

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1910.

The Week.

It is a long time since there has been an item of news about the Federal civil service so important as that which is now given out concerning the Post Office Department. Not only is President Taft to put into the classified list, by executive order, between 7,000 and 8,000 assistant postmasters, whose appointment has thus far remained a matter of patronage, but he will recommend legislation by Congress putting all second and third-class postmasters into the competitive class. This will leave to the patronage system only the comparatively small number of first-class postmasterships, and a portion of the fourth-class postmasterships, and will thus mark a notable advance toward the final extinction of the spoils system in its chief remaining stronghold, the Post Office Department. But the most interesting thing about the announcement is the statement that both these reforms have been adopted by the President upon the special recommendation of Postmaster-General Hitchcock, who has been led to make them as part of his earnest effort to bring the Post Office Department up to a self-supporting basis. It is not so very long since civil service reformers were sneered at as dreamers and doctrinaires, who knew nothing about practical affairs. But here we have the man who was appointed Postmaster-General as the result of his successful management of Mr. Taft's campaign—a man who is nothing if not a politician and a practical man—carrying the civil-service system beyond the farthest point it had yet reached, so as to enable him to make the two ends meet in carrying on the postal business.

Mrs. Storer's new attack upon the veracity of Mr. Roosevelt was duly telegraphed to the *London Times*. Its American correspondent afterward cabled the surprising fact that, while many American newspapers suppressed the matter, not one had come to the defence of Col. Roosevelt. Special wonder is caused by the *Outlook's* failure even to mention the controversy. Here is one of its own employees directly charged with un-

truthfulness, and the documentary evidence to back it up is furnished, yet we get nothing but silence from the *Outlook*. This must be at the special request of Mr. Roosevelt, as the editors, left to themselves, could hardly have let alone such a question of public morals. They might, at least, one would think, have printed some little consolatory extract from the Bible—as, for example, that passage where Abimelech called hastily to his armor-bearer, and said: "Draw thy sword and slay me, that men say not of me, A woman slew him."

Mr. John Hays Hammond was right enough in declaring that the difference within the Republican ranks on the tariff is "a difference of opinion, and not of party principle." The principle avowed by regulars and insurgents in the matter of protection is, indeed, much the same; but it does not occur to Mr. Hammond to inquire how it comes that a mere "difference of opinion, and not of party principle," should result in such violent animosity, such heated indignation, such revolutionary explosions, as the insurgent movement has manifested. The answer to this question would, indeed, not be pleasant to contemplate. The insurgents are so hot, because, in their opinion, they, the regulars, or stand-patters, under cover of a principle—the principle of safeguarding American wages—have persistently clung to pernicious practices which have no relation whatsoever to that principle; and because the protective system as actually maintained is based on false pretences and is a cover for outrageous spoliation of the masses of the people by great capitalistic interests. Indeed, the insurgent Republican attitude carries, on its face, a far more serious indictment of the Republican party than does the Democratic. A Democrat may believe that protection is robbery and yet admit that in the eye of a straight Republican it is no such thing; while the insurgent Republican declares that protection is all right in itself, but that the masters of his own party's policy have turned it into an instrument of oppression and fraud.

All accounts agree that Woodrow Wilson is making an excellent impression

as a campaigner. It is no surprise to those acquainted with him that he should have success with his audiences. His powers as a speaker have been long tested. Not all his friends were confident, however, that he could go before miscellaneous political gatherings and impress himself as he evidently has been doing in New Jersey. Personality counts for a vast deal in such matters, and Dr. Wilson's frank bearing, his good humor, his readiness and his pungency would greatly help any orator in carrying the thing off. But in addition he has put high seriousness into his speeches, and yet has been able to clothe his political thinking in such direct and clear language as to win and delight his hearers. All told, this university president turning his hand to active politics has shown how easy is the mastery of the mere forms of political campaigning, provided one has the ideas and the sincerity and the fervor to make his advocacy tell.

The insurgents of Iowa and Kansas are aghast at the performances of Roosevelt in New York. They had taken him to their bosoms in the rampant West, but now feel that they have only been warming a viper. The *Des Moines News*, which is the personal organ of Senator Cummins, comments with the utmost bitterness upon the course of the New York Republican Convention, under the domination of Col. Roosevelt. The platform's sweeping endorsement of Taft and of the Payne-Aldrich tariff, and its entire omission of "progressive" doctrine, are described as "a staggering blow to the insurgent cause." Says the *News* truculently: "Roosevelt, bringing with him Taft, Ballinger, Wickersham, Root, J. P. Morgan, Tawney, Lurton, Hitchcock, and all the motley crew of plutocrats, the Hessians of privilege, cannot enlist in the army of insurgency." This is very sad, but it all rests upon a strange misunderstanding of Roosevelt. In the first place, he is not the man to "enlist" in any army, whether of insurgents or regulars. It is his mission to command them both. That is a part of his all-embracing comprehensiveness, which is the second thing that we should have supposed the Western insurgents would have grasped

before now. Having put himself at their head on his Western tour, what more natural than that he should return to put himself also at the head of the Administration supporters in the East? This is only a proof of his many-sidedness. As for the New York platform, so offensive to the West, Mr. Roosevelt could privately explain it to Senator Cummins as merely the temporary shift of a "practical" man bent on carrying his immediate point.

The most bitter enemy of labor organizations would hate to believe them directly responsible for the awful crime of blowing up the building of the *Los Angeles Times*. That the terrible destruction, with the loss of a score of lives, was due to an explosion of dynamite from the outside, appears to be conclusively established. Murderous assault by bombs was also planned at the same time, it is evident, against individuals in the city. But, although the *Times* itself had long been a non-union office, and had taken a strong position against the tyrannies of labor organizations, we are very reluctant to believe that the deed received anything like official sanction from the labor leaders. The work may have been that of some miscreant who acted on his own notion. But granting this, we cannot emphasize too strongly the duty which this frightful assassination places upon the men responsible for labor organizations. It is for them not only to disavow and denounce the crime, as they are doing, but to bend every energy to catch the criminal and make an example of him. But further than this, the appalling tragedy at Los Angeles should bite it into the minds of labor leaders that they cannot afford even to dally with talk about violence, or getting what they imagine to be their rights by force.

A contribution to the explanation of the higher cost of living has been made by the Census Bureau. Great increases in the growth of cities are reported from every section of the country. This does not mean merely that great numbers of people have flocked to the urban zone from the suburban zone, but a wide expansion of the urban zone itself. The great advance in traction facilities has enabled communities to spread over the surrounding country, providing individual homes rather than herding newcom-

ers in already congested centres. This increase in the size of cities, territorially as well as numerically, has been the means of wiping out thousands of acres of productive land that were used as market gardens, and the men who worked them have either become toilers in the city or are taking life easy on the money paid for their farms. This has pushed the growing of market supplies farther into the country and into the hands of men new to the business. A decade ago thousands of farmers loaded their wagons at night and drove to New York with produce raised on ground now occupied by mile after mile of homes. In New Jersey hundreds of farms have been given up to the real estate men, and lie unworked while waiting for the tide of settlement to reach them. It is plain from a study of the census returns that the demand for food products has been pushing the supply harder and harder.

The article on salesgirls in the October *McClure's* is the first of a series by Mrs. Clark and Miss Wyatt on working women in New York. This series promises to be subversive of some of the stock ideas of the ultimate consumer. He knows little of the elaborate processes involved in providing him with the thousand and one articles which make up daily life, beyond the bad manners or inattention of the clerk who waits on him. It is time that he should take a look at the question from the saleswoman's side of the counter. Wages too small to admit of decent living, and fitful chances of promotion, added to nine hours of standing a day, may excuse poor service. From the fifty histories collected among stores of different grades, the authors have given the details in the lives of six of these self-supporting women whose wages range from \$4 to \$12 a week. The pitiful struggle of those more poorly paid to make both ends meet during health and activity leaves the reader to wonder just what becomes of them in case of illness or when they are laid off during the slack season.

Some unconscious ironies are revealed in the six stories which the authors have selected as typical. Four of the women manage to get along on their salaries by virtue of the charitable homes in which they live. Also, the bene-

fit system very often works on lines too similar to the commercial insurance companies. The employee receives her benefit only if she is ill or injured while still in the employ of the store. If she leaves or is discharged, she sacrifices to the management the amount she has already paid in. Such questions as hours of employment too long for health and seasonal overwork at Christmas time can be wholly regulated only by law, and the Consumers' League is continually working for proper legislation. The difficulty of wages the girls may help to settle by organizing, while only a changed attitude on the part of the purchasing public can obviate certain others. For instance, it is useless for the law to demand stools behind the counters if the public will not buy from a seated clerk. And those who object to having the stores open till midnight during the week before Christmas will have a formidable opposition with which to contend just so long as an easy-going public is willing to leave Christmas shopping until the last minute.

The horrible outcome of the Vanderbilt Cup race makes it clear that our roads do not lend themselves to so dangerous and terrible a sport. For the benefits to be gained there is little to be said. It is thrilling and dramatic to see a car flash by at the rate of seventy miles an hour, with its crew in deadly peril of their lives, but the thrill lasts only an instant and it is doubtful if it is adequate compensation. More interesting is the assemblage of cars and people and the excitement of staying up all night and racing back to town the next morning. But the price is too high. If there are those who feel they must still race, let them compete on tracks.

A statement issued from the Standard Oil office intimates that the company is preparing for a war of prices in its foreign field, in view of the recent immense increase, present or prospective, in oil production by foreign companies. To people who watched the singular outburst of share speculation in London, last February, this announcement will at once call to mind the "oil boom" on which much of that speculation converged. One heard chiefly, in those piping days on London's Stock Exchange, of the "rubber mania," and rubber-

shares, new and old, undoubtedly kept the centre of the stage. But the oil shares held their own; while new issues of rubber company stock, in the first half of 1910, footed up \$83,000,000, as against only \$4,500,000 in the first half of 1909, new issues of oil-company shares rose in the similar period from \$6,500,000 to \$42,500,000. Just as the rubber boom was started by an extraordinary increase in shipments of that commodity to America for the motor-car trade, so the oil boom pivoted on a sudden order for 50,000 tons of fuel oil from the Scotch refiners for the British navy. The oil craze, like the rubber mania, ran its course, and prices for the shares got down by midsummer 25 to 40 per cent. below the February price. But meantime, thanks to the British public's eagerness to place its capital at the service of the new producing enterprises, they are equipped for competition.

This phase of the trade situation the Standard Oil Company recognizes without mincing words. Its circular points out that "the level of prices for refined oil to-day in the United States is lower than at any time during recent years"; that "as a direct result of these prices, the consumption of refined oil in this country is increasing," and that the purpose of the cutting of prices in the foreign field is "to increase the world's consumption." There are several interesting aspects of the formal inauguration of such a policy. It may attract attention on London's Stock Exchange, where it could hardly be much more palatable to the "Oil Department" than the recent sudden shrinkage of orders from American tire-manufacturers was to the rubber-share specialists. But what is likely to attract the most attention is the frank recognition, by the Standard Oil, of an old-fashioned principle of trade which we have lately been assured was obsolete. No secret appears to be made of the fact that lower prices will stimulate demand from consumers, nor is any qualification applied to the theory that the way to meet aggressive foreign competition is to meet it. Since the formation of our enormous Trusts in other lines of industry—a matter, principally, of the ten past years—we have heard much of the new idea that reduction of prices brings no fresh business, and that trade supply and demand need have no influence

on market quotations. The heresy of the Standard Oil, as regards this industrial philosophy, is the more noteworthy in that it not only repudiates the notion as applied to the foreign field, but plainly intimates that supply and demand are playing their usual rôle at home.

Under the heading, "A Severe Indictment," the *Educational Review* reprints from the *San Francisco Argonaut* a statement concerning the qualities of our college-bred young men which it would be difficult to match in the anti-college utterances of recent years, numerous and sweeping as these have been. "In recruiting its service," says the *Argonaut*, speaking of its own experience, "trial has again and again been made of the college-bred youth, but never with any approach to success. We have never yet been able to find a college-bred youth, without a long subsequent practical drill, who could write clean English, or who could even write a hand which the printer could read. Not one of those from Frank Pixley down, whose work in the *Argonaut* has been an element in its character and influence, has been a man of college breeding. This remark applies to other publications of the country representative of journalism in its higher rank. It is only a few months ago that there was assembled at a dinner table in the Century Club at New York a little group representing the very highest forces in American journalism—including the editor of *Harper's Weekly*, the then editor of the *Century*, and others of equal note—when, through a chance inquiry, it developed that only one present was a college-bred man." And more to the same effect. But the trouble with this sort of general denunciation is that it obviously overshoots the mark. The element of truth in the *Argonaut's* complaint would be much more forcibly brought home if presented with more balance. The fact is that neither in our colleges nor in our high schools do we insist upon habits of thorough and exact mastery of intellectual tasks as does the German *Gymnasium* or the English public school—with results that are evident in many ways, though not justifying a view so gloomy as that of the *Argonaut*.

It is a rare compliment to our all too little recognized linguistic attainments

that the French have just done us. M. Damour, recent dispatches from Paris announce, formerly vice-consul at New Orleans, is on his way to these shores on "an official mission to encourage the teaching of French in American schools, especially in those of Louisiana." The gallant Frenchman, we take it, has conversed in his own tongue with some of our countrymen. He has then made inquiries, and been informed, to his great surprise, that their command of the language was unusual for Americans, the great mass of whom do not get to college or even high school, where alone the language is taught. Encouraged by the progress his informants have shown after only three or four years of French in the high school and four more in college, he naturally has become enthusiastic when he has thought of what they might do if they began six or eight years earlier. We wish him all success in his mission of encouraging the teaching of French in American schools, and merely beg to suggest the addition of the words "and colleges."

There is at least one country where "catchwords" in politics are under the ban. The Imperial Chancellor of Germany has been explaining his plan of campaign for the election of a new Reichstag next year, and the semi-official organ of the Government, the *Norddeutscher Zeitung*, in setting forth the programme of Bethmann-Hollweg, states that "we can give the assurance that in the highest responsible quarter catchwords are not being sought." What is being sought is, apparently, a catchall. For in the announced strategy of the Chancellor, as respects the next political battle, we have one of those beautifully vague statements which defy analysis, and almost defy attack, but which are designed to attract the support of all shades of opinion. Listen to this: "The Imperial Chancellor considers it his principal task so to conduct the affairs of the Empire that everything which is necessary for the prosperity of its industrial and commercial life and for its military protection may be assured to it, and that its continued intellectual development may be safeguarded." Does it not remind you of the finest Republican definition of the blessings of protection? Such sonorous phrases are not, indeed, catchwords, but they are intended to be catch-votes.

THE NEW YORK CAMPAIGN.

Mr. Stimson's nomination at Saratoga for Governor was a shrewd and strong move. From their list of eligibles, the Republicans of New York State could not have chosen a more promising candidate. For Mr. Stimson is not only a man who has displayed unusual ability, with a capacity for hard work, but one whose public activity as Federal prosecutor makes him peculiarly available at the present juncture. It was his skillful weaving of the web of evidence about Morse which sent that unscrupulous rich man to jail, and his prosecutions of the Sugar Trust for stealing and of railways for rebating were equally successful, and equally impressed the popular mind. We do not know whether Mr. Stimson is a good campaigner or would, in any case, boast of his achievements, but Mr. Roosevelt is ready to do the campaigning and the boasting for him.

As an opponent to Mr. Stimson the Democrats at Rochester have found in John A. Dix a happy solution of the problem which confronted them. It was essential that their nominee should not be a Tammany man and should not be a cringer before Hearst. Mr. Dix is neither. He bears an historic name of which he has never done anything to dim the lustre. His reputation is that of a man honorable in business and clean and courageous in politics. He was too stanch a Democrat to support Hearst in 1906, when by money and fraud that adventurer secured the Democratic nomination. As State Chairman this year, Mr. Dix has been working hard and fruitfully to bring back the party to its old standards and to tone up its management. This was done without the least thought of self-seeking, and he long resisted the demand at Rochester that he should become the candidate for Governor, yielding only when assured that his nomination could best unite the party and meet the peculiar needs of the hour. He is not an orator of the impetuous kind, but is a man of positive character and convictions, and would certainly, if elected, give the State a conscientiously business-like and clean administration.

As for the platform adopted at Rochester, it is superior to that of the Republicans in precision and in vigor. It is both progressive and aggressive. In matters concerning the State alone, it

crosses swords most effectively with the Republicans. But the plank which will most attract attention and which is of greatest strategic value in this campaign, is the one openly challenging and directly attacking the New Nationalism of Theodore Roosevelt. To have shirked this matter would have been not only recreant but foolish. Roosevelt is to be the head and front of the Republican campaign in this State. He made his party ticket; he is to put forth great exertions to elect it. It is a sure political instinct, then, which prompted the Democratic leaders to point their guns straight at him. To be sure, not a word is said about this doctrine in the Saratoga platform. Not even a faint hint of the purpose to promote such a doctrine is contained in it. Such suppression, however, can only be regarded as an admission of the impolicy of attempting to force that issue at the present time upon the voters of this State, not as any ground for imagining that the danger which it portends has passed, or that it is not imminent. The doctrine so deliberately and so emphatically propounded in the Osawatimie speech is but the latest and most extreme expression of a spirit and tendency which Mr. Roosevelt has always embodied. The limits of its manifestation by him have been simply such as have been set by his opportunities, or his estimate of those opportunities. In preparing his Osawatimie speech, he felt that the time was propitious for that extreme deliverance; since then he has judged it expedient to relegate to the rear the doctrine of suppression of State functions and unlimited exaltation of executive power centralized in the President at Washington. But with that doctrine Mr. Roosevelt is indissolubly bound up; and no result of the success of his campaign in New York would be more certain than that it would immeasurably increase his power not only to advance his personal ambitions, but to promote the "New Nationalism" and all that that term, in his hands, would imply.

On the second of the two great issues, on the other hand, it is not necessary to go behind the platform itself. The Saratoga Convention puts itself squarely behind the Payne-Aldrich tariff act. It knows nothing of Mr. Roosevelt's recently discovered moral issue in the tariff, or in the recent revision of

the tariff. By no sign or hint does it indicate that special interests, with an illegitimate and sinister hold on the party, dictated any feature of the tariff as it stood before the revision or as it stands now. Notorious as it is that not even the crudest attempt was made to conform with the promise of the Republican platform, the Saratoga platform has the effrontery to talk about "still more accurately" determining in the future the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. What was done in the last Republican campaign in the way of tariff-reform promises was accurately characterized by Judge Parker in his speech. "The promise of a revision of the tariff," he said, "by a special session of Congress, to be called immediately after the inauguration of the next President, was intended to hold the tariff-reduction Republicans in line, while the trick in the phraseology was to be made clear to the tariff beneficiaries." And it was because the trick thus devised was carried out according to programme that we have seen the great insurgent movement which has split the Republican party in twain. It was only after the trick had been executed that the big men of the regular Republican organization realized that the honest tariff-reduction Republicans were sufficient in numbers and importance to be reckoned with after election as well as before. President Taft's Winona speech, following on his laudation of Aldrich at Boston, was the signal for the breaking out of a storm of which the strength and volume have been made continually more manifest from that day to this. And yet the Saratoga Convention calmly goes on record as standing pat upon the Payne-Aldrich tariff and inviting its endorsement by the voters of the State of New York. Truly, the Democrats have a straight and easy path marked out for them.

"BACON IS SHAKE-SPEARE."

The Baconian incubus is always with us—ever violent, but at some times more violent than at others. Only last year there was a mighty summoning of strength, with rumors that the author of the tome had submitted his ciphers to the department of mathematics in a large Eastern university and had been assured that the laws of chance could never explain them. The public breathed more freely when it learned that the