
PRESS OPINIONS

Roosevelt Redivivus.

The Chicago Record-Herald (ind. Rep.), Dec. 16.—Colonel Roosevelt visited Boston to attend a meeting of the Harvard overseers. He made no speech, gave no interview, dropped no hint regarding current politics. He was cheered by multitudes on his arrival as well as his departure. At New York, on his return, a crowd of cheering men greeted him and he made his way through the station with difficulty. "Does this look like a dictator's homecoming?" asked the Colonel, alluding to the just reported remarks of "Boss" Barnes, chairman of the New York Republican State committee, on the national political situation. . . . Yet cheering multitudes in Boston and New York, suspecting nothing and deaf to Barnes' cries and warnings, hail Roosevelt as a friend of the people!



Judges versus Juries.

The Chicago Record-Herald (ind. Rep.), Dec. 17.—There is nothing surprising in the "victory" of the "striking" St. Louis jury. When the judge who had threatened the jurors with fines and jail sentences for "contempt" examined the Supreme Court decisions of his State—and of other States, no doubt—he found that the jury was not bound to render a "directed" verdict. A judge has the right to take a case from a jury. He has the right to set a verdict aside as being contrary to the weight of the evidence. But he has no right to "direct" a verdict, if the jury disagrees with him. The directing of verdicts regardless of the jury's own opinions and sentiments is an abuse. It makes a mockery of trial by jury. The St. Louis jury may have been wrong in its view of the case. But it was right in insisting on giving its own verdict. It was justified in "standing on its legal rights" and resenting dictation and usurpation.



A Pointed Question.

The Boston Common (ind.), Nov. 18.—Columns are being written to prove that the great recent gain in the Socialist vote—the upstanding fact in the late election—doesn't mean Socialism. All agree, however, that it means discontent; widespread, profound, growing discontent. One fact should be remembered. The Socialists have a program. Agree with it or not, you have to face it, for in politics you cannot beat something with nothing. No longer can this discontent be pooh poohed. It may be guided. But Standpatters cannot guide it. The discontent is because of their guidance. Middle-of-the-road moderates like President Taft aren't guiding it—it is thrusting them aside. The more radical Progressives want to guide it, but haven't agreed very far upon a program. That is what they will have to do soon if it is not to get beyond their reach, also. . . . If the wise men who reject the ultimates of Socialism wish to avert them, it is high time for them to begin to point out better paths. If not Socialism, what?

Mayor Baker of Cleveland.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Dem.), Oct. 30.—Critics of Newton D. Baker call him a dreamer—at least they did before his opponent had indorsed so many of Mr. Baker's campaign arguments. Since then not so much has been heard about dreaming. Mr. Baker himself has not denied the charge, and there is no reason why he should. The progress of the world is written in the deeds of dreamers. The epochal achievements of all ages are built upon the acts of those who have had the breadth and courage to dream. There are thousands of people in Cleveland who five years ago were calling Tom L. Johnson an impractical dreamer, but who are now willing to acknowledge the success with which he wrought. The best Mayor this city ever had was a dreamer and gloried in it. No man ever dreamed more persistently, and few ever saw more of their dreams come true. . . . Unless a man is a dreamer he is a plodder. Unless he can see beyond the needs and demands of one day to the possibilities of the day to follow, he is a plodder. Plodders, of course, have their useful role to play, but no wide-awake city wants one for Mayor. . . . Mr. Baker a dreamer? Let no one attempt to deny it. And Cleveland needs a dreamer of his type in the mayor's office.



Joseph Fels in St. Louis.

The St. Louis Daily Times (ind.), Dec. 2.—Whenever Mr. Joseph Fels comes to St. Louis there is occasion for publishing in the local news columns some of those theories which are as sound as a demonstration in Euclid, but which the country still insists upon regarding as a fine theory which cannot be put into practice. Mr. Fels has recently had something to say on the theories enunciated by the late Henry George. He deprecates the practice, followed by thousands of individuals, of buying land and waiting for other men to make it valuable, as a means of attaining riches. There can be no reasonable doubt that this universal evil is based upon injustice and is a hindrance to the growth of every community. There are scores of acres of land within the city limits of St. Louis, as in other cities, which are greatly needed for homes and factories, but which are held at a prohibitive price. Their value is increasing steadily; not because the owners are doing anything to make them more valuable, but because thousands of men who sorely need a little land are coming to the city every year—and paying a good part of their earnings for rent, and are living unwholesome lives in many cases. That a man is a better citizen when he owns his own home is a very likely proposition. That speculators are doing all in their power to prevent home-owning is plain. The "unearned increment" is not one of those dark and mysterious theories which thrive in the dark. It is an economic principle which describes, simply, the process by which the masses of the people are denied a portion of the wealth which they help to create. Mr. Fels does not pretend to bring us a new thought. Still, he is performing a worthy service in that he is reiterating a principle which ought to be proclaimed and expounded until it is made plain to all men.