

pot-hunters for whom there is always a quarry where Privilege and Poverty consort, the manhunt as a sport is nearly obsolete.

+

For one thing there is lack of game for it; for another, the kind of game to which the manhunt is limited makes it little better than mollycoddle for the development of manly qualities in the hunters. As a sport, there is much the same difference between the manhunt now and in the days when human game was plentiful and varied, that came to trap shooting after glass balls were substituted for live pigeons—a difference vastly greater in degree, to be sure, but very like in kind. The thrill of joy in the manhunt does seem to be dying down. Newspapers that follow the old traditions try indeed to make much of the manhunt when one comes off, but not with the best success. Provincials of New York and London (those most provincial spots on the face of the globe) appear to share in the newspaper excitement, for many "extras" are sold. And so, we presume, do the yokels of the countryside. But even they, city provincial and rural yokel, do not raise "the hue and cry" as everybody used to. Isn't this indifference to the age-long sport to be observed in the international manhunt which has just ended in the capture of a man and a woman by a detective from Scotland Yard?

+

Those two persons, charged with murder and one of them evidently saturated with guilt unless he is a prize fool, disappear as completely as if they had fallen into some fourth dimension of space, and are picked up by wireless telegraphy like iron particles from a bed of sand by a magnet. It was the first use of this invention for the manhunt, and the whole world looked on with keen interest. But nearly all the interest centered upon the dramatics of the "wireless" novelty. There were few indications of joy in the sport. It seems so to us, at any rate; and we hope we are right. For the worst of it regarding the manhunt is not the suffering endured by a hunted man, which may be well enough deserved; the worst is that moral degeneracy of the hunters which is always indicated and often promoted by the joy they experience in the hunt.

+ +

#### "Barbarous Mexico."

The testimony of Dorothy Johns in the *American Magazine* for August, in confirmation of Turner's articles on "Barbarous Mexico" (p. 579),

indicts several men who denounced that magazine for "slandering" President Diaz, with lying when they did so. They had themselves told her of the barbarous regime of the Mexican President. "I have heard the existence of slavery in the Republic casually discussed by Mexicans in all walks of life," says this writer. "Members of the priesthood, the professions, the press and many others," she adds, "spoke of it with approval or deploring it"; and "two of the signers of that letter of protest against your articles," she continues, referring to the "Barbarous Mexico" articles in the *American*, "have in my presence admitted the fact."

+

One part of the testimony of this witness is of exceptional value with reference to the action of the United States government in extradition proceedings against Mexican revolutionists accused of organizing armed revolt on American soil against the Diaz government. "The Constitution of the Republic of Mexico," she states, "gives the people of Mexico the right of armed revolt against any President who seeks re-election after serving one term." Since Diaz has re-elected himself term after term for thirty years, can it be said that armed expeditions against him, organized on American soil, are in violation of neutrality? Are we at peace with Mexico, or only with an individual Mexican "president" whom the Constitution of Mexico disqualifies for that office?

+ +

#### Bryan's Latest Killing Off.

All who may think that William J. Bryan's influence in American politics has been killed again—this time by his own party and in his home State—had better hold their jubilating energy in reserve until the election returns come in from Nebraska. If they have reason to use this energy then, they may possibly use it to some purpose; if they have no use for it then, they may be glad that they did not rejoice over a welcome political death followed so speedily by an exasperating political resurrection.

+

The truth appears to be that it is not so much a defeat for Bryan in his own party in Nebraska that has taken place, as a victory in that party for the whiskey ring—a "coals to Newcastle" matter, as many may say—which Bryan faithfully but unsuccessfully opposed. The inevitable effect of this "Bryan defeat," as he warned the convention that it would be, is to make the "county option"

liquor question an "issue," and not only an issue but *the* issue, in Nebraska politics this fall. For both the Republicans and the Populists of Nebraska have pledged themselves to county option, which the whiskey ring aggressively—and, as Bryan says and there is reason to believe, corruptly opposes. Others also oppose it, and genuinely, upon libertarian grounds; but the opposition of the whiskey ring is overshadowing. Bryan advised his party convention to make the same pledge the other parties had made, thereby taking this question out of the campaign, and letting it turn upon the initiative and referendum as a local and the tariff as a national issue. By refusing to do so—and this is the sum and substance of "Bryan's defeat"—the Democratic party of Nebraska has put itself in the position, in popular perspective in Nebraska, of the whiskey ring's sole political champion in that State. The popular tendency therefore will be to regard the whiskey ring as beaten if the Democratic party loses, and triumphant if the Democratic party wins.

+

Of the merits of the county option question in Nebraska, we say nothing here. The merits of that question are not involved in the cry that Bryan has been defeated in his own party; and, regarded simply as a question of political influence, we do not see how the action of the convention on county option tells against Bryan. An act by a convention of his party which, in the public mind, identifies the party with the whiskey ring, whether the party wins the election or loses it, and which Bryan did his utmost to prevent, looks to us more like a defeat of the present managers of his party in Nebraska than of Bryan.

+

We might add that we have yet to see or hear of any characterization of the matter as a defeat for Bryan which comes from any other source, all along the line from Watterson to Hearst, than where Bryan's defeat is perennially regarded both as a foregone conclusion and a foregone desire, and more of a desire than of a conclusion.

+ +

### Which? and What of It?

Mr. Roosevelt is reported from New York as having proffered George Harvey, of the Harper publications, a membership in the Ananias Club. Col. Harvey had written and published the statement that "recently Roosevelt, the man, declared that if a national election were to be held next November he undoubtedly would be the Republican

candidate and would win. His personal desires would be negligible. Circumstances and conditions would dominate the situation and his would be the role of a Son of Destiny." Mr. Roosevelt, upon having his notice called to the statement, said: "That is a simple falsehood; I never said anything of the kind." Whereupon Col. Harvey, declining the proffered membership, delicately suggests that Mr. Roosevelt fill the vacancy. "It may be unseemly," he retorts, "for me to engage with Mr. Roosevelt in a controversy involving a question of veracity; but that which I wrote is true."

+ \*

### Self-Government.

The Outlook's repudiation of that part of the Declaration of Independence which asserts, as a fundamental principle of Americanism, that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed (pp. 577, 601), is supported by the Congregationalist and Christian World of July 16, which pronounces that clause of the Declaration absurd. Church organs are pretty dependable as supporters of the "going thing," especially if the "going thing" be class bound. The spirit of domination, a very antithesis of the Christian spirit, has no stronger grip than in Christian churches.

+

If there were anything to be said for these pious attacks upon the Declaration of Independence, one could be quite considerate. But there is nothing. As no one ever argues for unequal rights, with himself on the lower side of the dividing line, so no one ever argues for government from above, with himself below—except as a graduated class system in which he concedes somebody's right to domineer over him so as to assert his right to domineer in turn over others.

+

There is good reason, too, for attempting no rational defense of unequal rights or superimposed power, as principles of human association. Simply as statements of principle, they are abhorrent; and as modes of social development they never have worked and there is no ground for believing that they ever will. The Congregationalist and Christian World, for illustration, intimates in its issue of July 16, what enemies of this Christian and American principle usually assert, that self-government of "backward" peoples should be delayed until "they are ready for it." We may ignore one thing which is historically true of this argument—that it serves as an excuse of the