

of steel had to pay. They had to pay that exorbitant profit because the protective tariff had shut off all the trust's foreign competitors. And did the workingmen employed by the steel trust get anything exorbitant in the way of wages? Well, if they should say, "Search us!" would you think it necessary to do so?



A Dangerous Candidate.

When Mr. Roosevelt announced his Presidential candidacy we remarked with due reserve that he might not find the road before him a smooth one, calling especial attention to his record on the Panama affair as a missile which would doubtless be thrown at him. At that time we had not happened to see Leander T. Chamberlain's convincing article in the February North American Review—"A Chapter of National Dishonor." Were that article to figure extensively as a campaign document against Roosevelt, it could hardly fail to disgust his self-respecting followers with their candidate, nor to arouse in them fears of his Napoleonic ambitions too intense to permit their trusting him with another term of Presidential power.



The author of the North American article is a clergyman, an expert student of international law, and president of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States and of the American and Foreign Christian Union. The article itself is a simple but keen and direct exposure of Mr. Roosevelt's autocratic action in the case of the secession of Panama from Colombia, and it is based wholly upon the official documents. The President who could do what those documents prove that President Roosevelt did to Colombia, in flagrant violation of treaty pledges and without the excuse of necessity or even of convenience with reference to the Canal, and who could boast of it afterwards as a patriotic performance, needs only the favorable opportunity to essay subjecting his own country to his unbridled will.



Are the progressive Republicans so hard-pressed for Presidential material that they must turn to a man who has shamelessly put into our national history this chapter of dishonor, and thereby confirmed his own title as the most dangerous popular leader since Bonaparte? Can they not rally, and invite the rest of us to rally, behind some one of their party leaders whom it would be at least an honor to have followed if he should be

defeated, and whose election would be a convincing guarantee of democratic government?



The Altgeld Memorial.

At Orchestra Hall, Chicago, on Sunday the 10th of March, there is to be a fitting observance of the tenth anniversary of the death of John P. Altgeld. With Daniel Cruice presiding in behalf of the Altgeld Memorial Association, there are to be addresses by three such democrats as John P. Altgeld was—Edward F. Dunne, Herbert S. Bigelow and William J. Bryan.



This meeting is the climax of a series. There was the memorial meeting at the Auditorium closely following Altgeld's death; then the memorial meeting of the fifth anniversary, at which Senator Charles A. Towne was the orator; and after that the Labor Day meeting of 1910, at which the four bronze tablets now affixed to the cemetery monument were dedicated and the orator was George Fred Williams. The meeting next Sunday will probably be the last for another decade; and the promoter of them all, Joseph S. Martin, Altgeld's most devoted friend, aims to make it a climactic occasion.



John P. Altgeld, who as Governor put himself in opposition to the inexcusable and lawless military invasion of his State by a popular President of his own party, and who dared to pardon unjustly condemned men whose views of government he did not share but at whose conviction without proof of crime by a packed jury and a class-bound judge he revolted, was one of those true and courageous democrats whose fame grows brighter as their graves grow greener. Those of us who join next Sunday in this testimonial will honor ourselves more than we honor him. There is ample assurance that this memorial tribute will be no post mortem apology nor any conventional enshrinement of a dead statesman. It will be an appreciative and affectionate tribute to a democratic leader who has not ceased to lead.



Riotous Women.

The wantonly criminal performances last week of a faction of the British woman suffrage movement, ostensibly designed to promote the suffrage cause, could not prejudice that cause more if this had been their deliberate purpose. They come at a time when nothing is needed but a majority in

the House of Commons to make woman suffrage part of the Ministerial suffrage bill. A divided Ministry have compromised upon an agreement that their electoral bill shall go into the Commons without extending suffrage to women; but that if a majority there vote to amend it by inserting that provision, the bill so amended shall thereupon be accepted by the Ministry as their own bill, and be forced through the House of Lords as such with all the power of the Liberal party. Acting upon that agreement, and with a large majority of the Ministry encouraging him, Lloyd George, the most popular British Minister for many a day, has undertaken to secure a majority in the Commons for the woman suffrage amendment. If the Tory suffragists in the Commons would vote for that amendment—and this they could do without violating their party obligations in the slightest—the woman suffrage cause in Great Britain would be won along with the abolition of plural voting; but even with unanimous Tory opposition there is excellent reason for expecting a majority of Liberals large enough to secure that result. And such is the view of all the women suffrage factions except that which is identified with Mrs. Pankhurst's leadership.



But just at a critical moment, when Liberal members of Parliament as yet unconverted are in doubt, and a trifle may move them one way or the other, Mrs. Pankhurst's faction throw stones through the windows of the Prime Minister's residence and through the windows of stores, and make other demonstrations which, if not criminal with reference to the law and in bad faith with reference to their cause, must be insane. What is likely to be the effect of such demonstrations upon Liberal members who hesitate between following Mr. Asquith or Mr. George on this question? Certainly not to weaken any tendency they may have to follow Mr. Asquith. Upon the opinion of thorough-going suffragists the inexcusable conduct of that faction will of course have no effect. Thorough-going suffragists will follow Mr. George's example and vote for the amendment in spite of the criminal folly of some women. But is that likely to be so with new recruits or prospective ones? The violent faction might serve their cause better by urging their Tory supporters in the Commons to vote for the woman suffrage amendment, thereby making it part of the Ministerial bill, than by getting up riots at a time and under circumstances which can serve no purpose of the rioters unless it be their purpose to prevent the embodiment in the Ministerial

electoral bill of a clause extending the suffrage to women.



Experts in Government

One of the justly distinguished men of the East, a wise man who, unlike those wise men of a farther East, sees a star only to wonder at it and blunder about it, makes the remarkable statement that democracy, in order to succeed, must learn to depend upon "experts." The dangerous feature of this bit of wisdom, for wisdom there is in it, is its undiscrimination. Very likely the thought in the speaker's mind was that specialized work should be done by specialists. But he may or may not have realized that all is not specialism. If he did not realize this, then his remark is one of those half truths which is ever the worst of falsities; if he did realize it, then he made a slipshod statement, or has been unintelligently reported. For democracy to assign its *expert work* to experts and trust them, is the soundest kind of civic good sense; but for democracy to assign its *non-expert work* to experts and trust them, is civic insanity.



Where can the line be drawn between expert and non-expert work in government? There may be difficulty in determining this where one merges into the other; but there need be no insuperable difficulty even there, and seldom would the issue be important. In general terms expert work may be briefly and roughly described as that which in detail executes a general purpose, and non-expert work as that which decides upon the general purpose to be executed. The latter has to do with the *What*, the former with the *How*. As to warfare, for illustration, democracy must confide in military experts to wage war; but it would be suicidal for democracy to leave it to military experts to make war at their own will. So, also, it is for architects and engineers to design and erect public improvements; but the people must decide whether they want the improvements or not. And although experts may be called in to help the democracy to a conclusion in the domain of public desire, their function there is only advisory. It is all as when one consults his lawyer. The lawyer may advise litigation, and if litigation is decided on, a lawyer must be trusted to manage it in its technical details; but whether litigation shall be entered upon is for the client and not for the lawyer to decide. At the point democracy trusts *public policy* as well as plan and execution to experts, democracy ends and absolutism begins.