

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1910.

The Week.

Mr. Roosevelt's speech at Columbus on law and order was a word fitly spoken. That Ohio city has for weeks been the scene of criminal violence by strikers and of flabby efforts by the municipal authorities to protect the street-car companies and operatives in their rights and to secure to citizens peace and safety. Hence the straightforward talk of the ex-President must have done good. Mr. Roosevelt was perfectly explicit on the folly as well as the criminality of those labor leaders or unions that encourage or even wink at assaults and the use of dynamite as a means of winning a strike. He justly said that it is impossible to listen to men who wreck cars and terrorize a city. They cannot get and do not deserve a hearing for their complaints until they show that they are first of all law-abiding citizens. Even if they have a measure of justice on their side they put themselves out of the court of reason when they resort to violence. And Mr. Roosevelt was equally clear and strong on the duty of the authorities to put down rioting at all hazards. He had only scorn for a Mayor who would palter with riotous strikers, or for a police that would hesitate to use every power at command to bring them to submission. On this whole question Mr. Roosevelt has been consistently right, so far as we know.

Mr. Roosevelt's refusal to break bread with Senator Lorimer at Chicago was an obvious thing for him to do, but nevertheless was a fine act which deserves high praise. We cannot have too much of such stern holding aloof socially from men politically corrupt. And in congratulating Col. Roosevelt on the stand he took with Lorimer, we must add a word of special felicitation upon his now being in a position where he is free to make no compromise with sin. It must be a source of great relief and satisfaction to him that he no longer has to muzzle his honest instincts at the demand of party regularity or political expediency. There are men living to whom Mr. Roosevelt said indignantly of

Mr. Blaine in 1884, "But he is a thief!" Yet because the party nominated Blaine, and there was no possibility of Mr. Roosevelt's being able to do good by getting office except through sticking to the party, he swallowed his righteous anger and supported Blaine. So during all the years when he sustained social as well as political relations with Platt and Quay, it must have been galling to him in the extreme to be compelled to give countenance to men whom in his heart he abhorred, simply because they had the votes and the Congressional delegations of two great States, without which his plans to bless the country could not be carried out. And when Quay died and Mr. Roosevelt sent a telegram in praise of that "friend" of his, he was doubtless burning all the time to speak fittingly of one of the most sinister political figures of the age, who had been openly accused of robbing the State Treasury, and whose trail was marked by the suicide of bank cashiers whom he had tempted and ruined. But from all those old trammels which held Mr. Roosevelt dumb in the presence of powerful political criminals, he is to-day happily freed, and we congratulate him on the new liberty he now has to spurn a man like Lorimer—after he has been found out and shorn of power.

The four Democratic members of the Ballinger investigating committee, and Mr. Madison, the insurgent Republican member, have gone on record as sustaining the Glavis-Pinchot contentions against the Secretary of the Interior. The vote taken, in the absence of a number of the Republican members, must, of course, be regarded merely as a strategic move; it would be preposterous to propose seriously to enter the findings of the committee, after months of inquiry, in any such way. The object was to compel action on the part of the majority members, who have shown an inclination to shove the matter over until after the November elections. In the meantime the action taken by the minority has had the effect of showing that Mr. Madison, as well as the Democratic members, goes the full length of declaring that Mr. Ballinger's course was such that he "should no longer be retained" in the office of Secretary of

the Interior. It is to be noted, however, that the judgments expressed in the resolutions offered by Mr. Madison, and adopted in the vote taken, are more carefully limited as regards the grounds of the conclusion than was the case with the resolutions offered by Senator Fletcher, for which Mr. Madison's were a substitute.

In a sketch of Gov. Harmon in this month's *Review of Reviews*, an interesting quotation is given from an address delivered by him at the opening of the Law School of the University of Cincinnati in 1905. Referring to the relation of lawyers to corporations, the lawyer, he said, should not refuse to represent corporations, but "he must not forget that they, unlike his ordinary clients, have or may have interests which conflict with those of the public, and that his first duty is to the public, not only because he is a citizen, but because from it he has received his commission as an officer of justice." This is sound doctrine, well expressed; few things would be more wholesome than the effective inculcation of it in the minds of the rising generation of lawyers. And so far as Mr. Harmon is concerned, the interesting thing is that his practice has squared with his preaching. The sketch referred to points out the important responsibilities that have fallen to Mr. Harmon in connection with his corporation practice, and the ability and success with which he has fulfilled them; but he has never, it is asserted—and, we believe, with truth—placed his services at the disposal of any corporation in opposition to the public interest. The more one considers both Gov. Harmon's public record and his personal traits, the more does his exceptional fitness for the leadership of the Democratic party in the next Presidential campaign impress itself.

The Democrats of Connecticut have made a notable contribution to that rehabilitating of the Democratic party of which there are beginning to be many promising signs. The mere fact of the nomination of such a man as Judge Simeon E. Baldwin for the Governorship would be significant and important,

but the unanimity and genuine enthusiasm of the convention gave to it a far greater value. Not since the demoralization of the party by the free-silver issue in 1896 has the party in Connecticut manifested anything like the spirit that was displayed at New Haven last week. And this enthusiasm was evoked not by any cheap appeal to mushroom sentiment, but by the prospect of a campaign for the election of a man of the highest intellectual and moral qualifications, a man who, if chosen Governor, will be sure to give to the State service of great and enduring value. It will be up-hill work to elect Judge Baldwin, in the face of the very large majorities which the Republicans have been recording in Connecticut in recent years, but the Democrats evidently feel that there is a good chance of accomplishing that result.

No result of the voting last week is matter for more hearty congratulation than the decisive victory of State Senator Bass as Republican candidate for Governor in the New Hampshire primaries. To talk of the contest in New Hampshire as a fight between conservatives and progressives is to give a very misleading impression of the struggle. It is true, of course, that the fight, in one aspect, formed part of the war that is going on all along the line between "insurgents" and "regulars"; but in New Hampshire, more than in perhaps any other State, the question really at issue was whether the people would support a corrupt political organization, the servant of a debasing railway corporation, or would register their verdict for an able, honest, and fearless candidate representing the cause of a vitally necessary reform. The result was a crushing defeat for the ring, the vote being about two to one in favor of Bass. And, as though to emphasize the value of the direct primary as an instrument of sound government, two men of national prominence and great political skill—Senator Gallinger and ex-Senator Chandler—though one was on the Bass side and the other against him, were defeated as candidates for delegate to the State Convention. These results cannot be dismissed without a word of sincere and hearty praise for Winston Churchill, to whose patriotic, persistent, and unselfish efforts this victory of decency, in a State the corrup-

tion of whose politics has been a byword for at least forty years, is chiefly due.

The election in Vermont shows that 10,000 Republicans who voted two years ago declined to go to the polls last week, while there were 1,000 more Democratic votes than last year. The Democratic candidate is quoted as saying that the result was due more to dissatisfaction with the Republican machine than to anger over the tariff. If that be true, conditions in Vermont are different from those in other States where insurgency and dissatisfaction with the tariff go hand in hand. Be that as it may, the small Republican majority of 17,500 indicates clearly that there is every prospect of as Democratic a year as 1890. Then, too, it was the stay-at-home Republican vote that counted. This year there is every reason to look for a similarly large stay-at-home vote in States like New York, Ohio, and Indiana, where the Republican party is fairly torn to pieces by factional fights and the sharp division of sentiment between the followers of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft. Strong Democratic candidates like Judge Baldwin in Connecticut and Woodrow Wilson in New Jersey will draw many Republican votes, but in a crisis like this there will also be many who will prefer not to vote at all.

Julius Cæsar Burrows, as a result of the primaries in Michigan, will retire from the United States Senate along with his friends and co-laborers, Aldrich and Hale. As he read the returns, he must have wished he had followed their example and retired of his own will rather than under the propulsion of the Republican voters' boot. It is particularly hard for him to contemplate the fact that he has been thrust aside in favor of "Young Mr. Townsend," as he calls him, an insurgent Representative who last spring was one of the leaders in the revolt against Cannonism. Mr. Townsend declared that Mr. Burrows was too old. Mr. Burrows retorted that he was "only seventy-three" and that there were many older men than he in the Senate. He further pointed out that as he would almost certainly succeed Aldrich as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Michigan would be sacrificing "her own best interests" in defeating him.

But Michigan has decided she would rather sacrifice her "best interests" and have Mr. Townsend, than stand six years more of Mr. Burrows.

Less than three months ago, Mr. Sherman, returning from a standpat "convention" in Milwaukee, declared that there were no insurgents in Wisconsin. Now "the original insurgent," Robert M. La Follette, has carried his party primaries against Cook, his standpat opponent, by a vote estimated at 3 or possibly 4 to 1. From this it is evident either that the Vice-President was misled as to conditions in Wisconsin, or that Wisconsin standpatters have a habit of voting for progressive candidates. As a matter of fact, any other result so far as La Follette is concerned would have been surprising. Every other outsider who has visited the State—and the list has included Cummins and Dolliver, Clapp, Bristow, Heney, Pinchot, and Garfield—has declared that Wisconsin was as strongly progressive as Kansas. The recent primary gave proof of it. The only question seemed to be whether the Legislature would ratify the people's choice. Indications point to the selection of a majority of members pledged to carry out the primary's mandate. With the exception of the contest for Governor, in which the progressive vote was divided and into which the local option issue introduced complications, the entire progressive ticket appears to have been successful.

The tactics pursued by the Eastern railways in submitting evidence last week were, to say the least, singular. Their programme amounted to presenting gross totals and percentages of increase in wages and proposed increase in revenue through higher freights, while declaring inability or unwillingness to give the details. It was inevitable that such a course of action should have prejudiced the railways' case at the very start. Nothing could be more damaging to their contentions, in the eyes either of the Commission or of the general public, than to create the impression that the companies were hiding essential facts. At the beginning of this week's hearing there were some signs that a more rational policy is to be pursued in subsequent testimony, and we trust that the expectation will be fulfilled.

The death of Lloyd W. Bowers, the Solicitor-General, is a genuine loss to the country. A man of great natural ability, one of the leaders of his profession, he had to a remarkable degree the confidence of President Taft and the other public men who knew him. It is beyond question that he would soon have ornamented the Supreme Court. Indeed, he would probably have been appointed ere this had he not been connected with the Government side of the highly important cases now down for a rehearing. His tragically sudden death again embarrasses the Supreme Court, and the Government particularly, in the matter of the Constitutionality of the corporation tax, the rehearing of which must undoubtedly be postponed. Mr. Bowers was a corporation lawyer and a railway lawyer, in that he was for years counsel to the Chicago and Northwestern Railway, and yet, when he gave up a large salary to enter the Government service at a much smaller one, no one for a moment insinuated that his previous professional engagements prevented his performing his new duties in an unbiassed and disinterested manner. It was a timely reminder that there are corporation lawyers and corporation lawyers—those who sell themselves and those who honor their profession by cleaving to its highest standards, and refusing to become the devisers of stock juggling and of ways to circumvent the laws.

It is high time that the question be squarely faced of how compliance with the customs law on the part of returning travellers may be obtained without making every American's return to his or her native country a source of humiliation and exasperation. Collector Loeb deserves great credit for making it perfectly unmistakable that the law, under his administration, will be no respecter of persons, though he has carried his inquisition methods, in some instances, to outrageous lengths. It should be possible, however, to execute the law effectively, and at the same time to treat returning travellers in a decent and civilized manner, as is done in other countries; but, in order to accomplish this, there must be a clear recognition of the fact that there are two methods available for the prevention of violations of law, and not only one. We do not prevent counterfeiting by looking into

everybody's pocketbook to see whether he has counterfeit money or by searching everybody's house to see whether he has a counterfeiting plant in it. What we do is to make the punishment very heavy when the counterfeiter, or the person who knowingly passes counterfeit money, is found.

A study in comparative mortality statistics among college students, by William Roscoe Thayer in the *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, gives a new application to the incidence of the wages of sin. Mr. Thayer has compared the death rate among bachelors of arts in five classes with the rate among members of the same classes who, for one reason or another, left college without taking their degree. Taking five classes between 1876 and 1885, he finds that after a lapse of twenty-five years, there had died, out of a total of 927 A.B.'s, 140 men, or 15+ per cent.; whereas, out of 299 temporary members, there died 93, or 32+ per cent. Not all temporary members have necessarily been "dropped." There are excellent scholars who come to Harvard with the intention of staying only a year or two, but that makes the case of the black sheep even less hopeful. Mr. Thayer does not want to generalize too rashly, but he believes nevertheless, that "the figures examined warrant us in concluding that dropping often implies more than mere juvenile inattention or whim, or than revolt against academic restraints. It seems to indicate a predisposition to bodily, mental, or moral inefficiency, which sooner or later, and usually sooner rather than later, results in disability and death. We all know temporary members who have done noble things; but as a group, the stars in their courses are against them. The fellow who 'could stand high, if he wanted to,' should be warned that his not 'wanting to' is an unfavorable symptom." Harvard figures continue to be merciless to the idler. The pretty legend that the man who loafs in college does exceptionally well in the professional schools was recently exploded. Now comes the apparent fact that if you flunk your examinations, you not only make a mess of life, but die at an unpleasantly early age.

Although the tunnels which now connect Switzerland with Italy have greatly decreased the importance of the St. Bernard and other passes, especially

during the eight months of snow, it is still deemed advisable to employ St. Bernard dogs, as in the good old times. It is no longer customary to send out the dogs alone, with baskets of food and drink, but a man always accompanies them. Usually a young dog is taken along that he may learn his duties. These dogs are not really the famous old St. Bernard breed. That originated in the fourteenth century, through a cross between a shepherd dog from Wales and a Scandinavian dog whose parents were a Great Dane and a Pyrenean mastiff. The last pure descendant of this tribe was buried under an avalanche in 1816. Fortunately, there were found subsequently, at Martigny and on the Simplon Pass, a few dogs which, by crossing with mates from Wales, yielded the modern St. Bernard dog, which is physically even stronger than his mediæval namesake, and shares most of his traits. The loss of one of these dogs, as recent cablegrams show, is regarded as a calamity.

General Juan Estrada, having fought long and valiantly in behalf of the right of the Nicaraguan people to say who shall be their President, now makes the first tentative, timid proposal of a year's postponement of the election. Presumably Gen. Estrada is actuated by the highest ideal of fairness. If the election were to take place to-day, he is well aware that, with the halo of military glory still fresh about his brow, there would not be the ghost of a chance for any other candidate. The populace would simply insist on forcing him into the Presidential chair that has been so recently and repeatedly vacated. Estrada has consequently determined to wait until his prestige declines to the common level of Nicaraguan statesmanship and then take his chances. It would be hard to find a parallel instance in all the annals of self-sacrifice. To think that the man who might be President of Nicaragua for the constitutional term of six years at a handsome constitutional salary, should be content to remain Provisional President for an indefinite number of years at any salary he can get! No doubt the fortunate Nicaraguan people will count themselves still more fortunate, after fighting a year to secure a fair election, to have the whole troublesome duty taken off their shoulders.

MAINE AND AFTER.

Democratic gains were generally expected in Monday's election in Maine, and it was thought possible that a Democratic Governor might be chosen by a narrow plurality; but the most sanguine did not look for such a tremendous overturn as the Republicans actually have suffered. They have lost the Governorship for the first time in thirty years—and even in 1880 the Democratic-Greenback fusion won only by a squeak and a “fluke,” the State going Republican in the Presidential election in the following November—and that by a majority little short of 9,000. Until two years ago, the Republicans regularly elected their Governors by majorities of from 25,000 to 34,000. Even as compared with 1906 and 1908, when the majorities dropped to 8,000, Mr. Plaisted's winning this year takes on the proportions of a political revolution. Maine's vote is not large, the total being about 142,000. A gain of 17,000 on that basis is a very high percentage. Applied to New York, it would mean a Democratic majority of 150,000 or so. And the result in Maine cannot be explained, as was that in Vermont, by Republicans staying at home. The Republican vote fell off, but the Democratic went up. There was an actual change of parties by many electors. Even after due allowance is made for the effect of the liquor issue and for changes in the population in some Maine cities, the election of Plaisted by an unexpectedly large majority will be everywhere regarded as a political portent. If the Vermont barometer was set for foul Republican weather, the Maine indications are for something like hurricane conditions.

The Republican upset seems even more disastrous when we turn to the figures for Congressmen and for the Legislature. Two Republican Representatives, in districts which have been thought absolutely “safe” from time immemorial, are defeated by majorities of 2,000 and 3,000, while the other two pull out, if the final returns show that they have pulled out, by pluralities of the most meagre sort. This is sufficiently astounding, but the news that the Democrats have triumphantly carried the Legislature also, and will elect a United States Senator to succeed Senator Hale, is fairly amazing. As a dazed Republican in Washington exclaimed, when

he heard of the Maine election: “If the Democrats have carried the Legislature, too, the world will come to an end.”

Everywhere it is admitted that the sweeping Democratic victory in Maine is not due to “local causes.” These concededly entered into the campaign, but did not determine the result. That is too large, too pervasive throughout the State, where the country districts were affected as well as the cities, to be accounted for by anything except a general cause. That cause was undoubtedly intense dissatisfaction within the Republican party. Specifically, it was dissatisfaction with the Republican tariff. High prices and the increased cost of living have made the people, even in protected Maine, restless and angry, and have led them to question the wisdom of the policy of taxing ourselves rich more sharply than ever before. The whole brunt of the fighting, at least in the Congressional districts, was against the Payne-Aldrich tariff. Democratic campaigners were even so sacrilegious as to talk of the advantages of free trade, and thereupon the Republican managers thought the Lord had delivered those Philistines into their hands. No candidate for Congress in Maine could utter the words “free trade” and live, they joyfully said. But they are wiser now. As for the Republican Representatives, Messrs. Swasey, Burleigh, and Guernsey, who had voted for the high-tariff law, they were savagely heckled by the most direct and awkward questions. On one widely circulated campaign card, such ugly queries were put to them by name as the following:

Why did you vote to admit raw silk free and only place a duty of 53 per cent. on the manufactured article, at the same time placing a duty of 135 per cent. on woollen or worsted cloths valued at not more than 40 cents a pound? Was it because silk is used by the greater number of your constituents and woollen and worsted only by a few?

Why did you vote to tax champagne from 54 to 66 per cent. and wearing apparel at 80 to 92 per cent.? Was it to encourage your constituents to drink champagne and to discourage them from wearing woollen clothes?

Why did you vote to tax hats bringing not over \$4.50 per dozen at 77 per cent. and those valued at more than \$18 per dozen only 47 per cent.? In whose interest was this done; your poor or rich constituent?

There must be a reason for *your* vote. Will you kindly give it to your constituents *before they vote*, September 12?

Look at the surprising figures from

Maine as they will, Republicans are unable to see in them anything but a gloomy prophecy of disaster in the November elections. In short, we have to-day conclusive evidence that President Taft was right when he said last winter, with appalling frankness, that the signs were plain that his Administration was not popular, and that the Democrats would elect a majority of the next House of Representatives. The business world has pretty plainly settled down to that belief. All along, it has been in the air; the Maine election crystallizes it into figures which not even the blindly partisan can misread.

WHITHER IS ROOSEVELT DRIFTING?

That Mr. Roosevelt has appropriated virtually the entire Bryan baggage, with the exception of the defunct free-silver issue, has become one of the accepted commonplaces of American politics. We do not remember that the assertion has ever been seriously denied. But there is a matter of far greater importance than any mere question of originality, or priority, or plagiarism. The fact is that Mr. Roosevelt has done much more than make his own the specific purposes for which Mr. Bryan stood, many of which were wholesome and necessary. He has adopted Bryan's attitude toward the great underlying problems of the economic organization of society; has adopted that attitude and gone much farther with it than Mr. Bryan ever undertook to do. What that attitude is, it would be difficult to define; but its essence consists in a readiness to assume as a governmental function the task of remedying economic evils or anomalies, however deep may be their foundation in the inmost structure of our economic life, and however violent may be the departure from the established principles of our government which that task inevitably involves. In this direction, Roosevelt has utterly distanced Bryan; and in his Osawatimie speech he gave the clearest possible indication that what he has thus far done and said is but an earnest of what he stands ready to say and do in the future.

These things being so, it is extremely instructive to turn back in the record to the time when Mr. Bryan was making his first great fight, and when Mr. Roosevelt was making speeches against