

been anything about him to deserve a patriotic man's confidence or a self-respecting man's admiration, although he seems to have commanded both and in high degree; but now he stands exposed to the thinking world as the brutal swash-buckler which his whole public career, when thrown into proper perspective, proves him to have been. One correspondent tells of his roughly commanding a passenger in a public elevator to take off his hat. Whether the man ought in courtesy to have taken off his hat is beyond the question in so far as it affects Mr. Roosevelt. The point as to him is that hardly any breach of good manners touches so low a level of boorishness as a conspicuous correction of another person's lapse in etiquette. If this elevator incident is a true story, Mr. Roosevelt's part of gentleman was poorly played. But the story, however well it illustrates his personal politeness, may not be true. Of his prepared speech at Guildhall, however, there can be no dispute; and this was the elevator incident over again, but magnified to the dimensions of international politeness and supplemented with an unpatriotic spirit. Taking advantage of his opportunities as the guest of a British city, he made an offensively partisan speech, which was impolite; and in that speech he advised the British government to treat the people of Egypt as George III and Lord North tried to treat the American colonies, which was unpatriotic. Whatever opinion his admirers may have of Mr. Roosevelt's acrobatic manners, it is difficult to understand how those of them who are not themselves Tories can admire his Toryism. Yet it is as a Tory that Mr. Roosevelt plainly revealed himself in his Guildhall speech—and a Tory at that of the period of George the Third.

+ +

Making It Easy to Do Wrong.

One of the best of statements regarding war was made in an Evanston church this week by a Scottish clergyman, the Rev. Walter Walsh of Dundee. "I believe," he said, "that most nations, as well as individuals, want to do right, but in the past it has been difficult to do right and easy to do wrong in international disputes because we had only the machinery of wrong-doing."

+ +

Mr. Taft and Socialistic Issues.

If in his Michigan speech in commemoration of the birth of the Republican party fifty-six years ago, President Taft intended to check the spread of socialistic sentiment in the United States, he went about it in a blundering way. It was precisely this kind of talk about abolitionism by

Democratic statesmen in the fifties that brought out the party whose birth Mr. Taft's speech has just celebrated. More and more as the days go by and event follows event, does it seem that Mr. Taft may pass into history as another James Buchanan—the last President, and a fatuous one, of a party which began as a champion of liberty and went to pieces in defense of slavery. And how very like Mr. Buchanan all round Mr. Taft does seem to be!

+

What President Taft had in mind as socialism when in his speech he promised the well-trained service of the Republican party to put it down, is not socialism; neither is it any other kind of social creed. Far be it from us to accuse Mr. Taft of intentional distortion, difficult as it is to harmonize his words with a statesman's intelligence in this part of his speech, but his notion of socialism is antiquated. He thinks it proposes to abolish private property. And the persons he alludes to as "socialists" are not those of socialist organizations, but those that hail as leaders such Republicans as La Follette and such Democrats as Bryan. In fact, however, there is no considerable number of Americans who favor the abolition of private property. There are not so many now as there were when President Taft was a boy. Except for a small number, who may be distinguished as "communists," nobody at all in this country favors the abolition of private property. Everybody to whom President Taft alludes advocates private property. Where they come in conflict with President Taft and his plutocratic supporters is over their opposition to private property in public property.

+

This is the crux of the whole matter with all Mr. Taft's "socialist" adversaries—from the mildest economic reformer to the most extreme socialist. The differences between these arise over the question not of private ownership of private property (they all advocate that), but of what things fall into the category of private property. The socialist draws this line in principle at property which enables its owner to extort property from producers; and doubtless all others to whom President Taft alludes draw the line at the same point, though they disagree as to the particular kinds of property that fall within the principle. Setting the Republican party up in opposition to this principle, President Taft proclaims it in effect the champion of private property in the kinds of property that enable the owners to extort property from producers of property.

The consolidation into one party of those of us whom Mr. Taft calls "socialists," for a battle royal with his remnant of the Republican party, is a welcome possibility. The sooner it comes the better. And when it does come let Mr. Taft be thanked for his Michigan speech as a factor in hurrying it on.

+ +

Public Service by the Wealthy.

In an educational address, Mrs. Emmons Blaine, one of the very wealthy citizens of Chicago, has made some sensible observations regarding the notion which has had considerable vogue, that the rich are trustees of their wealth for the common good. No doubt this fanciful notion is soothing to the overwealthy when they measure the comparative dimensions of needles' eyes and camels; but Mrs. Blaine thoughtfully questions it, saying, as she is reported in the newspapers:

If an individual has special powers of doing for the community by wealth giving does he not therefore instinctively feel relieved of other civic duties which he otherwise would necessarily feel he shared with all of the community? And by a certain wealth giving which satisfies his sense of duty, does he not unburden himself of those other civic duties? Again, if an individual justly feels that he is not able to give wealth in what seems to him an adequate proportion, does he not instinctively identify civic duty with that act, and, feeling that his hands are full with what are his own manifest responsibilities, leave it all to the other one who can? My question is whether the individuals who make up the state do not largely buy for themselves immunity from the essential civic responsibilities by the purchasing power of their own wealth giving or some other person's? Again, in amounts gained the enormous sums even that our multimillionaires can persuade themselves to part with are fragmentary compared with what the state might have by evenly, proportionately, and certainly collected sums from all of its citizens.

The suggestion that a proportionate tax be collected of all, regardless of whether they earn their incomes or somebody else earns their incomes for them, will not bear scrutiny; but the faultiness of this suggestion is offset by the good sense and civic spirit of Mrs. Blaine's criticism of the Lord and Lady Bountiful theory of public duty.

+ +

Mrs. Young's Triumph.

When the elementary teachers of the Chicago public schools joined spontaneously in celebrating Ella Flagg Young's successful administration as superintendent (vol. xii, pp. 745, 756, 901, 1144) with a reception at the Auditorium last week they paid her the best possible kind of tribute and one that she had abundantly earned. This distin-

guished educator and efficient administrator—the first woman in the United States to be entrusted with public functions of so high an order on so large a scale—has in one year rescued the teaching service in the Chicago public schools from the baffling demoralization with which for years prior to her appointment it had been pestered. Nor was the splendid reception her teachers gave her either perfunctory or a study in fawning, as such demonstrations are too apt to be. The spontaneity and enthusiasm of the tribute was unmistakably genuine. And there was a reason for it. Mrs. Young has established in the school system of Chicago the educational policy of leadership, in place of the business policy of drivership, which had preceded her appointment and was coincident with the long drawn out demoralization of the teaching force. This is the secret of her success. Never before have the teaching force of all grades—elementary and high school teachers, and the principals over both—been so completely co-operative in spirit and action as in ten months they have come to be under Mrs. Young's official leadership. In that respect it is doubtful if any other large school system in the country equals that of Chicago at this time. It is a striking demonstration of the superiority of the educational over the factory method of public school administration.

+ +

A National Health Department.

Mrs. Coonley Ward's paper on the proposed department of health in the Federal government (p. 495), which appeared in a recent issue of *The Public*, has evoked both approval and criticism, and from sources that are alike democratic. Those who criticize opposition to this project call attention to the fact that men of truly democratic interests and purposes are supporting the project and that the Senatorial leader in its behalf is Senator Owen. We may say that we have confidence in the democracy of this Senator, and also of others whose names are called to our attention as supporters of the measure. But as to one of the important facts we have as yet had no light—or rather, the light has all shone in one direction. We see no refutation of the charge that the movement for this national health department is supported exclusively—so far as medical support is concerned—by one school of physicians, and this a school which has a long record for professional bigotry. The essence of the opposition to the proposed national department of health is not altogether an objection to such a department. It is to the probability that under the circumstances the