

selves justly liable to criminal prosecution for striking, the combined publishers of Chicago did so when they struck against their self-imposed obligation to supply the public regularly with news. For strikes imposing far less inconvenience upon the public, workmen, without being under any obligation at all to the public, have spent terms in the penitentiary; but no punishment by the law is feared by the striking publishers of Chicago, though they were under an obligation to the public and ignored it in the most exasperating fashion. They fear no punishment by the law, because they are enormously rich; and in Goldsmith's prophetic words, "rich men rule the law."

ELECTION REFORM.

It is possible to lay too much stress upon the importance of methods of voting. No election reform, however perfect, can at any time produce better civic results than the people at that time are ready for. If the people are besotted, even the best election methods can produce but a besotted government. It may be almost affirmed of a degraded people that the more perfect their election machinery is, the worse will their government be. Of nothing is the saying more strictly true than of human government, that a stream cannot rise above the level of its source.

But in this country the stream is not allowed to rise up to the level of its source. That is because our election methods are bad. Instead of facilitating, they obstruct the expression of public opinion. And in no respect are they worse than in connection with the nomination of candidates for office. In consequence of defective nominating methods the control of both political parties has fallen into the hands of political hucksters and traders; and the control of new parties will meet the same fate as soon as they gain strength enough to make them worth manipulating.

The essential vice of these methods is the delegate convention. Delegates are elected at popular primaries of their respective parties. They attend conventions and vote for candidates to be supported at the election. The plan seems fair enough,

and if it operated so as to elect untrammelled delegates, truly representative of their party, it would be fair. But as a result of caucuses, contests at primaries become faction fights, which end in the election of delegates who, so far from representing the party voters, are the pledged tools of successful caucus bosses. Then, when the convention meets, the bosses who "control delegations" pool their strength, and through the medium of further caucuses turn the convention to the right or the left, according to their own interests and utterly regardless of the interests or wishes of the party, which is swung into line at the election by appeals to party loyalty. Finally, most of the rank and file of the party, finding that primary voting is voting in the air, stay away from primaries, thus making the primary still less effective as a register of the will of the party, and the surrender of the party to bosses still more complete. The party ceases to be governed by its masses. Its masses come to be driven by a few politicians, who in turn are driven or bribed by monopolists. In this way democratic government degenerates into autocratic government of the worst sort.

Proportional representation would remedy this. Under a proper system of proportional representation the people would be able to secure legislative representatives who as a whole would be a microcosm of the people as a whole. If the republicans were in the majority among the people, they would be in the majority in the legislature. If a new party had any strength among the people, it would have the same legislative strength. If one party bore the relation toward another of two to one in the community, it would bear the relation of two to one in the halls of legislation. Under such a system the evils of delegate conventions would be minimized; and if proportional representation were supplemented with the initiative and referendum—under which no important law could become operative until sanctioned by the direct vote of the people, and every measure that by direct vote the people demanded must be enacted into law—delegate conventions would become innocuous if not obsolete.

But proportional representation is a system, and systems come into vogue painfully and slowly. We must wait patiently while we work for them. Meanwhile, it is possible to assault the delegate convention directly, and by requiring nominations to be made by popular vote at primary elections, to retire the boss from power. Jay D. Miller, a well-known Illinois lawyer, and the author of that valuable little pamphlet, "Finance and Transportation," is authority for the statement that this could be done by a simple amendment of the primary laws in all the states having such laws, and by a simple amendment of the election laws of other states. His plan is to make the primary election a nominating election. It would require every candidate to procure a written nomination of, say, five per cent. of his party, upon the strength of which his name should be printed in the proper place upon the ballots used at the party primary, the person receiving the highest number of votes for any office to be the candidate of the party for that office at the ensuing election.

This plan is not wholly new. It has been in successful operation with the republican party of Jackson county, Kansas, for 19 years. In an account given of that experiment by its author, John S. Hopkins, in the June, Arena, Mr. Hopkins explains that for the purpose of avoiding the ill effects of local favoritism or prejudice, each voting precinct is accorded a "representative vote," calculated upon the basis of its vote at some preceding general election for a high state official, and the primary candidates are credited with such share of this representative vote as their total vote in the precinct bears to the whole number cast. The person securing, not the largest vote, but the largest "representative vote," becomes the nominee of the party.

To quote from Mr. Hopkins by way of example:

Whiting precinct was entitled to 8 representative votes for sheriff; Neta-waka precinct to 7 representative votes, and Hoyt precinct to 9 representative votes. The number of votes that J. T. Hancher received in Whiting township was 49 of the total number (109) of votes cast at that precinct. Hancher therefore received 49:109 of 8 representative votes in that precinct; and in

the Netawaka precinct he received 18-99 of 7 representative votes; and in Hoyt precinct 1-56 of 9 representative votes; and so on. While George N. Haas, the successful applicant and nominee, received only 4 votes at Whiting precinct, therefore only 4-109 of 8 representative votes; 20-99 of 7 representative votes at Netawaka, and 14-56 of 9 representative votes at Hoyt; and so on. The other applicants received votes, and each counted his just share of the representative vote of each precinct in the proportion of the number of votes cast for him to the whole number cast therein.

The result of this method, as Mr. Hopkins explains it, is that "the weakest applicant, all round, fails; the strongest applicant, all round, wins the nomination."

The advantages of such a method over the present delegate convention method are evident. Not the least important among them is the natural tendency to draw out a full vote at the primaries. This appears to have been done in a remarkable degree by the Kansas experiment. At the primary election in 1895, of which Mr. Hopkins gives the returns, it appears that the number of republican votes cast was 1,931—only 20 less than the party cast at the succeeding general election; and for 19 years, according to Mr. Hopkins, "at each and every primary election, the republican voters of this county have been turning out in about the same proportion of the increase or decrease of the republican electors."

Another advantage that might be reasonably expected is freedom from "bolting," and therefore a direct measuring of strength at the general election between the regular political parties. That is an advantage, because bolting is only a necessity of bad nominating methods; it is not a political virtue in itself. This advantage, too, seems to have been demonstrated by the Kansas experiment in Jackson county. There has been no republican bolting there since the Hopkins experiment has been in operation.

A still greater advantage would be the certainty with which the nominations of every party would be made by the people of the party. And this would be attended with an advantage the benefits of which would exceed all expectations. Our elections would become what Mr. Hopkins

aptly terms "the great common school of politics." Any member of a party who believed that some new policy was in harmony with the principles of his party, could represent that policy as a candidate at the primaries, if he could obtain the indorsement of a small percentage of his copartisans, and thus call upon the party itself to give its commands in the matter. In doing so he would help to educate the community in the most effective manner, not only in regard to the particular policy he represented, but in regard also to the application of fundamental party principles. Primaries under such a nominating method would be the forum for the discussion and decision of all vital questions affecting political parties and through them the municipality, the state and the nation. They would lift the people themselves to a higher political plane. By improving electoral methods they would actually foster democracy. Though they could not make the stream rise above the level of its source, they would elevate the source.

The election reform which Mr. Miller proposes, and the operation of which in a Kansas county Mr. Hopkins has described, would rescue political parties from the caucuses and bosses; and while going a long way toward accomplishing the objects of proportional representation and the initiative and referendum, would make those still more fundamental reforms easier of adoption.

NEWS

The operations in front of Santiago are still the center of interest in connection with the war. At the close of the account of these operations last week, the fierce battle of the 1st and the intermittent skirmishes of the 2d had been fought, and the Americans were strengthening their entrenchments, which commanded the beleaguered Cuban city. Gen. Shafter, according to his own reports, was then master of the situation. He had already demanded an unconditional surrender, accompanying the demand with a notification that if not complied with by 10 o'clock on the morning of the 4th he would begin a bombardment, but had postponed his threatened bombardment twice, for

24 hours each time, first at the solicitation of the foreign consuls at Santiago, and then on account of the new aspect which had been put upon the situation by the destruction of Cervera's fleet. This brought the armistice down to the 6th. At that time the distance from the American trenches to the advance works of the Spanish was only 200 yards.

But the bombardment did not begin yet for several days, though the Spanish commandant had positively refused on the 5th to consider the question of surrender. Meanwhile, the Spanish tried on the 6th to sink the *Reina Mercedes* in the channel, for the purpose of blockading Sampson's entrance into Santiago bay; but the Massachusetts and the Texas discovered the movement and sunk the *Mercedes* in one of the coves of the bay where she offers no obstruction. Also, during the delay of the American advance, refugees from Santiago poured by thousands over into the American lines. This exodus from the city began on the 5th, when the Spanish commandant refused to consider the question of surrender, and on the 7th it was estimated that 15,000 had come over. They were chiefly foreigners and women and children, and all were in extreme distress for want of food. Among the refugees were the civil governor, the mayor, and the president of the upper court of justice, who had been forbidden by the commandant to leave, but had managed to slip away.

Though the Spanish commandant had declined to surrender on the 5th he afterwards concluded to confer upon the subject with Gen. Blanco at Havana and his home government at Madrid. Being totally without telegraph operators, however,—the operators of the only open line, the English, having deserted,—he was obliged to apply to Gen. Shafter for assistance in that particular. Gen. Shafter responded by sending employes of the English cable company back within the Spanish lines, under the protection of the British consul, and upon the assurance of the Spanish commandant that they should be used only for the purpose of communicating regarding a surrender. He also granted an armistice until the 9th to afford an opportunity for the contemplated communication with Blanco and Madrid.

Gen. Shafter, therefore, delayed a