

veloped and established and secured by the people themselves, or shall they be conferred and conserved by superior persons? Shall the people govern themselves for their own good, or be governed for their own good by others?

+

This question discloses itself practically in connection with the agitation for and the operation of the Initiative, the Referendum and the Recall. Ask any one his opinion of those reforms, and if he understands them and favors them you may safely consider him on the side of a democratic democracy; if he understands but opposes or is indifferent to them, you may prudently write him down as on the side of a monarchical democracy. The one believes that human rights must be established and defended by the people, the other that they must be handed down and conserved by superiors; the one that the people must govern themselves for their own good, the other that they must be governed for their own good by—well, by some Roosevelt or other.

+

Perhaps no other one thing has done so much to clarify this issue as The Outlook's confession of faith regarding the Declaration of Independence. "We believe," to quote its words, "that the statement in the Declaration of Independence that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed is false;" but that the principle embodied in the Declaration that governments exist for the benefit of the governed" is "always, everywhere and eternally true." Turning to the Declaration one may see that the object of governments, alluded to by The Outlook as a principle, is security for "certain inalienable rights" among which "are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and that this statement of principle is coupled with the modifying statement which The Outlook rejects, that they derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed." According to the Declaration of Independence, then, the object of governmental authority is the good of the people governed, its source the consent of the people governed. But according to The Outlook, while its object is the good of the people governed, its source is not the consent of the people governed, but is—what? Some superior, of course. And what is that but the essence of monarchy? The monarch reigns for the good of his people, if we take his word for it. To call those persons democrats who believe in government for the good of the people governed as some quite superior person may conceive that good to be, is to

wrench language; but if out of politeness their claims be deferred to, we must call them monarchical democrats in order to distinguish them from the democrats who believe in government for the good of the people governed as the people governed conceive that good to be. The latter are the democrats Abraham Lincoln had in mind when he spoke for "government of the people, by the people and for the people."

+

With this distinction apprehended, there is little difficulty in understanding why many persons who profess democracy are so paternalistic in the methods they advocate. Their democracy is of The Outlook kind, which would have government of the people and for the people, but not by the people. It is of the Roosevelt kind, which would do the people good and make them good, with grape and cannister if necessary. To such democrats Roosevelt is an idol. To such democrats, and he is indeed their great exemplar in this as in other respects, the Initiative and Referendum and the Recall are in the category of democratic sentimentalities. Mark it well, the movement for the extension of those reforms in this country, toward which the monarchical democrats have turned a cold shoulder, will yet have to encounter their active opposition. The reason is that those reforms most distinctly give practical expression to the fundamentally democratic principle which the Declaration of Independence proclaimed and Abraham Lincoln accentuated, but which to Mr. Roosevelt is sentimental and to The Outlook false.—that governments are not only for the benefit of the people but that they derive their just powers from the people.

+ +

### The Napoleonic Roosevelt.

It was with hesitation that we wrote last week of the possibility of Mr. Roosevelt's being called again to the White House (p. 577), lest we might be overestimating his popularity. It never occurred to us that this might be an underestimate. We had not then read the estimate of Rockwell D. Hunt, Ph. D., which appeared in the California Weekly of May 27. Dr. Hunt says:

Theodore Roosevelt is the greatest of living men, the "most startling character since Napoleon;" among nations the United States of America is the mightiest in achievement and potentiality; the peace of the world is the most momentous as well as most alluring of all public questions. The conditions are perfect; the hero of San Juan and of the Peace of Portsmouth, in the midst of his matchless powers, is henceforth called to serve humanity by accepting the post never before proffered to mortal man—President of the United States of the World. This is not

an idle dream. The numerous forces, economic, political, cultural, ethical and religious, now at work in all lands in earnest advocacy of international conciliation, may indeed usher in the dawn of universal peace earlier than the most sanguine have yet dared to hope. The whole world groans and yearns for peace, peace that shall be free from the burdens of war, peace that shall not be broken while earth endures. The machinery of such a peace is well-nigh completed; its consummation awaits the touch of the hand of the master engineer. In the councils and the confidence of the expectant nations one man stands forth—truly a world-citizen, if such there be—pre-eminently fitted to essay the task as unique in its possibility of blessing to posterity as in the boldness of its conception, the most commanding personality of his generation—that man is unquestionably Theodore Roosevelt.

In the same issue of the California Weekly, an editorial comment on this estimate of Mr. Roosevelt's popularity "sees the raise and goes one better"—if we may quote from the vocabulary of that highly moral American game to which Republican phrasemakers are indebted for so many happy similes for political expression. Here is the first paragraph from that editorial:

The communication, in another column, expressing the hope that Theodore Roosevelt may see his way clear to head a movement for the formation of the United States of the World, and that he may be the first President of it, will strike a responsive chord in many hearts, but the brain of our correspondent is not the only one in which the idea has been incubating. It would probably be within bounds to say that it has taken a more or less definite form in the minds of millions in Europe as well as in America, and it cannot be that it has not had a place in the thinking of Theodore Roosevelt himself.

If Mr. Roosevelt's popularity is as Napoleonic as that, our estimate was well within bounds.

+ +

### President Taft's Labor Whimsicalities.

President Taft has taken great pains in two instances to demonstrate his attitude toward organized labor interests, and incidentally toward the public service. In one instance he appoints to a responsible and lucrative Federal office in Chicago, a mere campaign henchman, removing a blameless official to make the vacancy. Not only is there no pretense that the appointment is made for the good of the service, but it is ingenuously stated in honor of Mr. Taft that he made it solely out of gratitude to his appointee for having organized a workingman's mass meeting in behalf of Mr. Taft's candidacy in 1908. Having paid an election debt in this way to one type of workingman, Mr. Taft turns his attention to another type.

+

Congressman Hughes had secured an amend-

ment to a bill authorizing expenditures for enforcement of the anti-trust law, which prohibited expenditures in prosecuting labor unions as for trust conspiracies on account of organized acts not in themselves unlawful. This amendment went into the bill and would have become part of the law but for Mr. Taft's pressing demands upon members of Congress toward the end of the session to strike it out. Aided by Congressman Tawney of Minnesota, he succeeded in doing this. At the last moment the motion to strike it out was carried by 138 to 130.

+

Mr. Taft defends himself on the plea that the Hughes amendment was legislation in favor of a class; but Congressman Hughes remarks, rather louder than in a stage whisper, that Mr. Taft was not so squeamish about class legislation when in a special message on the 7th of last January he asked Congress to modify the anti-trust law in favor of corporations.

+

Apart from that, however, why did Mr. Taft choose to regard the Hughes amendment as class legislation? Is he overwrought on the subject, or didn't he read the amendment? As we find it quoted in a friendly paper, the Chicago Record-Herald, of the 25th, it merely provided "that no money should be spent in the prosecution of any organization or individual for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the condition of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof *not in itself unlawful.*" Is it class legislation for Congress to guard workingmen against bureaucratic persecution at public expense for merely organizing to better their condition, and for *lawful* acting in furtherance thereof? It must not be suspected that Mr. Taft, in using Presidential influence to strike out that organized labor amendment at about the time he was removing a faithful official in order to give another kind of labor man a public job, was influenced by that old time rule of political action under which enemies were punished and friends rewarded. But he has played the part with some verisimilitude.

+ +

### A Radical King.

Maxim Gorky, the Russian exile, tells the New York World of an interview he has recently had with the King of Italy, in which the King declared himself to be this kind of a Socialist:

I am a socialist, but my socialism is more individ-