

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 1910.

## The Week.

It is announced that when Mr. Roosevelt reaches the port of New York, his baggage will enjoy Ambassadorial privilege. None of his trunks or of those of members of his party will be subject to examination by customs inspectors. Now, personally, we have no objection to this favor being shown Mr. Roosevelt. We congratulate him, rather, on his good luck. But we still think that he will be missing a part of his education as an influential public man. If we could have our way, no American, however eminent or well deserving, should be deprived of that intimate knowledge of our barbaric tariff laws which is stamped upon the mind of every "resident of the United States" who comes back from Europe to find himself exposed to annoyance and insult which he could encounter in no other custom house in the world—not even in Turkey. It is in the public interest that every man who has to do in any way with the making of our tariff laws should be put into the same suffering category with the hundreds of thousands of Americans who find themselves every year treated on the docks of their own land as suspected smugglers and liars. So while we wish Mr. Roosevelt every personal comfort on his home-coming, we should be very glad if his stern sense of public duty, or even his insatiable curiosity, were to lead him to renounce his privilege and to find out by individual experience just what is the nature and the administration of the American tariff laws.

Now, in this matter of personal baggage there is no way of abolishing the abuse except by abolishing the foolish law. The system of advance declaration on shipboard, which we owe to Mr. Cortelyou when he was Secretary of the Treasury, is a great improvement over the old method, but it is necessarily only a palliative, as must be every other plan to render more easy the enforcement of a law which cannot be enforced at all without being made onerous and humiliating. We ought rather to assimilate our practice to that of all other civilized countries. For the detection of

real smugglers we have an organized secret service. If it does its work properly, there can be no serious evasions of duty on articles brought in for sale. But to persist in harassing a hundred thousand innocent people so as to catch one rogue is an exhibition of helpless folly which ought to be characterized by words in Mr. Roosevelt's vocabulary.

It is said that we have no privileged class in this country, but this is to overlook the private secretaries of Governors and Presidents. They are as regularly taken care of with a good office as if they had an hereditary and indefeasible title thereto. Gov. Hughes has simply anticipated matters a little in appointing Mr. Fuller to a State office, while Mr. Carpenter, the private secretary to President Taft, no sooner shows signs of breaking health than he is named as Minister to Morocco. In both cases there was simply a following of a long precedent. If we have anything like a permanent office-holding class in the United States—that dread thing which so frightens the spoilsmen—it is to be found among private secretaries to executives, and they get their start without coming under the abhorred civil service rules. There is the less objection to this because it seems to be felt that they have so many disagreeables to put up with while serving as private secretaries that they deserve recognition and reward afterwards. Everybody will sympathize with Secretary Carpenter in his break-down, but that will only increase the wonder at Mr. Loeb's uncommon robustness.

If it prove true, as has been stated in the Washington dispatches, that the appropriations in this session of Congress will be considerably beyond the billion-dollar mark—that is, fully as large as before, if not larger—President Taft cannot fail to be chagrined. Whatever "policies" he inherited from his predecessor, economy was not one of them. That was his own. In dealing so plainly as he did with public extravagance, and setting out to reduce the national budget by \$60,000,000 or \$75,000,000; he took an original and promising lead. In fact, the estimates submitted to Con-

gress by the heads of departments were cut much lower than in recent years, and it seemed reasonable to hope that the first steps in national retrenchment would be taken. But now it appears that the old total of outlay is to be reached again, if not surpassed. The leaders in Congress confess themselves unable to keep down the appropriations. Chairman Tawney puts his finger on one chief cause of this inability, so far as the House is concerned, when he says that there is no concentrated control of the public expenses. The appropriation bills have been more and more taken out of the hands of the Appropriations Committee, until now there are a dozen committees each entitled to bring in its own bill for money. Such a breaking-up of financial control, and such a breaking-down of responsibility, lead inevitably to wastefulness.

As high as \$16,000,000 run the varying estimates of the cost of each of the two 26,000-ton battleships just authorized by Congress. When there is not a war-cloud on the horizon; when the navy is larger than ever before in its history; when the whole country is groaning under the increased cost of living and steadily increasing burden of taxation, Congress is content to waste perhaps \$32,000,000. When it is considered that there were years before the Spanish War when our total naval expenditure was annually only \$9,000,000 or \$11,000,000, and no harm came to the country, the present insensate folly is inexplicable. We firmly believe that if the fact could be got into the head of every citizen that the United States is spending 70 cents out of every dollar upon expenditures for wars, past or future, this colossal waste would stop. Naturally, Congress refused to appropriate on the same day \$100,000 for a commission to inquire into methods of economy in the administration of government. To have done so after the naval appropriations would have been to stultify itself.

Senator Lorimer made last Saturday his expected denial that he had bribed his way into the United States Senate, but, unfortunately, almost at the very moment he was speaking, legislators

were being indicted and arrested in Illinois for having taken bribes to vote for him. This may be only an unlucky coincidence. Mr. Lorimer has called for an investigation of the charges against him, and the Senate Committee on Elections is bound to take the matter up. Pending the result of such inquiry, final judgment must be withheld. There can be no reasonable question, after what has been already shown by the prosecuting authorities in Illinois, that the Senatorial election in that State was corrupt, but it may not be possible to connect Mr. Lorimer personally and directly with the wickedness. It may be said that he was the victim—or the beneficiary—of over-zealous and too wicked friends. But even he himself is evidently aware that the presumptions are heavily against him, and that he has no time to lose in showing, if he can, that his title to a seat in the Senate is not tainted. The first thing he should set himself to clearing up is the mystery of confessed bribe-takers without any briber.

The doctrine of States' rights has been invoked to very poor purpose, indeed, by those Southern Congressmen who have come out in opposition to Senator Dick's bill for the establishment of an additional number of mine rescue stations in the Middle and Far West. At present there are only four such central emergency camps, situated at Pittsburgh, Knoxville, Urbana, Ill., and Seattle. Following upon the Cherry disaster, a report of the Secretary of the Interior ascribed the great loss of life in mining disasters in part to the distance of the rescue stations from the mines. The Secretary recommended the establishment of twelve additional branch stations all over the country at a cost of \$160,000. But inasmuch as such emergency depots would necessarily have to cut across State boundary lines, whereas mines are under the police power of the States, the States' rights shibboleth has been raised against a measure called for by every instinct of humanity and every argument from sound business policy. After the Courrières disaster in France a few years ago, a rescue party from the German mining fields came to take part in the work of human salvage. If the very real frontier that separates Frenchmen from Germans could be wiped out under the influence

of a common pity and common humanity, it would be the very height of criminal absurdity to let State boundaries stand in the way of so imperative a reform.

Shorter than Paulhan's last and longest flight by some forty miles, Glenn Curtiss's aerial dash down the valley of the Hudson last Sunday surpasses Paulhan's feat in actual difficulties overcome, in the clean-cut demonstration of the possibilities of the aeroplane, and in dramatic interest. To Americans, certainly, Curtiss's achievement gains a special intensity of interest because the scene of it was the river upon which the Clermont sailed a hundred years ago. That circumstance forces upon the mind solemn recognition of that human progress which we so easily talk about without realizing it to the mind's eye or the emotions. Curtiss's triumph is none the less emphatic because it was preceded by the doubts and hesitations that a crowd eager for a spectacle is none too patient with. The aviator was quite right in saying that the very people who insist upon the show being carried off at all costs would be the ones to shake wise heads in the case of disaster. It was a doubly dramatic event for Glenn Curtiss, therefore, that his record-making flight should have lain along the historic trial course of the Hudson, and that his landing should have been on the very spot where less than a year ago he gave a certain excuse for bitter comment on his abilities and his motives.

Robert Koch was born the same year that Louis Pasteur entered the university. It would be difficult to decide which of the two men has gained the wider fame. Certainly, Koch and Pasteur are the two great names in the science of bacteriology which has revolutionized modern medicine. In range of achievements, Koch was probably the greater man of the two. His discovery of the germ of tuberculosis would in itself constitute a service of transcendent importance. But in addition, he had studied malaria, cholera, and, newest of all to European knowledge, that sleeping sickness which has been threatening negro Africa almost with depopulation. Associated with his name is one tragic disappointment which detracts nothing from his reputation as a scientist or a man. Everybody over thirty

must recall the vast stirring that followed the announcement from Berlin of the discovery of a specific for tuberculosis. Science and the millions of afflicted who looked to science for aid in their affliction turned expectant eyes towards the Prussian capital. Pilgrimages were made. It was a vast upward surge of hope that failed of realization. But whether the dread white plague is to be conquered by a sudden discovery or by the slower hand-to-hand methods which we are adopting to-day, Robert Koch's share in the ultimate victory will be unquestionable.

Every patriot heart from the Atlantic to the Golden Gate and from the Gulf of Mexico to the forty-ninth parallel of north latitude so recently eulogized by Mr. Cannon, will thrill with pride at the news that our epic scramble for the privilege of lending China some money has succeeded. The Hankow-Sze-chuen railway matter is settled, or at least almost settled. After years of furious contention, we have won the right to participate with Great Britain, France, and Germany in the \$30,000,000 loan which it is now only a question of inducing China to accept. For it would appear that at the last moment the Chinese have been seized with sore doubt. The beautifully altruistic spectacle of the four leading nations of the West fighting for the right of giving away their money has somehow failed to impress the bland Celestial mind. That the struggle for the privilege of forcing money on China was accompanied by a struggle for such sordid things as a share in supplying the necessary railway material and engineering skill, was probably only a coincidence. To the pure all things are pure. But China has had so rich an experience of the implications that go with a European loan that her hesitation is, after all, comprehensible. All the more reason, therefore, why the four allied and altruistic nations should now concentrate their efforts, and, with one eye on the main chance and one eye on each other, proceed to lend money to a heathen foreign government by hypodermic injection.

The death of Edward VII has aroused profound regret and actually some anxiety in Russia. One correspondent relates that when the order for court mourning, usual in such circumstances,

was presented for the approval of the Czar, Nicholas II with his own hand struck out the traditional three weeks and inserted three months. The *Novoye Vremya* printed, in heavy type, immediately after the dispatch announcing the King's death, the single sentence, "The death of King Edward VII is a day of sorrow for Russia." The *Russkoe Slovo* of Moscow declared that in Edward the country had lost one of its sincerest friends. The Polish press laid stress on the fact that, as a result of the Anglo-Russian understanding, of which Edward VII was the author, Russia had been saved from her humiliating dependence upon Germany. Such expressions of regret were probably as sincere as formulas of this kind usually are; and perhaps a little more so, because at the present moment the Anglo-Russian *entente* in Persia is being put sharply to the test by German diplomacy. It is the misfortune, however, of Russia's blundering autocratic system that her Czar will often pull one way and his Ministers another. It may be that Nicholas II was really moved by the death of the English monarch and its possible effects on Anglo-Russian friendship. But, on the other hand, there is no guarantee that the Czar may not be soon making another little Baltic trip with his good friend William II, and soliciting his advice on vital matters of state.

The Prussian Government has been compelled to abandon its franchise bill after carrying it through one house, which is gratifying proof that even in Prussia obstinate officialdom cannot prevail against popular opinion. The effect of those wonderful, peaceful demonstrations of the Socialists in Berlin could not be withstood, nor the sentiment created elsewhere by the clashes between police and people. According to the dispatch, the Chancellor has declared that the measure failed because it gave to the wealthy and middle classes a greater influence in the elections and that there would doubtless be a continuance of the bitter agitation against the suffrage system until the Government submitted new legislation. But if the Chancellor sees that now, why was he not aware of it when he drew the bill and announced that it would go through whether the people liked it or not? If the agitation has really converted the Chancellor, that fact, by itself, is a

great gain, but the price seems high if one considers that all the ill-feeling and anger aroused among the populace could have been avoided by a little greater intelligence on the part of the rulers. The Chancellor's prestige is bound to suffer, for this was his first measure of importance. So far as suffrage reform is concerned, the attitude of all enlightened people in Prussia has been that it would be a great deal better to have the present intolerable conditions continue than to accept the proposed legislation. Even in the House of Lords the Chancellor's bill met with the greatest opposition, steadily increasing until even the Chancellor abandoned it as hopeless.

A conversation about Turkey with Arminius Vambéry at Buda-Pesth is reported in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* by Sir William Ramsay. The veteran traveller and professor—he is now eighty-nine—holds that the new régime in Turkey must enjoy twenty-five years of peace in order to have a good chance of success. What Vambéry most fears is not attack from without, but bitter race and religious dissensions within the Empire. The Albanian trouble he regards as serious, but as really the least threatening of many probable causes of dissension. Vambéry's opinion of the former Sultan is interesting. He agrees with the general view that Abdul Hamid in his later years sank into a condition of listless cruelty, but affirms that earlier, say, about twenty years ago, he displayed great ability and tireless energy, often working thirty-six or even forty-eight hours on a stretch. It is well known that Vambéry was once in the employ of the Turkish Government, to which he made confidential reports. One of these so plainly enumerated the causes leading to the ruin of Turkey that the Sultan in a towering rage ordered all allowances to Vambéry stopped. Afterwards, narrates Sir William Ramsay, on the authority of a friend in Constantinople, when the Sultan discovered that Vambéry had been entirely right, he made tempting offers to him to resume his connection, but they were all declined.

The first Cabinet for United South Africa has been organized. Pessimists who see everything in old England going to ruin might be asked for a moment

to look at South Africa. After all, there must be something of the ancient virtue left in a nation which can accomplish what England has accomplished in South Africa in the last seven years. In that space of time, a conquered population has been not merely appeased but conciliated and won over. Civil government has been reestablished in the former Boer republics, and such government has been placed in the hands of the conquered element. Superimposed on the four separate colonial governments of Cape Colony, Natal, Orange River Colony, and the Transvaal, comes now a general government for South Africa, which, too, has been handed over to the men who only eight years ago were in the field against England. Gen. Louis Botha is the first Premier of United South Africa, and Gen. Smuts is his leading associate. Nor is it less eloquent testimony to the English genius for using the dead past only as a foundation for the present, that the son of the English statesman who was responsible for the "disgrace" of Majuba Hill should be the first Governor-General of the new nation.

The fact that the Premier and the Minister of the Interior in the first South African Cabinet hold the same positions in the Transvaal Ministry raises the natural expectation that to the Transvaal will fall, if not a predominant voice in federal affairs, certainly a degree of influence greater than would be its share on a strict population basis. The population of Cape Colony is nearly twice that of the Transvaal, and the proportion holds for whites as well as for the colored races. In the Transvaal, too, the Boer element predominates decisively over the English element, whereas in Cape Colony the two are pretty evenly balanced. The Transvaal's economic importance, of course, outweighs the mere factor of population, but it is doubtful if even then Cape Colony would have foregone its claim to the leadership in the first federal Ministry, if it were not for the manifest desire in England and South Africa to make the point that the loyalty of the Boer population conditioned the success of the great political experiment. Of that loyalty there can be no doubt, though it may well be that racial influences will color South African politics for many years to come.



*POLITICAL LEADERSHIP.*

The startling change in the national Republican prospects within a year, the even swifter alteration in New York State within the last few weeks, are among the most recent and conclusive demonstrations of the fact that, however intelligent an electorate may be, without some sort of leadership it cannot prosper. For the apparently irreconcilable differences within the Republican party are not sudden developments. It is only their revelation in all their mutual repugnance that is novel. While McKinley lived, divergences of view were harmonized by a spirit of peace-at-any-price compromise, for the sake of party success; Roosevelt smashed opposition where he could, yielded to it where he was compelled, actuated by conviction as well as by party success; Hughes, scorning compromise, has triumphed by making use of the only legitimate weapon, the power of public opinion. These three men, two Presidents and a Governor, represent three stages in popular political leadership. The first stood for organization. Whatever theory of government he may have held, his practice resulted in the victory of the practical politician, of the man who looked first and chiefly for the purely political effect of measures and appointments, the man who was thinking always of the next election. That President McKinley was himself the preëminent politician of his day may prove to be his best title to enduring fame. Our fathers seem to have feared the demagogue less than the tyrant; the politician who combines the hypocrisy of the one with the oppression of the other is to be feared more than either.

The uniqueness of McKinley's successor lay in the circumstance that the country, while giving him its enthusiastic support, was uncertain whether to call him politician or statesman. His aims were high; his means "practical." All the arts of the demagogue, all the resources of the tyrant, he employed with consummate skill. Those who did not trust him, feared him. Many who favored his ends censured his means. But it was such a relief to see old-timers completely beaten at their own game that his countrymen generally overlooked the method for the sake of the result. Nevertheless, Roosevelt's blazing seven years were only the middle stage. It was reserved for another New Yorker

to take the final step; to do, after all these years, what the plain citizen would naturally have supposed all public officials would do of their own accord—to refuse unworthy means as quickly as unworthy ends, to think of party as no more than a means, and to act as if genuine statesmanship were its own sufficient justification. To withhold adoration from the great god Success is to run the risk of being sneered at as un-American; but there are few more successful careers than that of the Governor who has despised any success except the highest.

These three stages in democratic leadership are progressive in kind rather than in time. They exist simultaneously; and, while it is not difficult to rank them, it is very difficult to find leaders belonging to the last one. Leadership, nevertheless, democracy must have, and, if it cannot find one sort, it will perforce turn to another. It is this aspect of the Republican break-up that is serious. The only party to emerge with credit from the special session of Congress last summer was the group of partyless insurgents; the only respectable party in New York for some years has been the party-scorned Hughes Republicans. Neither of these groups now has a leader. If the nation, in order to punish the long-dominant party for its inexcusable derelictions; if the State of New York, in order to discipline the same party, entrusts itself to a long-discredited Democracy, what guarantee is there that the transfer will be an improvement in the character of our political leadership? It is a fact, as ominous as it is obvious, that the rarity of the highest kind of leadership is one of the prime causes of the existence of the lower kinds. If a people lack real leaders, the reins will slip into the hands of those who substitute organization for opinion, party for principle, power for right. The buying of votes, the dealing out of offices, the suppressing of primary reform, even the juggling with the tariff, are only phases of the situation. They one and all range themselves on the side of organization, as unresponsive as they dare to be to the legitimate sovereign, public opinion.

The ground for hope is the memory of what is notable in these last ten years: the rise of a new leadership, the assertion of an awakened popular will, the realization in actual politics of lofty

ideals, the sight of living flesh-and-blood men of the highest ability and respectability out in the struggle, fighting with the superb skill long consecrated to business for the attainment of a truer democracy, and fighting with a success that makes their baffled opponents look like tyros. The people can be trusted. Give them a man possessed of a modicum of ability, fired with a desire to serve them, and their ready spirit of hero-worship can be counted upon to do the rest. This is the hey-day of the statesman of the new school. He has before him a richness of opportunity that, in its rewards no less than in its demands, can be matched by nothing short of the most dramatic moments of our history.

*THE BALLINGER INQUIRY.*

The long-protracted hearings in the Ballinger investigation came to an end last week with the oral arguments of the attorneys. On neither side was an attempt made to cover with convincing precision all the points in dispute. This indeed was impossible in the limited time at the disposal of counsel, as would be shown by the attempt of any impartial student to settle a single one of these questions. Not until the briefs have been submitted, and the evidence studied in the light that they should furnish, will a trustworthy conclusion on the whole case be possible. Nevertheless, the survey of the case afforded by the oral arguments makes the present an appropriate time for weighing the general controversy.

In the first place, there are some points about the nature and genesis of the case of which the public needs to be reminded. Especially as regards Mr. Glavis, it is necessary to recall to mind the character of his initial connection with the matters involved. Whatever basis there may be, or may be alleged to be, for supposing that the animating force behind the developments of the past ten or twelve months is of a political or personal nature, no such allegation can be made as to Mr. Glavis's first resolute interposition in the Alaskan coal claims. No Rooseveltian plot can have been at the bottom of his zealous interference in the year 1907, to prevent the patenting of the Cunningham and other claims without searching inquiry. Mr. Ballinger was at that time Commission-