

appearances, gave his sympathies and his influence to the plutocratic side in that contest. But no one doubted his sincerity, and four years later he stood where from the convictions of a life time he naturally belonged. From boyhood he was a democrat. It was devotion to democracy that placed his life in jeopardy in Germany in 1848, and that made him a Republican in the United States in the '50's, and a Democrat in the '70's and since. His life has been a long one, and always a sincere and useful one. But in nothing else has it been so useful as in the democratic character he developed as an American citizen and servant, the example and influence of which he leaves as a rich legacy to the country of his adoption.

\*   \*

#### Roosevelt and the Railroad Ring.

The important consideration is not whether Mr. Roosevelt's or Mr. Chandler's version of their interviews over the Hepburn bill is the true one. Although the circumstances, so far as disclosed, indicate that Mr. Roosevelt did send for Mr. Chandler, that he did solicit Mr. Chandler's mediation for an alliance with Senator Tillman, and that he did say to Mr. Chandler that certain Republican senators were bent on frustrating his rate regulation policy, yet these are only incidents in a general situation. The essential thing about it all is not the verity of Mr. Roosevelt's version of these incidents, but Mr. Roosevelt himself as a factor in the general situation. And as to this there is neither dispute nor any room for dispute.

\*

Certain senators were implacably hostile to the Hepburn bill. Mr. Roosevelt was committed to the principle of this bill. The bill would have been smothered in senatorial committee but for the union of Mr. Roosevelt's supporters with the Democrats of the committee. When this bi-partisan majority of the committee had defeated those of their Republican colleagues who represented the railroad interests, the latter proceeded to humiliate Mr. Roosevelt and his supporters in the Senate, as party men, by placing the bill in the hands of a Democrat as floor leader. The intended humiliation was personal as well as political, for the Democrat they named was Senator Tillman, whom Mr. Roosevelt had deliberately and publicly insulted. Between the two, therefore, a long-standing enmity notoriously existed. These facts, dependent upon nobody's veracity, imply obviously that the enemies in the Senate of Mr. Roosevelt's rate-making policy had declared open war against him and his policy.

Mr. Roosevelt's enemies then transferred the seat of their warfare from the committee room to the Senate chamber. If Mr. Roosevelt did not by this time recognize them as irreconcilable enemies to his rate-making policy he was singularly obtuse; and if he did not say so, he was unusually reticent. But whether he did say so, as Mr. Chandler informed Senator Tillman at the time, or did not say so, as he himself now protests, makes little difference; the fact of the determined hostility of these senators to Mr. Roosevelt's rate-making policy is undisputed and indisputable. One of their methods of warfare was to make of every act of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the bill, which might be unsatisfactory to the railroads, a football for the courts. Thereby they hoped to destroy the effectiveness of the Commission. It was to be done by giving unlimited powers to the courts to review the acts of the Commission. Mr. Roosevelt and his friends were opposed to granting such powers. They insisted upon limiting the power of court review to such acts of the Commission as might be in excess of their authority under the law or in derogation of property rights under the Constitution. In this position Mr. Roosevelt and his friends were supported by the Democrats. And they welcomed the support; not cordially, to be sure, but as a harrowing necessity. The railroad interests were thereby checked, and the success of Mr. Roosevelt's policy was practically assured. But just as he was on the point of winning a victory for his policy, and so for the people if his policy would produce the results its supporters claim for it, he suddenly changed front. With his party supporters (Senator La Follette alone excepted) he went over to the other side, over to the side of the railroad ring, and in union with the railroad senators agreed to an unlimited court review clause. The facts bearing out this generalization are as indisputable as those already alluded to as leading up to it; and not only does nobody dispute them, but Mr. Roosevelt's own letter bears them out.

\*

When so much is told the whole story is told. Mr. Roosevelt may have accurately narrated the details of interviews between himself and Mr. Chandler, after the climax and in self-defense, or they may have been stated accurately by Mr. Chandler as they occurred. That raises an issue of veracity between Mr. Chandler and Mr. Roosevelt. But regardless of that issue, Mr. Roosevelt stands out in full public view, simply upon the historical facts that need no personal verifica-

tion, as a man who has run away from his own fight for the people and against the railroad ring, his co-partisans trailing behind him and his allies left in the lurch. He has compromised with the railroad ring when his own non-partisan alliance with the Democrats made compromise unnecessary. And in his compromise he has surrendered his cause and given himself away. He appears from this episode to be the boaster and "quitter" that his critics who knew him best have all along accused him of being.

\* \* \*

### A High Example of Civic Conscience.

An event of extraordinary significance in municipal affairs occurred in Springfield, Illinois, at the meeting of the City Council on the 14th. Alderman Bode, the single tax Democrat who had carried a Republican ward (p. 7), was about to be confronted with the necessity of voting on a question of high license for saloons, a question not at issue at the election. Personally he was opposed to high license, his position being that if the saloon business is illegitimate it should not be licensed at all, and if legitimate it should not be discriminated against in taxation. But, regarding himself as a representative of the people of his ward, he addressed them on the subject and solicited a postal card referendum. Out of 1,639 voters he received replies from 652, and of these 437 voted for the thousand dollar license. Mr. Bode thereupon declared that as alderman he would vote for this measure.

\* \*

Accordingly, at the meeting of the Council at which his vote was called for, he cast it as his constituents had voted, but with an explanation which throws a great light upon the influences that business men exert upon public officials to tempt them to betray the people they represent. After narrating the circumstances outlined above, Alderman Bode, who is the senior member of a wholesale grocery house in Springfield, proceeded:

Those of you who have read my letter to the citizens of the Fifth ward will probably remember that I claimed that the crowning evil of this license system is the demoralization of our politics—that such demoralization is the natural result of this socialistic policy of governmental interference with private business, and that we should not be surprised when men affected by such interference do everything in their power to control the political machinery of this country. Just the day before yesterday I was given the most striking and direct proof of the painful correctness of this argument. It is because I am convinced that this proof is a matter of direct interest and deep concern to every citizen of this community

that I consider it my solemn duty to publicly expose every word that I can safely substantiate with witnesses. I deeply regret the personal nature of the remarks I am about to make and wish to say in advance that it is not from malice but entirely from a conviction of civic duty that I am impelled. Last Friday I received a telephone message from Mr. George Reisch, Sr., of the Reisch Brewing Company, asking me to call at his office that afternoon. I replied that as city salesman for our firm my regular route would bring me in his neighborhood Saturday morning. Accordingly I called about noon: As he is the owner of the building which our firm occupies I assumed that he wished to see me on ordinary business. What he did wish to see me about was this question of high license. He accused me of being a party to what he called a conspiracy to pass a high license measure which he claimed Mr. Devereaux and others had planned last summer. I denied being a party to such conspiracy if it existed. . . . He then notified me that unless I voted against high license he would order our firm to vacate his building in twenty days, viz.: by the first day of June, that if we did not move our rent would be raised \$125 for that month, and if we had not moved by July 1 it would be raised again until we could not bear it and would be forced to get out. This in spite of his verbal agreement to allow us to remain five years from July 1, 1904, without raising the rent. He went so far as to threaten to do all he could to ruin our business not only in Springfield, but in the surrounding towns as well, taking pains to remind me of the great influence he possessed. He ended by accusing me of having "sneaked" into office—that if he had known that I intended to be influenced by the wishes of the majority on the license question he would have accomplished my defeat; to which I replied that if he had the power to boss this city he had more power than he ought to have. He replied that he did not want to boss the city, but that he must protect his business, and insisted that whatever he did to gain control he did honestly. Is it not evident that, as a community, we have tempted this man to constantly endeavor to control every candidate for public office until, from constant practice, he has actually become deadened to any realization of the enormity of endeavoring, by oppressive methods akin to bribery, to coerce a public official into betraying his constituents? Thus, in a sense, we can hardly blame him, although now that he is so wealthy even he should be unwilling to resort to such methods as I have described. . . . But I do not wish to give the impression that I consider myself persecuted. It was no temptation to me. I do not believe he can injure us financially to any great extent, and even if he can, I value some things more than money. As I said before, it is entirely without malice and with a charitable recognition of the fact that we, as a community, must share the blame, that I have felt it my duty to publicly expose these facts with the hope of awakening the citizens of Springfield to a realization of the danger to popular government here at home, which we simply augment by agitation for further encroachment on the liquor traffic or any other private business.

\* \*

The high license measure was defeated, as it