

we speak with authority—the authority of a long and intimate acquaintance, and what we believe to be a complete understanding of the spirit and motive which actuate him in all his public work and utterances.



DEMOCRACY ON TRIAL

The New York papers publish a formal statement by Mr. Barnes, of Albany, from which we clip the following paragraph :

The recent attack upon the Supreme Court of the United States by a keen-witted and aspiring citizen could not have been made without a purpose well thought out. It was an appeal to passion. If this appeal against judicial decisions is popular and is not rebuked, there is no reason whatsoever, if a direct primary law should be enacted in this State, that candidates for judicial offices, compelled to run the gauntlet of a district or State-wide primary, would not, in order to appeal to the temporary sentiments of the moment, declare in advance their attitude upon matters which would come before them for judicial review. Instead of men of long legal experience and judicial training, there would be candidates for the bench from lawyers who would not hesitate to make that kind of appeal to the people which would be a disgrace to their profession.

This paragraph puts in concrete form the real issue joined between the Reactionaries and the Progressives. The Progressives believe in popular government ; the Reactionaries do not. The Progressives believe that the people are competent to select their own officials ; the Reactionaries do not. The Progressives believe that the functionaries so selected, from village constable to Supreme Court judge, are servants of the people, interpreters and executants of the people's will, and therefore responsible to the frank criticism of the people who have selected them ; the Reactionaries believe that they are, and should be, superior to criticism. Sir Henry Maine, quoting John Stuart Mill and Sir James Stephen, declares that the essential difference between a monarchical and a democratic government is this : in a monarchical government the "rulers are presumably wise and good, the rightful rulers and guides of the whole population ;" in a democratic government "the ruler is the agent and servant, and the subject the wise and good master, who is obliged to delegate his power to the so-

called ruler because, being a multitude, he cannot use it himself." Therefore, in a monarchy it is unseemly for the people to criticise the rulers, who are their superiors ; while in a democratic government the officials who carry on the government are always subject to the criticism of those whom they serve. Measured by this test, the government which Governor Hughes and the Progressives are fighting for is a democracy ; the government which Mr. Barnes and the Reactionaries are fighting for is an oligarchy.

There are a great many people in this country who do not believe in popular government. They may believe in government *for* the people ; but they do not believe in government *by* the people. They believe in the "remnant." They believe that political wisdom is in the few, and the few should rule. They believe that railway experts can manage a railway better than the public can ; therefore they do not believe in regulation of the railways by the Government. They believe that the men of individual enterprise can develop the country better if they are not interfered with ; therefore they do not believe in Conservation. They believe that capitalistic managers should have absolute control of the great organized industries, that the workers should take the work, the wages, and the conditions assigned to them ; therefore they do not believe in trade unions. They believe that a few men—shall we say self-appointed, or shall we say the result of natural selection?—can choose the functionaries for the people better than the people can select their functionaries for themselves ; therefore they select the candidate, though they reluctantly allow the people in the election which follows to exercise a veto power over the selection. They believe that a small and select body can legislate for the people better than can the elected representatives of the people ; therefore they give to such a small and select body the power to determine what matters may come before the representatives of the people to be considered and what the action of the party shall be on such measures when they are permitted to be presented to the legislative body for its action.

There is much to be said for the appointment of judges of our courts as the

Federal judges are appointed. But the Federal judges are appointed by the President, in the open. The country knows who makes the appointment, who receives the appointment, and why it is made. Often before appointment the candidates are discussed; always after appointment they are described. And the President can be held by the people to strict account for the appointments which he makes, as he can for every other Executive act. But appointments by the bosses, to be ratified or rejected by the people, are made in secret, by unknown, and therefore irresponsible, persons. There is generally no discussion of the candidates before appointment. Any criticism of them afterward is resented. And there is no way of calling to account the appointing power if the appointment is unsatisfactory. For the bosses are not elected by the people; they are self-elected.

The Outlook takes issue with Mr. Barnes in his assumption that the people are not competent to select their own candidates, and thanks him for stating the issue so clearly. We believe in the competence of the American people. No doubt they have made mistakes. No doubt they are sometimes liable to unreasonable prejudices; sometimes to unreasoning enthusiasms. But political history has repeatedly shown that the popular judgment is more to be trusted than the judgment of the self-selected politicians. The politicians wanted Seward for President; the people wanted Abraham Lincoln; and the Civil War made it perfectly clear which was right. The politicians vigorously opposed the nomination of Mr. Cleveland; the people demanded his nomination, and his Administration abundantly justified their judgment. The "Old Guard" accepted with a wry face the nomination of Mr. Hughes, forced upon them by popular demand; and if the people had the opportunity, they would triumphantly re-elect him for a third term this fall. The wise reformers—and The Outlook agreed with them—opposed the election of Mr. Gaynor as Mayor; the people elected him and rejected the rest of the Tammany ticket; and his administration has been so notable that the citi-

zens of the second city in the world, without regard to party, hope that he will not be persuaded to lay down the work he has begun so admirably in order to take up what we are convinced is the less important task of the Governor of the State.

Democracy is possible without the direct primary. But the opposition to the direct primary is engineered by men who do not believe in democracy. The Outlook believes in democracy, and it believes in the direct primary because it believes in democracy. It believes in the right of the people to rule, because it believes in the competence of the people to rule. And it reaffirms its faith in the maxim:

The remedy for the evils in democracy is more democracy.



LIVING OUT OF DOORS

The gospel of play is preached and practiced by Americans in rapidly increasing numbers. The nervous strain is far greater than it was a generation ago, but a multitude of men have discovered that the way of health is also the pathway to success, and are intercalating their days of concentrated energy with days of relaxation. The sallow dyspeptic in the black broadcloth coat has given place to a stout, vigorous, aggressive man of affairs who belongs to a golf club, sails a boat, and is his own chauffeur. The contemporary American hunts, fishes, plays tennis, golf, polo; takes a midwinter, as well as a midsummer, vacation; and knows the ardors of mountain climbing. College life goes out of doors with the first flush of spring and stays out of doors until the snow flies. American girls pursue athletics, not with amateurish enthusiasm, but with the trained zeal of the professional. Those who cannot afford expensive recreation crowd excursion steamers and throng near-by seaside resorts. Shop-girls are helped to secure wholesome vacation conditions, and small armies of children are marshaled in tenement districts and sent on innocent predatory expeditions into the country. In a word, there is in America a National movement out of doors with the advent of the season that