

ne has heard Mr. Bryan's answer, and that the
to meet it is to ignore it. So he keeps on
g the question. Spoiled children do that
of thing now and then, but nobody thinks
e.

+

aking of questions, why doesn't Mr. Taft
r this question which Mr. Bryan asks? "You
nted to the Chief Justiceship of the Supreme
Justice White, who, thirteen years ago,
he trusts' side of the trust question; you ap-
d him over the head of Justice Harlan who
erved longer and with more distinction
ho had taken the people's side on trust and
questions. Who asked you to give a *trust*
erat the preference over an *anti-trust Re-*
an? Make public the recommendations, writ-
l verbal, and let the people know the influ-
at dictate your appointments." This ques-
om Mr. Bryan to Mr. Taft is much more
nt than Mr. Taft's to Mr. Bryan. We
et along without knowing, until the trial
ff, what particular trust might escape un-
White obiter dicta; but the preference for
ment to high office by a Republican Presi-
a *pro-trust* Democrat over an anti-trust
an is suggestive enough to need explan-
out undue delay.

+ +

Judges Fear the Recall?

nd order end when interpreters of the
nger possess the confidence of the people
vants they are. Why, then, should the
compelled to have their laws interpreted,
and expanded by any judge whose com-
integrity they may have learned from
al conduct to distrust? What man
lace on the judicial bench would wish to
if he had lost the confidence of his peo-
judges talk as if the Recall would de-
pendence of worthy judges. A judge
pendence is so fragile a possession that
endure the publicity of a popular vote
ce or no confidence is a judge without
ce. By nothing else could the inde-
f any public servant be better tested,
to higher levels of public confidence
the test, than by the Recall. To be
Recall would indeed be humiliating,
le might sometimes make sad mistakes
lings, even as judges often do; but
ge to give such general satisfaction
l petition cannot be secured is to be
to be retained by a vote of confidence

at a Recall election is to be exalted. It is not
humiliation alone that is involved in the Recall,
if judges are even approximately as good as some
of them say they are, or as independent as some
of them profess to be.

+ +

Magazine Muck-raking.

A subsidence of "muck-raking" in the maga-
zines is plainly noticeable these days, and those
of us who live in "muck" rejoice, while those of
us who don't—some at least—are sad. Coupled
as it is, however, with another noticeable fact,
this subsidence should cause rejoicing by all who
welcomed the now obsolete "muckraking" when
it began. There is a strong tendency among the
magazines, as they abandon "muck-raking," to go
forward and not backward. "Muck-raking" con-
sisted in little more than exposures of particular
and conscious graft in high places and low ones,
of methods of business and politics and habits of
life that were subject to repression by law with-
out altering economic conditions. From this the
magazines seem to be turning to the conditions
that make particular and conscious graft pos-
sible by making general and unconscious graft in-
stitutional. Look over your magazines today, and
though you find little or none of the kind of
matter for which Thomas W. Lawson set the
pace, you do find matter of a kind that cuts deeper
than those exposures, that hits us all and not
merely a "goat" or two, and that gives promise
of pushing on for better things the crusade which
"muck-raking" only began. This new departure
would have been impossible before "muck-rak-
ing," the function of which was to arouse public
opinion. But now it is possible and it has set in.
Let no one mistake the tendency for reaction.
Whereas magazine "muck-raking" exposed the
"muck" in which some lived luxuriously on the
labor of their fellows, and held "muck"-mongers
up to popular scorn, the magazines are now turn-
ing public opinion toward purifying the "muck."
The third step in the series, of which this is the
second and "muck-raking" was the first, will be
to point the way.

+ + +

**ROMAN CATHOLICISM AND
AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP.**

Our editorial on Cardinal Gibbons's cathedral
sermon against direct election of Senators, the
Initiative and Referendum and the Recall* has
evoked a courteous editorial reply from the Den-

*See Public of October 6, page 1017.

ver Catholic Register, the official organ of the Roman Catholic diocese of Denver, Colorado. In justice to the Register it should be said that prior to our editorial it commented in its issue of October 5, upon its own initiative, in these welcome terms on the reactionary Cardinal's sermon:

Cardinal Gibbons last Sunday told his people in Baltimore that he had little faith in the new panaceas which are loudly proclaimed, and chiefly in that which is named "the recall." Catholics, of course, understand, but Protestants and others may not understand, that Cardinal Gibbons's statement is simply worth its logic. There are many Catholics who will continue to believe in "the recall," even of the judiciary, which is entirely within their privilege. The Cardinal's opposition to "the recall," except in so far as the fact that he is a wise and thoughtful and patriotic man, will have nothing to do with your opinion and mine, and our vote, on the subject.

It was in the same American spirit that our criticism of the Cardinal was considered by the Denver Catholic Register in its next issue, October 12.

With none of the Register's comments have we any fault to find, but rather the contrary, except for its ignoring the fact that the Cardinal spoke not as a citizen but as a priest, not from a political platform but from a cathedral pulpit, not in a secular lecture but in a church sermon, not by way of reasoning to a general audience of citizens but dogmatically to a congregation of spiritual dependents. It is this that distinguishes the Cardinal's from Archbishop Ireland's assaults upon the Initiative, the Referendum and the Recall. We have no condemnation at all for Ireland's though we disagree with him profoundly. In his lectures and speeches on the public platform, Archbishop Ireland may denounce democratic progress as much as he pleases, and call the voting masses "a mob" as often as he likes. It would be his right if he were uttering his own untrammelled thought; it is equally his right under existing circumstances, known to most well-informed Catholics and which arouse in us for him no unkindlier sentiment than pity. John Ireland's public speeches as a citizen are not in the same objectionable category with Cardinal Gibbons's cathedral sermon as a priest.

"The man does not cease to be a citizen when he becomes a priest," says the Denver Catholic Register in response to our criticism of the Cardinal. So we also hold. It is for that reason, as we state above, that we distinguish between Archbishop Ireland's political speeches on civic platforms and Cardinal Gibbons's political sermon from his cathedral pulpit. Continuing, the Regis-

ter thinks The Public "must have a very poor opinion of the intelligence of some Catholics if it imagines that large numbers of Catholics accept the Cardinal's opinion as a priestly command, instead of an individual opinion." We assure our Catholic contemporary that we have a very high opinion of the intelligence of some Catholics, of many Catholics, of multitudes,—of multitudes large enough to constitute what the unhappy Archbishop Ireland calls "a mob." Nevertheless we do imagine that large numbers of Catholics accept the Cardinal's sermon—not his opinions as a citizen, but his sermon as a priest—for a priestly command.

From the number who accept that sermon we exclude the mass of Catholics of Irish origin. Not that the Irish are better than others, but their experience is different. On the Continent your Catholic is as a rule either obedient in all things to the ecclesiastical powers, or he quits the Church. Not so your Irish Catholic. He has learned to fight ecclesiastical domination in politics from the inside. Haven't the Catholics in Ireland always been jealous of ecclesiastical interference with their civil rights? When in O'Connell's time a cardinal negotiated a treaty with the British government providing that Catholic priests should receive government stipends on condition that it might veto appointments of Catholic bishops in Ireland, the great archbishop of Galway fought the treaty with all his might, although most of his associates in the priesthood were tempted to yield. This devoted Irish archbishop would not use his ecclesiastical power to betray his people in the interest of the privileged classes of that day and country, as Cardinal Gibbons seems willing to do at this day and in our country. There you have the true spirit of the Irish Catholic in the United States—not in every individual instance, to be sure, for Rome has educated some and has great favors to offer. But as a rule the Irish Catholic layman is no ultramontane, and many Irish priests, wherever you find them, stand bravely by the people. "Soggartha-roon" is the Irish Catholics' loving word for "priest of the people." The Irish have learned their lesson from the history of Ireland. O'Donnell phrased it when he said: "All the religion you please from Rome, but no politics." And didn't the Irish prove its influence by boycotting "Peter's pence" in order to support a Protestant leader in politics, Parnell, when British Tories were scheming with Big Business ecclesiastics at Rome against the Land League? Some Irish Catholics among us may think one way and some another of the Initiative and Referendum

the Recall; but it is for the most part as American citizens, not as obedient churchmen. So, however, with our newer citizens from the continent of Europe. For the most part they come out of the Catholic church and fighting they are within it and blindly obeying its commands in all things. It is to this class that the Cardinal's political sermon addresses itself, and to this class that its condemnations may be applied by subservient parish priests. This is the class that is likely to take such condemnations as a warning to the great danger of American citizenship on the one hand and of Catholic freedom on the other.

The Denver Register implies that probably a Catholic who previously believed in the Initiative and Referendum and the Recall has changed his views because of the Cardinal's utterance. This is probably so, but it is not the important consideration. How many Catholics who previously had no opinion either way, may be brought to reason-proof? How many such will not be brought to anything at variance with the Cardinal's utterance? There is the important consid-

eration is another important consideration: What will be the effect of the Cardinal's sermon upon the utterance by Catholics who disagree with it? Even intelligent American citizens of Catholic faith who are not deceived by ecclesiastical masquerading in politics, are not they, at least, just a little more prudent than those who are, a little more reserved, in advocating the Initiative and Referendum and the Recall? Are the editors of the Denver Catholic Register, for example, open to a discussion of that question on the ground as a problem of American citizenship? Do many Catholic papers in the United States say as much regarding the Cardinal's utterance as the Register has said? Have many of the Register's wise and true, even if they are not Catholics, discriminated against? Among the Catholics who will vote for those reforms, there are many who have a just and reasonable fear, who would advocate them in moderation and with as much freedom now as they have, and who would not have the Cardinal condemn them in a sermon from the pulpit of his cathedral. And how many Catholics are there who, believing in those reforms, would feel as much at liberty now as they do to follow the Cardinal's sermon to advocate them on terms with anything like the boldness, freedom, and independence with which Archbishop Ireland conducted his campaign?

These are the primary questions for American Catholics to consider. When the Cardinal in America preaches from his ca-

thedral pulpit against direct election of Senators, the Initiative and Referendum and the Recall, and Archbishop Ireland boisterously echoes that sermon from civic platforms, shall all Catholic-Americans who think the other way—laymen, press and priest—either abjectly acquiesce or abjectly shrink back, letting those prelates *seem to command* effectively whether they do or not? If so, then difficult will it be for non-ecclesiastical Americans to defend Roman Catholic freedom under American institutions against attacks like this: "The chief issue is not whether the addition of the Initiative and the Referendum systems do or do not promote the general welfare, but whether the people shall protect themselves against the attacks by the Roman Catholic rulers. The Roman Catholic Church is ruled from the top, and it claims to and does exercise control over its subjects, and for it to dictate concerning the people's system of civil government in the United States is contrary to American ideals."* If our Catholic fellow citizens do not more publicly and pointedly and vigorously defend themselves against *appearances* of Roman Catholic obedience in politics to a foreign potentate, who can do it for them successfully and how?

*From a circular of the "Publicity Bureau Concerning Activity of Roman Catholic Rulers Against People's Rule in the United States." P. O. Box 81, Washington, D. C.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN CALIFORNIA.

Pasadena.

Our success for woman's suffrage is due almost wholly if not entirely to the Insurgent movement which first of all placed Hiram Johnson in the Governor's chair and along with him gave us a legislature wholly free from the domination of the Southern Pacific Railroad for the first time in forty years. Through that legislature and our splendid Governor we got the amendments passed and ready for submission to the people and during the campaign all those fine men talked for suffrage with as great enthusiasm as for the other amendments.

Suffrage was as much a part of the State-wide campaign as any other subject. I never can remember the time when Governors, Senators, Congressmen, Judges, Mayors and lesser lights from this State and others took up with such fervor the entire Insurgent movement, and woman suffrage had its full share of their consideration. The women did their part too but the men were splendid.

I wish to say this principally because I believe the State of Illinois will never secure the ballot for women until the men and women of that State unite for a State-wide agitation for the Direct Legislation measures. Only in that way will the States, one by one, be freed from the control of party politics and