

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

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

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

CHARLES D. NORTON,
Secretary to the President.

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

+ +

Ex-President Roosevelt in Politics.

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

+ +

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

+ +

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

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

+ +

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

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

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

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

Progressive Victory in Washington.

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

Illinois Politics.

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

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

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

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

The Initiative and Referendum in Arkansas.

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

30,014 for Governor.
20,942 for the Amendment.
6,476 against the Amendment.

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

Direct Legislation in New Mexico and Arizona.

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

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