

the defenders of the existing order catch at the Eugenists as at a straw.

Unfortunately the organized forces of discontent are fighting at cross purposes and playing into the hands of their enemies. In the words of Philip Snowden, M. P., "neither trade unionism, nor the Labor movement, nor the Socialist parties have any clear idea of the attitude they ought to take up in regard to the functions of the state in industrial affairs." His remedy is state interference to counteract the effects of the competitive system. The British Socialist Party, assembled at Manchester, hold a turbulent session at which mutually destructive theories are hotly discussed. The Fabian Society at Keswick celebrate the advent of the minimum wage. At the 20th annual conference of the Independent Labor Party at Merthyr, Mr. W. C. Anderson condemns profit-sharing and co-partnerships and demands the abolition of private property in land and in industrial capital.

But there are signs of promise. Socialists are not too pleased with recent socialistic legislation, and members of the Labor Party find themselves more and more in accord with the Singletax group in Parliament so brilliantly led by Josiah Wedgwood.



Most hopeful of all, the discussion of Welsh Disestablishment has brought the land question to the front again and Lloyd George seems prepared to make use of his great opportunity. Speaking at Swansea, on May 28, he declared that Liberals were too timid. "Let them look at the land question," he continued. "Up to the present time they had dealt with it as if they were handling a hedgehog." Religious foundations had been robbed to establish private fortunes, but this was not the only trust in land which had been betrayed. "In South Wales they had hundreds of thousands a year paid in rents and taxes, and the men of South Wales jeopardized their lives to pay these exactions, and when they came up into the sunshine again to seek rest and restoration they were met with disease and degradation. The men for whom they worked grudged them every inch of sunlight or space of breathing ground. That was a trust that would be looked into. They claimed a right to it. Who gave it them? It was not in the Law nor in the Prophets. . . . I will tell you what is the matter with this country. There is one limited monarchy here and there are ten thousand little Tsars. They hold an absolutely autocratic sway. Who gave it to them, this trust or property? We mean to examine the conditions of it. It is a fight full of hope for the democracy.

F. W. GARRISON.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

SENATOR LA FOLLETTE AND THE LIQUOR QUESTION.

Asbury Park, N. J., June 4.

I have read with great pleasure the editorial in your current issue relative to the interrogatory concerning his stand on the liquor question which was put to Senator La Follette at the conclusion of his

speech in Asbury Park.* Your conclusions are to the point and unanswerable. I desire, however, to correct one detail which may seem of small consequence, but which will gain in significance as the campaign proceeds if Mr. Roosevelt is nominated. I was standing with my hand on Senator La Follette's shoulder when he said to the minister: "If you are an honest man you will come tomorrow and ask the same question of Mr. Roosevelt." Mr. Taft's name was not mentioned. The minister was merely admonished to ask the question of Mr. Roosevelt. The significance of the Senator's remark will doubtless be appreciated by The Public even though recent primary votes go to show that as yet the public isn't "on."

G. A. MILLER.

*See The Public of May 31, page 506.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, June 11, 1912.

Presidential Politics.

Although ex-President Roosevelt has been carrying the party vote at the primaries for Republican candidate for President, President Taft appears to be getting the convention delegates. In Ohio, where the popular vote for Roosevelt was overwhelming, the Republican State Convention at Columbus on the 4th awarded the six delegates-at-large to Taft by 390½ to 362½, with the net result of giving Taft 14 and Roosevelt 34 of the national delegation as a whole. "Pure political brigandage," is what Mr. Roosevelt called this action in an interview about it. When the national committee met at Chicago, a vote regarded as a test disclosed only 13 anti-Taft members to 39 in favor of Taft. The vote was over two questions: (1) That 8 votes in the committee should be enough to require a roll call, and (2) that the newspapers be afforded representation on the Congressional press-gallery basis. By *viva voce* vote the first was defeated by the substitution of 20 for 8, and by a roll call vote the second was defeated by providing for accommodations only for 5 accredited press associations. On the 7th contests from Alabama and Arkansas were decided adversely to Roosevelt by the national committee. Most of these were decided unanimously; but in the one from the 9th Alabama district "steam roller" methods were used for Taft in the spirit of rule or ruin, as Roosevelt partisans assert. In a public address on the 8th, Mr. Roosevelt said that "a nomination obtained by the votes of delegates seated in utter defiance of justice as these two Alabama delegates [those from the 9th district] have just been seated, would be worthless to the

man obtaining it and would be indignantly repudiated by the party as a whole." The Indiana contest was passed upon by the committee on the 10th. As to the 13th district, the Taft delegates were seated by a vote of 36 to 14; all the other Taft delegates were seated by unanimous vote of the committee. [See current volume, page 539.]



On the Democratic side, Governor Harmon controlled the Ohio convention of the 4th at Toledo. Mayor Baker of Cleveland led the opposition in behalf of Governor Wilson, but the convention instructed for Harmon and adopted the unit rule by 597 to 355. Of the 48 delegates from Ohio,—6 of them delegates-at-large,—79 from the districts are for Wilson. These announce their intention of opposing the application of the unit rule when they represent their districts at the national convention. At the State convention Mayor Baker "served notice," says the Plain Dealer report, "that he did not recognize the validity of the action, and while the convention might be able to shackle his vote, it could not stop his tongue or his voice, and both would be used at Baltimore to defeat the end sought by the delegates." Mayor Baker's defiant speech, reported by the Plain Dealer to have brought great applause, "denounced the convention's way of building up support for a Presidential candidate, asking the men if they thought it possible for a candidate to win who went to the convention 'with delegates shackled to his chariot wheels, with all other delegates knowing they were being counted for one man under a gag rule, while at heart they were for another and had the high authority of their districts to vote for the other man.'" [See current volume, page 512.]



The Labor War.

Conditions in Belgium not unlike those of two weeks ago in Hungary, were reported on the 4th. "Post-election riots" were reported to "have taken on a revolutionary character." At that time the Socialist central committee at Brussels was expected to "proclaim a general strike," but it was subsequently reported that they had decided to postpone this question for a month. The rioting—reported to have broken out in Liege, Antwerp, Bruges, Tournai, Ghent and Louvain as well as Brussels—was explained by the dispatches of the 4th as a revolt of working classes against the Roman Catholics, provoked by the success of the latter at the elections, which had returned to the Chamber of Deputies 101 Clericals and only 44 Liberals, 39 Socialists and 2 Democrats. The burning issues were over (1) a question of financial support from public funds for Catholic schools and (2) the question of plural voting, the Liberals and the Socialists being jointly opposed to the con-

servatives or Clericals on both questions. Both the Socialist and the Liberal parties have issued urgent appeals to their followers to refrain from violence and to devote their energies to obtaining the abolition of the plural vote by parliamentary methods. These appeals, however, are reported to have had no effect in the Walloon provinces, where "direct action" through a general strike is demanded. Pursuant to such demands strikes in different places have been called locally, including a miners' strike at Mons and a suburban railway strike at Brussels. On the 6th there was a strike of miners in the Province of Hainut—over 15,000 going out at La Louvière alone. Socialist orators were hissed by a vast mass meeting at La Louvière when they urged the strikers to return to work. On that day it was estimated that 100,000 men were then on strike in the Walloon provinces.



When the labor strike at Budapest over the question of suffrage extension had subsided, violent demonstrations over that question shifted from the streets to the Diet, where a deadlock was broken by the police under orders of the new president, Count Tisza. On the 4th the Opposition created a tumult in the Chamber which obstructed its proceedings. When the president called in the police, Count Karolyi defied them to lay hands on any member; but they ejected him with 21 others. Upon resumption of the session, the disorder was revived, and the police removed 15 more members under orders from the president. This drastic action being insufficient to give him command of the chamber, President Tisza ordered the ejection of 38 more, and his order was obeyed. The remainder of the Opposition then withdrew and the army bill was agreed to without debate. Suspensions of members of the Opposition for varying periods were voted on the 5th. On the 7th an excluded member, Julius Kovacs, evading the police and getting into the press gallery, fired three pistol shots at the president without effect and thereupon shot himself. Count Tisza, the president, is opposed to suffrage extension. [See current volume, page 512.]



The transport strike in London was strengthened on the 10th by action of the General Council of the Transport Workers' Federation, which sent telegrams on that date to every port in England, Scotland and Wales calling for a national strike. The telegrams were sent in consequence of a decision by the employing shipowners, announced earlier on the same day to reject a compromise which the Asquith Ministry has been attempting to arrange, providing for a general organization of the employers to treat with the unions, with money guarantees by both sides as insurance against violations of agreements. The employers