

## 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

him. On September 29, 1896, in a speech at Utica, Roosevelt thus expressed his judgment of that agitation of which—apart from the lost cause of silver—he has now himself become the foremost leader:

Mr. Bryan is appealing more and more openly to the base malignancy and hatred of those demagogues who strive to lead laboring men to ruin, in order to wreak their vengeance on the thrifty and well-to-do. He advocates principles sufficiently silly and wicked to make them fit well in the mouth of an anarchist leader. For the government of Washington and Lincoln, for the system of orderly liberty bequeathed to us by our forefathers, he would substitute a red welter of lawlessness as fantastic and as vicious as the dream of a European communist, turning aside from the American principles of government, repudiating everything which has made the name America a symbol of hope among nations. Instead of government of the people, for the people, and by the people, which we now have, Mr. Bryan would substitute a government of the mob.

Against Mr. Bryan and his programme many loud voices were raised in that famous campaign, but it would be difficult to find any utterance to match this for violence of denunciation and intensity of abhorrence. Yet to-day the same voice is hurling epithets and anathemas almost as consuming against everybody who fails to agree with him in the very views which he was then denouncing as abhorrent to American principles.

How far Mr. Roosevelt is prepared to go along the line of governmental domination of economic affairs was never so clearly shown as in the Osawatomie speech, and especially in this remarkable passage of it:

We grudge no man a fortune which represents his own power and sagacity, when exercised with entire regard to the welfare of his fellows. But the fortune must be honorably obtained and well used. It is not even enough that it should have been gained without doing damage to the community. We should permit it to be gained only so long as the gaining represents benefit to the community. This, I know, implies a policy of a far more active governmental interference with social and economic conditions in this country than we have yet had, but I think we have got to face the fact that such an increase in governmental control is now necessary.

This opens up an endless vista of legislative and administrative interference with business affairs and personal activity, in comparison with which anything ever proposed by Bryan becomes a mere passing trifle. It is predicated on the assumption that whatever is wrong in human affairs or human relations can be mended by governmental

fiat; that once we have arrived at a conclusion as to what is ideally desirable, we must grasp at the implement that lies nearest to hand and rush in with a remedy; that the complexities and difficulties which have beset mankind since the dawn of history need never have existed but for want of a strong arm determined to enforce a square deal all round. As ready as the most extreme Socialist to grapple with the deepest problems of the economic organization, Mr. Roosevelt differs from him only in indulging a childlike confidence in the possibility of solving them by the simple process of piling upon a central government more and more duties of supervision and control, and clothing the Executive with greater and greater powers.

Whether the people of the United States will be so carried away from their moorings as to follow this half-baked Rooseveltian Socialism is the great question of the day. Such a result would be impossible but for the unparalleled personal hold that Mr. Roosevelt has established upon the people in all parts of the country; but as matters stand, no prediction based upon the past attitude of the nation toward projects of radical change and disturbance is of any practical value. Confronted in the abstract with the question raised by such a pronouncement as that which we have quoted from the Osawatomie speech, nine out of ten Americans would simply dismiss it as moonshine; but it is not presented in the abstract. It is not a theory that confronts us, but a man. Ask the average American whether he wants laws passed that shall permit people to gain money "only so long as the gaining represents benefit to the community," and to retain it only if it has been "honorably obtained and well used," and he would laugh at the question; but the same man will applaud Roosevelt to the skies when he says he is going to see to it that these things shall be done. It is to the contemplation of government—and especially the chief executive at Washington—as the omnipotent source of all good, the infallible righter of all economic wrongs, that Roosevelt is rapidly accustoming millions of our people; and the great question is whether or not the old-time American sturdiness and common sense have still sufficient vitality to throw off this pseudo-social-

ist virus before it has done immeasurable mischief.

#### THE FISHERIES DECISION.

The full meaning of the award handed down by the Hague Tribunal in the Newfoundland fisheries arbitration can be attained only by considering certain circumstances of which the court and the court's opinion seem to have taken no official cognizance. Even Washington concedes that on the face of the award Great Britain has won a substantial victory. Of the seven questions submitted for adjudication the two principal ones have been decided in her favor. Of the five minor points decided in favor of the United States, several bear conditions and limitations; so that here, too, Great Britain has not lost everything. The two points on which she won declare that Great Britain is entitled to make local fishing regulations without the consent of our government, and that the three-mile zone from which American vessels are excluded shall be measured from a line stretching across the mouth of open bays instead of following the windings of the shore line of the bay. Under the American contention it would have been possible for our fishermen to enter bays more than six miles wide and three miles deep. By the Hague award they may not enter any bay, no matter how broad and deep it may be.

Here, apparently, is a heavy setback for our fishermen, to be thus excluded from waters which at certain seasons constitute the most valuable fishing grounds. But here, too, enters the highly important fact that this American fishery over which we have been at odds with Great Britain from the very first years of our national existence, has, for the last half-century, been no fishery at all, but a branch of international trade. We have, before this, quoted the succinct statement by a Newfoundland journalist, that "the practice of fifty years has been for American vessels to visit the coast and purchase cargoes of these herrings from resident fishermen who actually caught them and sold them to the American crafts as a matter of ordinary commerce." Hence to be excluded from certain valuable coast waters or not to be excluded, makes comparatively little difference to our sturdy American fishermen for whose benefit the heavy duty on foreign fish is writ-