

the title of which we have quoted—of the substitute, that is, for the present Article IV,—is sent to every registered voter in Oregon well in advance of the election; and any man of ordinary intelligence can read that text in half an hour and understand its provisions. If he does not like them or any of them, he may vote against the amendment. It is true that he must accept or reject it as it stands. But that was true of the original Constitution of Oregon when it was voted on. The people had to accept or reject the whole document, with its very much greater number and complexity of subjects. And has not that been true also of the constitutions of every other State, unless as in some States—and as the Oregonian, the Times and other reactionaries would doubtless like for all States—they were validated by autocratic constitutional conventions over the people's heads?

+ +

#### Tainted News from Topeka.

In an editorial last week on the "Constitutionality of Direct Legislation" (p. 869) we mentioned an absurd pronouncement of one "Justice Knowlton" of "the Kansas Supreme Court," whom a Topeka news dispatch of August 25 quoted against "William Allen White's plan" for the Initiative and Referendum in Kansas. We are now informed by Mr. White that "there is no Justice Knowlton in Kansas, or any other judge with a name like it;" but that there is "a machine press bureau in Topeka, which makes a business of sending out all sorts of stuff to discredit all progressive movements in Kansas." These machine press bureaus are not confined to Topeka. Their trails cover the land. In one way and another, and in one place or another, they are all the time as busy as bees manufacturing tainted news, of which the Topeka dispatch in question is an instance. That dispatch is probably on its rounds yet in the newspapers of the country. Somebody is paid for this extensive and expensive service to the Interests, of course; and equally of course somebody does the paying. A California town contemplating municipal ownership has recently been victimized by one of these tainted news factories. Whether the local paper that featured its serial "epitaphs" was victimized or is a victimizer, we are not yet sure; but of the victimization we are sure, and shall have something to say about it anon.

+ +

#### Prostitutional Legislation in New York.

If Dr. Maude Glasgow is right in her recollection that Mr. Roosevelt, when Commissioner of Police

of New York, ordered that men as well as women be arrested when houses of ill fame were raided by the police, Mr. Roosevelt deserves the commendation she gave him in her speech on the 15th at a Madison Square meeting that had been called to protest against the Page law of New York, which subjects women of dissolute life, or so accused (p. 855), to a species of degradation that not only humiliates them but so brands them as to make escape from that life except by death virtually impossible. All the speakers at that meeting were women, most of them were physicians, and one, the chairman of the meeting—Dr. Anna Daniels—is a physician peculiarly qualified, by professional service at the Woman's Infirmary, to criticize such a law. Dr. Jane D. Berry of the Woman's Prison Association denounced this law, characterized by others as the "infamous Page law," as impotent for its ostensible purpose of preventing the spread of sexual disease. The frightful pressure upon ill-paid working girls, tending to lead and then drive them into a dissolute life, was described by Miss Margerie Johnson, a settlement worker; and some speeches urged woman's suffrage as a means of securing protection and of preventing sex discrimination in penal laws. The position of those public-spirited women regarding that law, is sound in public policy and in morals. The law as it is reported deserves all the denunciation that can be given it. The question of one of the speakers, "Do you men who have daughters as well as sons want to see these poor girls tortured while the men who are responsible for their fall go free?" must drive the merits of the issue home to every thinking man. The Rev. Anna Shaw exposes the vicious character of the law when she says: "If there existed on the part of the framers of this disgraceful bill an honest intention to mitigate the horrible results of the social evil, would their conception of its regulation be limited to women only?" Laws like this one are startling commentaries upon all those anti-suffrage arguments which assume that enfranchised men as a class protect unenfranchised women as a class.

+ +

#### Social Surplusage and Individual Earnings.

For several weeks the Chicago Tribune has been singularly direct, clear and sound in many of its editorial utterances. Yet the history of that paper is such that there is much wondering as to when the clamp will be applied. Here is an example:

Ask most men what they mean by "earn" and they will first be irritated at being asked to define such a

common, simple word. But they will end by giving it up. A generation ago, perhaps ten years ago, a definition would have come easier. Probably it would have taken some such form as this: A man earns what he can get without breaking the law. But this conception is no longer satisfactory. We are beginning to see that this question of earning has its roots deep in the soil of our social life.

+

Excellent, and bravo! Every word has the ring of pure gold on a marble slab. But the conclusion we reproduce below, what does that mean? After quoting from Roosevelt's Osawatomie confession the absolutely true deliverance that "every dollar received should represent a dollar's worth of service rendered," the Tribune editorial goes on:

We are beginning to realize nowadays the narrowness of the old theory that one earns whatever one can get under the law, under the rules of the game. We know now that many of us, quite honestly and lawfully, get more than we earn, the difference being that part of our acquisition we are enabled to make because of the co-operation of our fellows, because of that entity called the community or society. And for this surplusage we owe a return in the form of social and civic service at the least.

+

What can that mean—not the first sentence, which is fully up to sample; nor the last, which may be better than it looks, a sort of editorial "singe cat;" but the middle sentence? If it, too, is of the "singe cat" species, or a hostage to prudence,—good enough, good enough, and well done. If it implies that co-operation yields a social surplusage distinguishable from individual earnings—better yet. But if it means what some sociologists do mean when they write or talk in that way, that all difference between what workers in social co-operation acquire honestly and lawfully in excess of what they could acquire without social co-operation, is unearned individually—if this is what it means, then the writer responsible for the editorial had better think again at just that point.

+

Millions of men in co-operation, with all the varieties of knowledge each assimilates and the skill each acquires, produce immensely more of all the things that each of them wants than they could possibly produce without co-operation; but part of the increase is individual, for the power of each is greater. If one refused to contribute, the measure of the consequent lessening of the aggregate result would be, not his individual power under

primitive conditions but his individual power under civilized conditions. His individual earnings, then, are the value of that contribution, be it more or less,—and it could be easily measured, more easily than the "return in the form of social and civic service" he may "owe." But there truly is a surplusage—as easily measured, too, as individual earnings—and it does result from the "co-operation of our fellows because of that entity called the community or society." As society improves, not only does this surplusage increase, but individual earnings for work also increase. If this is what that Tribune editorial means, then more power to the writer's elbow; if it is not what it means, let the elbow power be turned in on his analytical faculties.

+ + +

## CONTRASTS, NOT COMPARISONS.

Whenever attempts are made to improve the methods of popular government, we hear from some fine old crusted tory pedant. Histories of ancient Greece and Rome are ransacked for awful examples. Comparisons are drawn, which fail to mention the widely different conditions that existed then from those that exist now. The fact that the principle of representation in governmental affairs was unknown to the ancient world, is ignored.

Modern electoral machinery did not exist in the ancient political systems. The secret ballot with modern safeguards as to registry, casting and counting the vote, insuring secrecy, preventing intimidation, and reducing opportunities for bribery (which are rightly considered indispensable now), were unknown to ancient Greeks and Romans. The ancients had relatively no standard of morality in public affairs. What is now known as public opinion was then a negligible quantity.

There were, of course, none of the modern methods of distributing intelligence, no modern means of locomotion or communication, no mails as we understand the word, and no press.

The existence of slavery in ancient Greece and Rome created institutions, customs, laws, and a situation politically, which should remind us that there was no democracy as we understand democracy. Gibbon, Merivale and Mommsen make plain the demoralizing influence of slavery on Greek and Roman. Americans should be chary, then, of comparisons drawn by the pedantic army which is in alliance with standpat commercial and political interests.

Certain remarks of President Schurman of Cornell made at Silver Lake last summer in opposi-