

liquor question an "issue," and not only an issue but *the* issue, in Nebraska politics this fall. For both the Republicans and the Populists of Nebraska have pledged themselves to county option, which the whiskey ring aggressively—and, as Bryan says and there is reason to believe, corruptly opposes. Others also oppose it, and genuinely, upon libertarian grounds; but the opposition of the whiskey ring is overshadowing. Bryan advised his party convention to make the same pledge the other parties had made, thereby taking this question out of the campaign, and letting it turn upon the initiative and referendum as a local and the tariff as a national issue. By refusing to do so—and this is the sum and substance of "Bryan's defeat"—the Democratic party of Nebraska has put itself in the position, in popular perspective in Nebraska, of the whiskey ring's sole political champion in that State. The popular tendency therefore will be to regard the whiskey ring as beaten if the Democratic party loses, and triumphant if the Democratic party wins.

+

Of the merits of the county option question in Nebraska, we say nothing here. The merits of that question are not involved in the cry that Bryan has been defeated in his own party; and, regarded simply as a question of political influence, we do not see how the action of the convention on county option tells against Bryan. An act by a convention of his party which, in the public mind, identifies the party with the whiskey ring, whether the party wins the election or loses it, and which Bryan did his utmost to prevent, looks to us more like a defeat of the present managers of his party in Nebraska than of Bryan.

+

We might add that we have yet to see or hear of any characterization of the matter as a defeat for Bryan which comes from any other source, all along the line from Watterson to Hearst, than where Bryan's defeat is perennially regarded both as a foregone conclusion and a foregone desire, and more of a desire than of a conclusion.

+ +

#### Which? and What of It?

Mr. Roosevelt is reported from New York as having proffered George Harvey, of the Harper publications, a membership in the Ananias Club. Col. Harvey had written and published the statement that "recently Roosevelt, the man, declared that if a national election were to be held next November he undoubtedly would be the Republican

candidate and would win. His personal desires would be negligible. Circumstances and conditions would dominate the situation and his would be the role of a Son of Destiny." Mr. Roosevelt, upon having his notice called to the statement, said: "That is a simple falsehood; I never said anything of the kind." Whereupon Col. Harvey, declining the proffered membership, delicately suggests that Mr. Roosevelt fill the vacancy. "It may be unseemly," he retorts, "for me to engage with Mr. Roosevelt in a controversy involving a question of veracity; but that which I wrote is true."

+ \*

#### Self-Government.

The Outlook's repudiation of that part of the Declaration of Independence which asserts, as a fundamental principle of Americanism, that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed (pp. 577, 601), is supported by the Congregationalist and Christian World of July 16, which pronounces that clause of the Declaration absurd. Church organs are pretty dependable as supporters of the "going thing," especially if the "going thing" be class bound. The spirit of domination, a very antithesis of the Christian spirit, has no stronger grip than in Christian churches.

+

If there were anything to be said for these pious attacks upon the Declaration of Independence, one could be quite considerate. But there is nothing. As no one ever argues for unequal rights, with himself on the lower side of the dividing line, so no one ever argues for government from above, with himself below—except as a graduated class system in which he concedes somebody's right to domineer over him so as to assert his right to domineer in turn over others.

+

There is good reason, too, for attempting no rational defense of unequal rights or superimposed power, as principles of human association. Simply as statements of principle, they are abhorrent; and as modes of social development they never have worked and there is no ground for believing that they ever will. The Congregationalist and Christian World, for illustration, intimates in its issue of July 16, what enemies of this Christian and American principle usually assert, that self-government of "backward" peoples should be delayed until "they are ready for it." We may ignore one thing which is historically true of this argument—that it serves as an excuse of the

“forward” for plundering the “backward”—in order to come directly to the point, also historically true, which is that no superimposed government which once postpones the grant of self-government ever confers it voluntarily. If you admit the soundness of postponing it until the people are ready for it, you cannot deny the soundness of making the postponement perpetual. For there is only one way given under heaven whereby any people can learn self-government, and that is by practicing self-government.

\* \*

### The Lawless Police Sweatbox.

It is refreshing to those of us who have protested against the unlawful police sweatbox (p. 587), to read in a Chicago Record-Herald's dispatch from Quebec regarding the arrest by a Scotland Yard detective of Dr. Crippen and Miss Leneve, the statement with special reference to the latter that—

no attempt has been made by the officials to obtain a statement from her in addition to the formal questions asked at her examination to-day; the intimidation of suspected persons is abhorrent to the British notion of justice, and if Miss Leneve makes any statement it will be of her own volition.

This is in accordance with the law—the law in the United States as well as in Great Britain and Canada. Its violation in Great Britain would menace a ministry; but in this country, detectives too lazy or too incompetent for intelligent detective work, defy it by making short cuts to criminal convictions through extorted confessions from suspects. Being extorted—through fear, hope, hypnotism, physical violence, or all four—these confessions are as likely to be false as true. More likely, it may be. But all this is no affair of your lazy or incompetent law-breaking American detective. What he is after is not justice; it is verdicts of guilty, regardless of justice.

\* \*

### H. Martin Williams.

One of the candidates for the Democratic nomination for the lower house of the legislature of Illinois in the 46th senatorial district, is H. Martin Williams, of Woodlawn, Jefferson county. No matter who loses in that district, Williams ought to win both at the primary and at the election. Personally he is an excellent man, which is good; but it is for better than personal reasons that his nomination and election are to be desired. He has an extended experience and acute understanding of legislative work, which also is good; but it is not this in addition to his personal qualities that

makes it desirable that he be nominated and elected. Besides having personal character and legislative experience, Mr. Williams is a fundamental democrat in all that those words imply; and has been so, through thick and thin, in sunshine and shadow, for more than thirty years. When he explains his present candidacy as springing from his hope to “accomplish something in the interest of the men and women of Illinois who produce the wealth and bear the burdens of government,” he knows what that means, and he means it, too. It is not a platitude. He stands for the initiative, the referendum and the recall, and these are not novelties with him. He is for the election of U. S. Senators directly by the people, for a corrupt practices act, for the merit system of public service, for the heavy ad valorem taxation of valuable lands held for speculative purposes, and for all, in absolute sincerity. Mr. Williams is a pleasing speaker, rugged and powerful, and in the legislature of Illinois would be an effective fighting member for the right side. Of course he is opposed by the Interests and by the kind of Democrats that keep in touch with the Interests.

\* \*

### The English League For Land Values Taxation.

This League, which was active in the Budget fight (p. 417) and has just passed its twenty-seventh birthday, made an interesting report of its last year's work down to June 30, in anticipation of the annual meeting in July. E. G. Hemmerde, K. C., M. P., Recorder of Liverpool, who succeeded Josiah C. Wedgwood, M. P., as president a year ago, was succeeded this year by Henry George Chancellor, M. P., with whom as vice presidents are George N. Barnes, M. P. (Parliamentary leader of the Labor parties), W. P. Byles, M. P., the Rev. Stewart D. Headlam (of the London County Council), F. G. Hindle, M. P., John Paul, Wilson Raffan, M. P., C. P. Trevelyan, M. P., C. H. Smithson (of the Halifax Town Council), Thomas F. Walker of Birmingham, L. W. Zimmerman, J. P., of Manchester, R. L. Outhwaite, Ignatius Singer and Franklin Thomason. Lewis H. Berens as treasurer and Frederick H. Verinder as secretary, manage the executive work. Following a survey of the past year, the report makes this statement of policy with reference to the Lloyd George Budget: “The valuation is already in progress. We must urge the Government to complete it as quickly as possible, and to make the results public. Then comes the question of the use to which the valuation, when completed, is to be put. No real advance can be made