

legislature is not bound by the result. But as the mandatory Initiative and Referendum to be voted on next month in this State was submitted by the signatures of 137,000 (p. 873) voters—very many more than the requisite 10 per cent—and for the purpose of putting an end to “jackpot” legislation by enabling the people to control their legislative agents instead of being controlled by them, to secure representation in place of misrepresentation, and as candidates are being personally pledged, it is reasonable to expect that a large vote under the “public policy” law for the mandatory Initiative and Referendum will convince the new legislature that it had better do its part toward giving the people an opportunity to vote not merely in an advisory way but as a people having authority.

+

No matter what the advisory vote may be, the legislature can only submit or refuse to submit a Constitutional amendment such as is asked for. To do this there must be a majority in each House. After that, there must be a majority of all the votes cast at the election. With this obstruction to Constitutional amendments, the importance of first carrying what Herbert Quick calls a “gateway” amendment, is manifest. Let the advisory vote this fall be large enough for the Initiative and Referendum to make that reform “look good” to legislators, and other needed reforms will be easier. Whoever would help, may get all possible information and assistance by communicating with the Committee of Seven, Unity Building, 79 Dearborn street, Chicago; or Direct Legislation League, Odd Fellows’ Building, Springfield.

+ +

James O. Monroe.

Under the minority representation law of Illinois, the voters for legislative representatives in the 41st district, which coincides with Will and DuPage counties, may cast $1\frac{1}{2}$ votes for two Democrats, or $1\frac{1}{2}$ votes for two Republicans, or 3 votes for either of them. That is, if they vote for both their party candidates, the vote will be counted as $1\frac{1}{2}$ for each, whereas if they vote for only one, it will count as 3 votes for him. Each party has nominated only two candidates. They might have nominated three, for three are to be elected. This is a boss’s arrangement of course, the object being to elect two men who are “right”—“jackpot” right—of one party, and one such man of the other party. But the voters need not carry out this arrangement unless they wish to—not altogether at any rate. For James O. Mon-

roe is an independent candidate in this district; and every ballot with one cross opposite his name and no cross opposite anybody else’s, will count as 3 votes for Mr. Monroe. A man whom any democratic Democrat or democratic Republican may trust in the legislature, James O. Monroe is himself a democratic Democrat, and one that knows why; he is the same kind of democratic Democrat that Henry George was, and this should be guarantee enough.

+ +

The Pardon of John R. Walsh.

Ella Flagg Young, superintendent of Chicago schools (p. 651) has once more demonstrated her well balanced courage by pleading in person at Washington for the pardon of John R. Walsh (pp. 85, 412). It was both a courageous thing and a right thing to do. Not that John R. Walsh was a good citizen. He was not. But he was as good a citizen,—that is to say, he was the same kind of bad citizen,—as the men who tripped him up in the very kind of business game that all play at. The crime of which he was convicted was the violation of a technical requirement of a technical statute—precisely the kind of statutory irregularity that other bankers are guilty of, and for which Walsh would never have been prosecuted if he hadn’t crossed their path as a competitor in frenzied finance. If the national banking business were all exposed as ruthlessly as Walsh’s little corner in it was, there would be a financial earthquake from New York to San Francisco; and among its victims would be found some of the very financiers who sent Walsh to prison to get him out of their way. Mrs. Young is wrong in saying that there was some “dreadful misunderstanding.” There was no misunderstanding. The understanding was perfect,—and vicious, respectably vicious. But she is right in urging the pardon of this man, although it might rest as well upon the circumstances of his prosecution as upon the present condition of his health.

+ +

Criminal Responsibility.

Woodrow Wilson’s ideas about responsibility for crime of the men who manage corporations is certainly sound. He is reported to have said this in one of his campaign speeches for Governor of New Jersey:

Corporations do not do wrong. Individuals do wrong. Guilt is always personal. You will say that in many instances it is not fair to pick out for punishment the particular officer who ordered a thing done, because he really had no freedom in the matter; that he is himself under orders, exercises

no individual liberty of choice, is a dummy manipulated from without. I reply that society should permit no man to carry out orders which are against law and public policy, and that, if you will but put one or two conspicuous dummies in the penitentiary, there will be no more dummies for hire.

That this most excellent attitude toward the managers and beneficiaries of corporations should be looked upon as progressive, is a strong illustration of a reaction we have been going through in this country. Our executives, our legislators, our courts and our bar have drifted woefully, and the praise that Dr. Wilson rightly gets for that utterance of his proves it. Fifty years ago the applicant for admission to the bar anywhere in the United States who did not answer the question of criminal responsibility for corporate crime precisely, in substance, as Dr. Wilson answers it in his first three sentences quoted above, would not have fared well. The examiners would have considered him lacking in legal qualification; and if the committee on character had been consulted on the point it is not improbable that they would have regarded him as unfit morally. Yet a university president gains additional distinction now by uttering this sentiment, which once was and always ought to be elementary both in law and morals: "Corporations do not do wrong—individuals do wrong—guilt is always personal."

* *

Golf Links and Connecting Links.

Speaking of the Taft-Hammond aggregation, there is a chap of the name of James Hay, Jr. who writes with a flowing pen. One of his entertaining articles appeared in the Sunday Magazine of October 9. The Sunday Magazine is a factory-made supplement for the Sunday editions of daily newspapers, and a right good supplement too. Sewell Ford's frequent contributions alone would commend it. In Chicago this magazine is the Sunday supplement to the Record Herald; and, as we say, in the number of October 9 it contained an interesting and enlightening contribution from Mr. Hay. The title of that article is "The President's Crony," meaning John Hays Hammond, whom it describes as President Taft's "favorite playmate," especially in "twosomes," and now and then a "threesome" on golf links. Irreverent writers have hinted that Mr. Hammond gets more than fun out of his playmate. But that in passing. According to Mr. Hay, who describes this distinguished mining engineer and head butler of plutocracy as President Taft's "playmate" and "crony," John Hays Hammond is also—but let Mr. Hay tell it: "The playmate of Taft is also a friend of Porfirio Diaz, President

of Mexico. The last time he was in that country, Diaz greeted him with this in the palace: 'We are always glad to hear that you have come back, Mr. Hammond; for we regard you as our ally in developing the resources of our land.'" Need one go farther for light on the curious relations of "Barbarious Mexico" (p. 956) with our own "benevolent despotism"? Favorite playmates on golf links may turn out to have been connecting links.

* *

"Benevolent Despotism."

Professor Frederick Starr, the famous anthropologist of the University of Chicago, who has but recently returned from the Philippines, charges that the fact that the Secretary of War, Mr. Dickinson, received thousands of petitions for independence while he was in the Islands, has been suppressed. Professor Starr's word is good for his assertions. No doubt those petitions were presented, no doubt the fact that they were presented has been concealed. But isn't the concealment necessary? How can officials divinely consecrated to the work of governing the people for their own good (the good of the governed, to be sure), how can they perform their extraordinary governing functions if they don't pigeonhole liberty petitions and suppress the facts? Were they to pay attention to Philippine petitions, they couldn't govern the Philippines with that "benevolent despotism" which was instituted by the McKinley-Hanna regime; and if they disclosed the facts they couldn't govern Americans satisfactorily to the Taft-Hammond aggregation of governmental divinities.

* * *

"UNEARNED INCREMENT" IN BOSTON.

Mayor Fitzgerald, of Boston, has begun an agitation in that city which not only calls for special mention, but makes distant observers wonder whether the criticisms of their Mayor by good Boston people may not possibly be misplaced. Or is he really a demagogue, selfishly watchful of the currents of public sentiment? Let the explanation be as it may, that which he now proposes is good in itself; and coming from a political leader it is significant also of a welcome tendency of public opinion in Boston.

*

Mayor Fitzgerald's suggestion was made to John A. Sullivan, chairman of the Finance Commission, in a communication that appeared in the Boston papers of the 2d. In that communication he called