer will deny the evil and more will seek its cause.

"According to the census of 1900," writes the author, "11 per cent of all workmen in the United States were unemployed for at least three months of the year," and the United States Commissioner of Labor reports that "85 per cent of this idleness was from causes entirely beyond the workman's control." Along with this irregularity of employment the yearly resources of "about 21 per cent of normal families are below \$500." "Beyond doubt the homes of several million laborers are far below a reasonable standard for comfort and for morality"—despite the fact that they pay nearly 20 per cent of their income for rent—and "about a third of the American industrial people do not consume enough proteids for the maintenance of efficiency."

The author adopts, slightly amended, Mr. Gompers' definition of a living wage as "a wage, which when expended in the most economical manner consistent with the intelligence of the average housewife, shall be sufficient to maintain the average-sized family [father, mother and three children] in a manner consistent with whatever the contemporary local civilization recognizes as indispensable to physical and mental health, or, as being required by the rational self-respect of human beings." With this definition in mind, Mr. Streightoff finds the extreme low limit of the living wage to be \$650, dividing the expenses as follows:

Food	\$297
Rent	100
Clothing	120
Fuel	40
Church and other organizations.....	20
Medical attendance	12
Amusement	20
Miscellaneous	40
Total	\$649

"At this wage there can be no saving and a

minimum of pleasure. Yet there are in the United States at least five million industrial workmen who are earning \$600 or less a year."

ANGELINE LOESCH GRAVES.

+ + +

"THE UNIVERSAL CONSCIOUSNESS OF LIFE."

Psychic Phenomena, Science and Immortality. By Henry Frank. Boston. Sherman, French & Co. Price, \$2.25 net.

Following an earlier work, "Modern Light on Immortality," Mr. Frank supplements his proofs by recounting in the present volume his studies and experiences in the realm of psychology. While drawing on the facts already made public in the reports of the Psychical Research Society, the author contributes his own remarkable experiences, together with his theory concerning the same which is both original and interesting. For this in itself the well-indexed and well-written book is to be commended to investigators along psychic lines.

In conclusion Mr. Frank asks the pertinent questions: "By whom or by what has the reality of death been revealed? . . . How does death differ from life? Is life but death in process, or is death a process of life?"

To these and many other questions the answer is returned that the universal consciousness of life is the groundwork of belief in immortality. "We know only life—we cannot by any possibility know death. We realize life; death we can but observe."

A. L. M.

+ + +

PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY.

Thinking for Results. By Christian D. Larson, Editor of Opportunity. The Progress Co., Chicago. Price, 50c.

In this prettily bound red-lined book of 132 pp. we have Mr. Larson's philosophy of the power of thought reduced to pocket compass—if one is so fortunate as to have a pocket. Better than that, the condensed statements of the author's previous volumes on the same topic are here put in sugar coated pellets that the ill-conditioned mind can grasp and apply at once to its own relief. There is invaluable service in the careful reading and determined practice of the thought rules laid down in the simple unequivocal words of Mr.

Larson who is ready to testify to the results of right thinking.

A. L. M.

+ + +

Little Arthur was very proud of his membership in the "Band of Mercy." He wore the badge, a small star, as if it were a policeman's insignia, and could often be heard reproving the other boys for their cruel treatment of dogs and cats. But one day a lady of the neighborhood was astonished to find

New Edition of the Complete Works of HENRY GEORGE

The Fels Fund Library Edition of the Works of Henry George. Complete in Ten Volumes. Handsomely bound in Blue Buckram, Gilt Tops, Paper Labels, Portraits.

Price, \$12.00 at our office, or \$13.00 with transportation prepaid to any express address in the United States or Canada.

The volumes run as follows:

- I. Progress and Poverty.
- II. Social Problems.
- III. The Land Question.
Contains "The Land Question," "Property in Land," and the "Condition of Labor" (open letter to Pope Leo XIII).
- IV. Protection or Free Trade.
- V. A Perplexed Philosopher.
- VI. and VII. The Science of Political Economy.
- VIII. Our Land and Land Policy.
Contains the miscellaneous writings, speeches and lectures.
- IX. and X. The Life of Henry George.

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

Don't Be Discourteous!

You'll make new friends in the vacation season. Why not introduce The Public to them?

Business Dep't of The Public

him in the very act of tormenting the cat. She protested: "Why, Arthur, what are you doing? I thought you belonged to the 'Band of Mercy.'"

"I did," he said, "but I lost my star."—Metropolitan Magazine.

+ + *

Housekeeper at Lord X's: "And which way did you vote, Mr. Budd?"

Butler: "The 'ole of this election has been fought

on clarse 'atred, Mrs. Timms, and is directed against hus, and I did my duty accordin'!"—Punch.

+ + +

A teacher of English, in order to disprove the charge that high school pupils know little about the really vital things that are going on around them, gave a test in which she asked for definitions of such terms as: tariff, reciprocity, the labor problem.

Do You Wear White

clothes all through Spring and Summer? Makes too much washing, you say. Not if you use Fels-Naptha soap.

Fels-Naptha keeps white clothes fresh and clean with little work at little cost. You wash them with Fels-Naptha in cold or lukewarm water without boiling and you don't have disagreeable steaming suds.

Then your clothes wear longer if washed with Fels-Naptha. No boiling to weaken their fibre; no hard-rubbing to wear and tear them.

Fels-Naptha will not harm the most delicate fabrics. Fels-Naptha makes it easier to wear white clothing. Be sure to follow directions on the red and green wrapper.

Fels-Naptha will lighten the labors of housecleaning, just as it does the drudgery of wash day.

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., 531 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

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

Terms of Subscription

Yearly	\$1.00
Half yearly50
Quarterly25
Single Copies05
Trial subscription—4 weeks.....	.10

Extra copies, \$2.00 per 100, in lots of 50 or more. 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 and 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 Rate, 10c Per Agate Line

(14 lines to the inch)

One page, each insertion.....	\$24.00
Half page, each insertion.....	12.00
7 inches, single column, each insertion.....	9.80
Quarter page, each insertion.....	6.00
One inch, each insertion.....	1.40

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

2% discount for cash in 5 days from receipt of bill. Columns 3 inches wide, 120 lines long, two columns to the page.

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

In the paper of a fifteen-year-old she found this:
 "The labor problem is how to keep the working people happy without paying them enough to live on."
 —La Follette's Weekly.

* * *

In Paris last summer a Southern girl was heard to drawl between the acts of "Chantecler": "I

Five-inch oval picture of the late **TOM L. JOHNSON**, and Edmund Vance Cooke's poem "**A MAN IS PASSING**," combined in an attractive wall card, sent postpaid for 10 cents. **PITT PUB. CO.**, Pitt Bldg., Cleveland, O.

think it's mo' fun when you don't understand French. It sounds mo' like chickens!"—Life.

* * *

"Well, this is the first time you've been back to the old town for several years, ain't it?"

"Yes, this is my first visit here since 1907."

"What you doin' up to the city now?"

"I am in the railroad business."

"Railroadin', eh? Brakin' or conductor?"

"No, I am in the office of one of the trunk lines."

"Oh, I see. Gosh, don't you git purty tired sometimes handlin' all them trunks that come into a large city?"—Chicago Record-Herald.

Proportional Representation

By John H. Humphreys, Hon. Secretary of the Proportional Representation Society of England, with Introduction by Rt. Hon. Lord Courtney of Penwith. Octavo, Cloth, 400 pp.

A thorough treatise on methods of election, including authoritative descriptions of those systems of Proportional Representation in use in Japan, Denmark, Switzerland, Belgium, Finland, Sweden, South Africa and elsewhere. Mr. Humphreys has been assisted in his descriptions of the system of election in force in different countries by expert assistants from those countries.

The recent general election in France in which the people declared in favor of Proportional Representation, emphasizes the rapid progress which this reform is making in Europe. It was specifically advocated by John Stuart Mill and Earl Grey, late Governor General of Canada, as the most important political reform. No substantial reform in city government can be made without the adoption of Proportional Representation in the election of city councils.

A few copies of the book have just arrived from England.

Price, \$1.50; postage prepaid.

WILLIAM HOAG, 19 Milk Street, BOSTON, MASS.

3 Annual Subscriptions for 2 Dollars—two of them new

4 Dollars pays for six;

6 Dollars pays for nine subscriptions.

Give the new subscribers the benefit of the reduction, if you choose.

THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Bldg, Chicago

"American Conservation"

Illustrated monthly magazine of the National Conservation Association

A twelve-times-a-year chronicle of events in the field of natural resource conservation.

Authoritatively written, carefully edited, beautifully illustrated, handsomely printed.

The only publication in America which covers the whole Conservation field.

We have an exceptionally attractive plan whereby active, intelligent representatives—boys and girls as well as adults—may earn good salaries. We will gladly send details on request.

Yearly subscriptions, \$2.00
 sample copy sent on request

AMERICAN CONSERVATION
 COLORADO BUILDING
 WASHINGTON, D. C.

"The Land We Live In"

THE BOYS' BOOK OF CONSERVATION

BY

OVERTON W. PRICE

Vice-President, National Conservation Association

Foreword by Gifford Pinchot
 President, National Conservation Association

READY ABOUT AUGUST 1

A book that will hold the interest and attention of every real, manly boy who is anxious to learn more about the natural resources of "the land we live in."

As interesting as a novel; as true as history.

Beautifully illustrated from photographs—pictures that tell a story—pictures that every red-blooded boy will rejoice over.

PRICE \$1.50, NET.

Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, Publishers