

Constitution—why should not Chicago be given the same right?

Why should this overgrown and still rapidly-growing giant be kept in the swaddling clothes of an infant? The proposed Constitutional Amendment adopted by the so-called convention would give it a suit of clothes fitted for its present size. The initiative and referendum would give it a suit for present use and an unexhaustible supply of cloth for use in its future growth and development.

Every law demanded by the requirements and necessities of a great city from year to year, which might be presented to the Legislature by the City Council, or by ten per cent. of Chicago's voters could, not necessarily would, be passed by the Legislature, and if adopted and approved by the citizens of Chicago by popular vote, would become a law impregnable against attack in the courts. Why should not this be the situation in a great city in a Republic based upon popular suffrage?

In these latter days the delusion seems to have gone abroad that Constitutions and Legislatures are the masters, instead of being the servants of the people. Powerful interests seem to be instilling this poisonous delusion into the minds of the people. Lest we forget that the people are the source and creators of all Constitutions and of all laws, let us go back and consult the greatest, highest and broadest Statesman of our country. Walker's American Law declares:

The representatives, to whom authority is delegated, are the servants of their masters, of their constituents, whose will it is their office to execute.

Daniel Webster declared:

The sovereignty of government is an idea belonging to the other side of the Atlantic. No such thing is known in North America; with us all power is with the people. They alone are sovereign, and they erect what government they please.

George Washington declared:

The powers under the Constitution will always be with the people. It is temporarily intrusted to their representatives—their servants; they are no more than the creatures of the people.

James Madison more emphatically declares:

The Federal and State Governments are, in fact, but different agents and trusts of the people, instituted with different powers. The ultimate authority resides with the people alone.

Judge Parsons, of Massachusetts, in the ratifying convention of the State, characterized the Federal Government as:

A Government to be administered for the common good by the servants of the people vested with delegated powers.

Alexander Hamilton, in the ratifying

convention of New York, while arguing in favor of the Constitution's adoption, said:

What is the structure of the government? The people govern.

Chief Justice Marshall, while emphatically speaking of the people's control over their representatives, declared:

Who gave may take back.

The experience of the last 30 or 40 years that we have had with corrupt and profligate legislators and common councils has forced upon reflecting citizens the conviction that a check upon legislative corruption and profligacy is absolutely necessary. The people are the only superior power who can apply this check, and this check can be applied only by the Initiative and Referendum.

It has abolished corruption, profligacy and plunder of the people's rights in Switzerland. Why should it not do so in Chicago? Under such a system the lobbyist would be abolished and the wealthy corruptionists would disappear forever.

The only objection that can be urged against it is that it will interfere with the wholesale traffic in franchises and debauchery of its representatives, which has prevailed too long and too injuriously to the interests of the people of this community.

## BOOKS

### A FOURTH OF JULY ORATION.

"The Principles of the Founders," Edwin D. Mead's oration before the city government and citizens of Boston, at Faneuil Hall, July 4, 1903 (Boston: American Unitarian Association), is an inspiration from Lowell's thought in answering Guizot when the latter asked how long the American Republic would endure: "So long as the ideas of the men who founded it continue dominant."

Mr. Mead is always eloquent with the eloquence of democratic thought elegantly and simply expressed, and this Independence Day oration is no exception. It is a fine example of what a Fourth of July address at the present time ought to be.

One thing upon which Mr. Mead dwells needs special emphasis in the common thought. This is the relation of war to poetry, and its bearing upon American history. "'Cursed is the war no poet sings!' is the fine authoritative line of one of our Boston poets," says Mr. Mead; "and however much subsidizing passion still divides us, we shall all soon, I think, rejoice together that, although the Revolution and the Civil War hold so great and sacred place in our literature, there is no single reputable song there which celebrates the conquest of Mexico or the conquest of Luzon."

Allied in thought is Mr. Mead's view of the possible righteousness of war. As a peace man, distinctively and aggressively, his choice of and comment upon the following extract from Emerson have especial value. We quote from the oration: "There have been righteous and necessary wars. 'The cause of peace,' said Emerson, 'is not the cause of cowardice. If peace is sought to be defended or preserved for the safety of the luxurious and the timid, it is a sham, and the peace will be base; war is better. If peace is to be maintained, it must be by brave men, who have come up to the same height as the hero, but who have gone one step beyond the hero!' Howells has told us that there are greater words than patriotism, and among them are civilization and humanity. So there are greater words than peace, and among them are justice and honor."

In our view of the matter that sentiment is absolutely sound in principle, notwithstanding that it is often distorted by the selfish who confuse justice with "destiny" and honor with "glory."

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"The Ethics of Literature." By John A. Kersey. New York: Twentieth Century Press, 17 E. Sixteenth St. Price, \$1.50. To be reviewed.

### PAMPHLETS.

"Abraham Lincoln's Democracy" is a pamphlet reprint of the contribution made to the Lincoln birthday number of the Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat, by John R. Dunlap, of New York, editor and proprietor of the Engineering Magazine, and author of "Jeffersonian Democracy." It is especially interesting for the light it throws upon Lincoln's views on the question of tariff protection.

"The American Guild" is a pamphlet by Thomas M. Butler (Thos. M. Butler, Box 1093 Chicago; price, 15 cents) in exposition and advocacy of a constitutional amendment empowering Congress to "organize into guilds the various trades, professions or pursuits, and to grant to each guild, respectively, sole and exclusive control of all the matters designated in its charter," etc., etc. The scheme might be a satire on socialism, but it isn't; and it is too much like a nightmare to be called a dream.

### PERIODICALS.

John Dewitt Warner's discussion, in the Ethical Record for March, of the subject of municipal socialism and home rule, is strong in argument and surprising in the high repute of the heretofore unquoted authorities it cites in support of both tendencies.

The German letter in the March Atlantic from William C. Dreher, presents a thoughtful and interesting summary of large affairs in Germany during the year just closed. It is especially enlightening on the relations of Socialism to German politics. Race factions in labor unions, by Wm. Z. Ripley, and "Books Unread," by Thomas Wentworth Higginson, are among the other noteworthy contributions to this issue.

The Nation's unfriendly reviewer of Mayor McClellan's new book, "The Oligarchy of Venice," says: "It seems never to have occurred to him that forms of government are not inevitably good or bad." We may agree with the reviewer that no form of government is inevitably good, but it is to be hoped that Mr. McClellan's readers will go with him in believing that any form of oligarchy is in-