

nificant to be regarded as merely an accidental coincidence." All of which is very true. But if President Taft is to be judged by and criticized for the cabinet officers he has selected, should not Roosevelt be judged by and criticized for the President he selected? Who guaranteed Taft? Aldrich and Cannon, or Roosevelt? Who hustled Federal officeholders through the States, selecting "Taft delegates" for the Republican convention? Aldrich and Cannon and the Interests—or was it Roosevelt? Who wrote a letter saying that the Trusts didn't want Taft and did want Bryan? Was it Morgan or Harriman? Wasn't it Roosevelt? Then, again, when the great railway corporations coolly gave notice to their employes that if they expected a continuance of "high wages" they must vote for Taft, and Taft said that was not coercion but "business," did Roosevelt rebuke Taft? Not a rebuke. Did he denounce the corporations? Well, the letter hasn't been found yet. And will anyone pretend that Roosevelt didn't know Taft as well when he nominated him as the country knows him now? To say that Roosevelt was deceived in Taft, after an official intimacy of several years, is to throw discredit on any future certificate of good character that Roosevelt may issue. To say that he did know him—after what we have discovered since March 4 last—is to put a Roosevelt guaranty in the list of indigestible insecurities.

* *

What About Calhoun?

The American minister to China, W. J. Calhoun, has enjoyed a reputation along the border lines of elementary democracy for democratic ideals, and in his speech last winter at the Chicago meeting to resist the extradition to Russia of a political refugee (p. 12) he gave evidence of democratic faith. That was under circumstances which test the genuineness of platitudes. The mere platitudinous democrat avoids the firing line, and it was on a firing line that Mr. Calhoun then appeared. As he was not on the firing line in a recent after-dinner speech, his platitudes there might have been only platitudes, hollow and empty. Yet they seem to ring true. He was speaking to the members of the Industrial Club of Chicago and their guests, including not a few who must have thought Mr. Calhoun, from what he said, to be as unfit as Mr. Crane for the mission to China.

*

No one could utter these words, for instance, which Mr. Calhoun put into his speech, without

some appreciation of their tremendous import:

Great social movements are agitating the people of England. France is seething with surging forces until the government is rocking. Germany feels the force that threatens to disrupt its long traditions. And we are conscious of a new force in our midst which we must try to understand.

His analysis of the underlying influences of social progress is that of a sincere as well as thoughtful man:

There are generally two classes of persons—radicals and conservatives. The conservative never reforms society. He clogs the wheels of progress. New movements are always led by reformers. In history reforms have started with some obscure person or in some obscure place.

What he said in criticism of reformers was also just, though its phrasing implied a feeling of necessity for deferring to the prejudices of his audience:

Reformers must not be despised, though they do not appeal to your sober judgment. The reformer is radical, restless and advancing. He is not to be relied upon always, and may be a superficial thinker, but we may sympathize with him in his purpose. Frequently reformers start wrong and want to pass new laws right off before the people are ready to have them enforced.

It is hardly believable that the man who spoke that last sentence could think also, as Mr. Calhoun is reported, that "if you want a lasting reform, begin at the bottom and reform the individual man." He must have been inadequately reported, for that is but half a truth. The whole truth, as Mr. Calhoun might agree even if he didn't happen to utter it, would be this: "If you want a lasting reform of evils of individual origin, begin at the bottom and reform the individual man; and if you want a lasting reform of societary evils and the individual evils resulting therefrom, begin at the bottom and reform social laws and institutions." Most important, however, of the practical observations which Mr. Calhoun made, and especially for his audience of the moment, was this:

There are men around you who are regarded as successful. They have wealth and power and pride themselves that they are practical. They despise anything that smacks of sentiment, yet I think of them as not making good neighbors, friends, or citizens. A man without sentiment in his life does nothing for others. A nation without sentiment never lasts long. I love the story in the history of the Revolutionary War of the devotion of the soldiers during the hard winter at Valley Forge. The body of men inspired by a sentiment which leads them to go out beyond their own private interests is the body in which the hope of the public lies. Men of business, men of property and of public affairs must realize that all safety depends upon the cultivation of a strong and healthy moral spirit in the civic body, or else the government is a failure.