

Bureau, speaking for the ex-service man, says: "Whether it be a matter of calling the Bureau's attention to an unrewarded claim, or an ill man needing hospitalization, or of tiding the sick veteran over the time which must elapse before Government aid can be offered, the Red Cross is always on the job with expert service and the necessary goods."

These are only the larger divisions of the humane work of the American Red Cross. Its public health activities, its encouragement of sound sanitary systems, its education in first aid, its training of nurses, its work in the schools, are less outstanding, but combined are extremely valuable.

We join with President Harding in urging Americans to renew their allegiance to the Red Cross "in the interests of our common humanity and of the service which we owe to our fellow-men."

## THE ELECTION AS A SCHOOL

Midnight, October 22, 1780.

*Franklin.* Eh! oh! eh! What have I done to merit these cruel sufferings?

*Gout.* Many things: you have ate and drunk too freely and too much indulged those legs of yours in their indolence.

*Franklin.* Who is it that accuses me?

*Gout.* It is I, even I, the Gout.

*Franklin.* What? My enemy in person?

*Gout.* No, not your enemy.

**B**ENJAMIN FRANKLIN, whose paper in the form of a dialogue between himself and the gout thus begins, was wise enough to learn the uses of adversity. What the gout was to Franklin failure can be made to be to any one. It can be made to serve as a physician, a teacher, a good friend.

Fools encounter defeat or censure, and become angry.

The timid encounter defeat or censure, and become discouraged.

The wise encounter defeat or censure, and learn from it.

Whether the elections on November 7 were a victory for the Democratic party is disputed; but it is universally recognized that those elections were a defeat for the Republican party. There is reason for doubt whether the people by their votes were eager to register their approval of the Democratic party; but there is no doubt that they registered censure for the Republican party.

By our laws the Republican party, in spite of the adverse vote, will remain in power in the National Administration for over two years to come; and will even continue in control of Congress by the present overwhelming majority until next March, and by a narrower margin

for two years thereafter. It is therefore of great concern to the Nation whether the rebuke administered at the polls will cause the Republican leaders to be angry, or discouraged, or willing to learn.

If experience of the past is any guide for the future, it is certain that some Republican leaders will have learned nothing. When in 1910 the people began to show dissatisfaction with the conduct of the Government, Republican leaders in power paid little attention; and when the revolt came they proved their incapacity for authority by a course which was guided by anger and resentment. Again in 1916 Republican leaders had a great opportunity of profiting by their lesson, but this time, to their undoing, they were guided by timidity. We hope for the sake of the country that such leaders will not prove to be in control of the dominant party now. We hope that those who are in position of authority in the party will repress whatever anger they are inclined to and overcome whatever timidity they are tempted by, and will regard this election as a school.

If they do, they will find defeat a good teacher.

Defeat can teach them a lesson in leadership. A self-governing people like the Americans do not like bosses, but they demand leaders. They do not wish to be ordered about and told what to do; but they are ready to follow a man who understands their needs, has the insight to read their thoughts and interpret them aright, has the knowledge of the past to enable him to avoid pitfalls, has faith in the country's future, and has the authority of character and mind to direct the forces of government in carrying out the people's will. It is a mistake to believe that the people of America do not want leaders. It is a mistake to believe that the people are afraid to have those in positions of executive responsibility exercise authority. No two men in American history form a more striking contrast than Roosevelt and Wilson, but they both were willing to lead, and each found that the people were willing to follow him as long as they believed he represented their will and purpose. To-day there is a widespread feeling that the Administration has been reluctant to lead. In particular, it is felt that the President, out of a sincere and unselfish desire to promote the spirit of co-operation, has been too willing to forego opportunities for shaping legislation, for forming and guiding public opinion, and for controlling through executive authority such disturbances as the coal and railway strikes. There is a feeling also that within Congress itself there is lack of intelligent, public-spirited, courageous

leadership. The people have common sense enough to know that the legislative and the executive machinery cannot run without direction. They want in charge of that machinery engineers who are willing to accept responsibility and exercise the corresponding authority.

Defeat can also teach Republican leaders a lesson in political appointments. Americans as a rule recognize the need of political organization. Indeed, they are among the most conservative people in the world in their loyalty to organized parties. During the past generation, however, they have been becoming more and more distrustful of party politics and party politicians. They are more sensitive than they were to appointments made for purely party reasons. They demand in every appointment at least the apparent justification of public service instead of party reward. They may not always be right in their judgment as to the men most fitted for public positions. They are willing to roll up a large vote for a man like Charles Steinmetz for the position of State Engineer in New York because, perhaps without sufficient reason, they believe that a man who has gained a great reputation as an inventor and as a scientist would be a good administrator of a public office that has to do with engineering; and they do this although Mr. Steinmetz had no place on either of the great party tickets. They believe that the appointment of Mr. Daugherty to the position of Attorney-General was not because he was the greatest lawyer available but because he was a powerful agent of the party in the State. They believe that the appointment of Mr. Reilly to Porto Rico was not because he was the fittest man that could be found for the difficult task of colonial administrator, but because it was convenient to find some berth for a man who had rendered political service. They ought perhaps to remember that the former Administration made a worse appointment to Santo Domingo, and that the present Administration has chosen for Governor of the Philippines the greatest colonial administrator in history; but it ought not to be altogether distasteful to Republicans that the people should expect better things of this Administration than the worst of the preceding one, or that they should consider it natural that the high standard adopted in the Philippines should be applied to Porto Rico and elsewhere. That there is widespread dissatisfaction with the appointment of Dr. Sawyer as the Administration's chief spokesman concerning public health and public welfare is obvious, and it is no less pronounced because that appointment is attributed to personal rather than political causes. More and

more people are demanding that appointments to public office should be made for public reasons.

Defeat ought to be able to teach Republican leaders a lesson in political management. Again and again Americans have shown their discontent with the old method, followed in both parties, known as log-rolling. The fact that the people themselves are apt to follow this method in local politics renders them no more tolerant of it when it is followed in National politics; indeed, it may be one of the very reasons why they are intolerant of it. They do not like petty ways of dealing with matters of National concern. In particular, they are outraged by the log-rolling method as applied to the tariff. Very few Americans know anything about the specific schedules of the Tariff Bill which Congress recently passed; but they saw those schedules determined by a log-rolling method. They saw their representatives swapping votes for the sake of satisfying special interests, giving a concession here for the sake of one interest in exchange for concessions on behalf of another interest. They have seen that method used again and again; and if they are disgusted with it more this time than ever before, it is because their disgust has become cumulative. It is this kind of political management that they identify with reaction. They are ready to trust almost any man who speaks to them in the terms of general interests as distinct from those who seek favor by giving favors for special interests.

Defeat possibly may teach Republican leaders, finally, a lesson in humanity. No matter how efficient, or high-minded, or industrious a public servant may be, Americans are not likely to trust him long with responsibility if they feel that he does not understand them and does not see the problems of the Nation in terms of the problems of the individuals who comprise the Nation. Men of widely different political opinions, widely different economic views, may all be successful in a single election if they all appear to the people to be thinking in terms of the experience of the individual men and women whom they seek to represent. Gifford Pinchot and Smith Brookhart, "Al" Smith and Henry Ford, to cite but four instances out of many, are men whom the people generally regard as human. It was this element of human understanding, the ability to think as the people themselves were thinking, that gave Theodore Roosevelt a unique place of leadership as long as he lived and will endear his memory to the American people through all coming generations. Such personalities cannot be made to order, but if party leaders

wish to maintain their party in control they must find men who not only have integrity and public spirit and the genius for command, but also personal understanding of the ordinary man and woman.

These, we think, are some of the lessons which defeat may teach the Republican leaders if they are teachable. Perhaps at the end of their course of discipline they may be tempted to say to Defeat as Franklin said to the Gout: "I submit and thank you for the past, but intreat the discontinuance of your visits for the future; for in my mind one had better die than be cured so dolefully." And possibly they might profit, as indeed all political leaders would profit, if Gout's final warning might be put into the mouth of Defeat: "I know you too well. You promise fair, but after a few months of good health you will return to your old habits; your fine promises will be forgotten like the forms of the last year's clouds. Let us, then, finish the account, and I will go. But I leave you with an assurance of visiting you again at a proper time and place; for my object is your good, and you are sensible now that I am your real friend."

## PROHIBITION

IF, as the "Wets" claim, prohibition was put over on an unsuspecting and unwilling public by the covert and cunning action of a small group of zealots and fanatics, the prohibitory law is certainly not going to stay on the statute-books without wide discussion and a good many rigorous tests of public sentiment.

The late election furnished some of those tests. The triumph of Senator Edwards in New Jersey certainly shows that an unmistakable majority of the voters of that State want beer and light wines, if not the good old American corner saloon. In New York the issue was somewhat obscured, although the "Drys" must admit that Governor Smith's overwhelming vote is an indication that the ardor of the women of the State for prohibition is not what it was thought to be. In Massachusetts the "Wets" claim to be encouraged by the election, although there the issue was, as in New York, obscured by other questions.

The "Drys," however, are justified in being jubilant about California and Ohio. California, in which wine-making was until recently a leading industry, has adopted by a clear majority a measure which insures effective State co-operation with the Federal authorities in enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment. This is really significant. And Ohio, which has never been a pro-

hibition State, rolled up the extraordinary majority of 187,000 against light wines and beer.

The number of Americans who want a return of the gin-mill, the corner liquor saloon, the village barroom, is negligible. There are thousands of good citizens, however, who would like to be able to have a glass of claret with their dinner or a glass of beer on a summer evening while listening to a good band concert.

Now this picture of a glass of ruby Pontet Canet or of amber Liebfraumilch at the family dinner table and of a cooling stein of Pilsner or Würzburger at the family concert party is really very tempting. The trouble is that these nice things cannot be had without the liquor saloon. It has been tried, and the attempt has failed over and over again. The dispensary system has failed in the South; the Gothenburg system has failed in the Scandinavian countries. It seems to be pretty conclusive that if we take beer and light wines we must take the grog-shop along with them. The man who says, "Oh, no! I don't want the saloon back again; all I want is light wine and beer," either does not know what he is talking about or does not really mean what he says. What he really means is that, saloon or no saloon, he ought not to be deprived of his personal pleasure. Don Marquis, the genial and perspicacious satirist of the New York "Tribune," hits the nail on the head with this well-aimed stroke:

"If they do make light wines and beers legal," grumbled Clem Hawley, The Old Soak, yesterday, "that ain't gonna mean much to us drinkin' men. The trouble with light wines is that they're light. An' the trouble with beer is that it takes up room that ought to be used for hard liquor."

Stripped of all sophism, the question is simply a problem in social expediency. Is it better for the Nation to insist upon the personal liberty of every man to decide for himself about the use of alcoholic beverages or to insist upon the sacrifice of that form of personal liberty in order to abolish the liquor saloon with the alcoholism, the vice, the crime, and the political corruption which it inevitably produces?

Prohibition is not a matter of abstract morals; it is a matter of social welfare, like the abolition of the personal liberty of spitting where one chooses or the institution of compulsory vaccination. Viewed in this light, it is the greatest and most interesting experiment that has ever been tried in the history of civilization. It is certainly worth trying fairly and honestly. Notwithstanding New Jersey, we believe that a substantial majority of Americans want to see that trial made.