



(C) Paul Thompson

Blasco Ibanez, famous Spanish novelist

against membership in the League of Nations will be reversed.

Senator Brandegee's death by suicide after a period of great depression was a shock to many of his most pronounced political opponents, for he was respected and liked by many of those who disagreed with him. He was a man of exceptional mental ability. He was effective as a public speaker; and it is said that he never wrote an important speech in his life.

Since the death of Senator Knute Nelson, of Minnesota, Senator Brandegee was Chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

### Friendly Opponents

**T**HOMAS JEFFERSON and Alexander Hamilton, when they sat together in Washington's Cabinet, presumably tried to accommodate their views each to the other. But it is doubtful if, since that time until just now, persons holding to the opposite principles of the schools of political thought founded by these men have sat down together and, in a spirit of tolerance, tried to find and apply the good in both schools. This new thing was done a little while ago in Utica, New York, when the Hamilton-Jefferson Association was founded.

More remarkable still, perhaps, is the fact that the membership is composed almost equally, not of Protestants and Catholics merely, but of Masons and Knights of Columbus. This new civic

body is cut across one way by a line of political cleavage, the other way by a line of religious and fraternal cleavage. Yet it may be that this double division itself makes for unity. Half the Jeffersonians, roughly, are Catholics, half Protestants. So of the Hamiltonians. In large part Hamiltonian agrees with Jeffersonian in religion, Protestant with Catholic in politics. It doubtless is a body well adapted to carry out the expressed purpose of the organization, which is—

To promote devotion to and understanding of the purposes of the founders of our Republic as expressed in the Constitution of the United States of America, and to foster a spirit of toleration in economics, politics, and religion.

Elihu Root, himself a Hamiltonian and a Protestant but looking upon life from an eminence sufficient to enable him to see the best in Jeffersonian and in Catholic, was the guiding spirit. He it was who made the principal speech and breathed out the inspiration upon which a great experiment in tolerance and adjustment of views was launched. For the organization is not to be a society in Utica, but an association of societies throughout the United States, of which the Utica society will be, in a sense, the "mother lodge." The organization is to be extended as rapidly as possible throughout the State of New York, and then into other States.

In this organization, if it is developed as intelligently as it was launched, there are great potentialities for good.

### And Unfriendly Ones

**A** REVOLUTIONARY movement headed by a novelist whose chief weapon is his pen and whose direst threat is to write a romance against his enemies is something new in history.

This is just what has sprung up on the Spanish political horizon. Vicente Blasco Ibañez is known all over the world as a writer of highly colored and passionate fiction. He is anti-monarchical to the core. He has issued a manifesto from Paris in which he not only attacks the Government of Premier de Rivera, who himself came into power at the head of a bloodless revolution, but assails King Alfonso in a manner that can only be called vituperative—and this is the more astonishing because the world at large has been accustomed to regard



(C) Keystone

King Alfonso of Spain

Alfonso as a popular and harmless sovereign. He declares that "it is not the military directory, but the degenerate Alfonso who is mainly responsible for the troubles in Spain and the catastrophe in Morocco." Other excessively abusive remarks gleaned from the novelist's manifesto assert that Alfonso is "a cruel and faithless puppet. His greatest friend is the only man who surpasses him in ignominy if not in stupidity—Primo de Rivera. He is a companion in the King's debauches. Alfonso must go."

From Madrid, despatches show that the representatives of those in power are ready to carry on their part of the wordy war. A cabled interview with the Acting Premier, Señor Magaz (General de Rivera is in Morocco), denounces Blasco Ibañez as "a publicity seeker who takes good care to remain out of reach of the Spanish law while he preaches the overthrow of the Government and blackens the reputation of the King." Furthermore, Señor Magaz remarks that the novelist does not know what he is talking about, that his statements are illogical as well as untruthful, and that some literary men find the best way to advertise themselves is to pose as revolutionaries. As regards the personal attack on the King, Señor Magaz is less angry than shocked.

This is a lively, acrimonious, probably not very dangerous, war of words. In the meantime the Spanish situation is undoubtedly uncomfortable politically, both because of the failure of the present

Government to subdue the revolt in Morocco and because of domestic political agitation.

## The Issue

**T**HIS year there is an issue which transcends any personality, any party, and any special policy.

Many citizens, it is true, will vote because they like one candidate better than another, or because either through habit or through conscious revolt against habit they prefer one party to another, or because either through self-interest or through public spirit they desire to record their approval or disapproval of some policy. It is evident, however, that citizens generally are more indifferent to the personality of the Presidential candidates, freer from party ties, and less concerned with any particular issue than they have been in any Presidential campaign for more than a generation.

For this seeming indifference on the part of the voters one reason can be found in the three chief personalities of the campaign.

Senator La Follette is picturesque. During his whole career he has been in the eyes of his supporters a political knight errant, and in the eyes of his severer critics a political soldier of fortune, but never a good captain in a regiment or a good colonel in a brigade, and therefore incapable of being a really good general of an army. Alone among the candidates he has secured what may be called a large, popular, personal following; but his recklessness in appealing to group prejudices and his instability have confined that personal following to those who distrust political stability and care little for political consequences.

Mr. Davis is eminent, respectable, and experienced in public life; but he has failed to impress the country as a constructive statesman. He has devoted a large part of his speeches to attacks upon his opponents and even to verbal assaults upon individuals. Even in his speech at Omaha, which is one of his more positive and constructive utterances, he spent most of his time in analyzing the agricultural situation and finding fault with the party in power, and very little, and that in most general terms, in making any constructive proposal. He has not appealed to the popular imagination.

President Coolidge is quiet, reserved, unspectacular. He has not appeared on

the stump. Since his speech of acceptance his utterances have been those not of a candidate but of a President. His distinctive qualities are rather those that confirm the confidence of associates than those which kindle the zeal of disciples.

As the voters are not deciding this election primarily by their preference for candidates, so they are not deciding it by their preference for party. All three parties in the campaign are more or less disorganized. The Socialist Party, whose candidate is Mr. La Follette, is one of a group of factions which have little if anything in common besides their Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates. They command no party loyalty. They have the cohesion of an alliance in a fight, and they have the weaknesses of such an alliance. The Democratic Party, seriously split by sectional, racial, and even religious differences, has not become reunited. The Republican Party has lost its old coherence, and its power to command party allegiance and exercise party discipline. Republican voters and even Republicans elected to office are less constrained by party traditions than ever.

And as candidates and parties fail in this election to be the controlling factor, so do questions of policy. There is nothing this year that stands out as the paramount issue of policy as free silver stood out in 1896, or imperialism in 1900, or the League of Nations four years ago. Among certain groups and certain sections some questions of policy have aroused popular interest; but these policies have varied with the locality and the group. In most of these cases, so far as any constructive proposal has been concerned, the issue has been raised by those closely or loosely connected with the La Follette movement; but the very diversity of the groups composing that movement has rendered the issues themselves diverse. Government ownership of railways, for example, advocated in the La Follette platform, has changed its form as an issue from audience to audience as the La Follette campaign has progressed. And similarly the League of Nations is one issue as presented in the Democratic platform, another issue as presented in the speeches of Mr. Davis. Certainly questions of policy are not definite or outstanding in this campaign.

Above any question of policy, above any preference for party, above any choice between candidates, is the issue between two ideals of American destiny.

On one side are those who believe that America was originally started on the right path and that progress consists in continuing forward as that path leads. On the other side are those who believe that America was started on the wrong path and that progress consists in going back to take a path in some other direction. On the one side are those who believe that the structure of government set up on this continent was on the whole soundly planned and well built and that progress consists in enlarging that structure, adapting it in detail here and there, and making new uses of it as new uses are called for. On the other side are those who believe that that structure was faulty in design and not well put together and that progress consists in tearing down some of its central parts, changing the design, and planning such fundamental changes as to make of it a new and different building. If those who wish to preserve what they believe to be good can be called conservative and those who wish to turn backward can be called reactionary, then the issue may be said to be one between conservative progressives and reactionary radicals. Really, however, it is an issue more profound than those terms would indicate. It is an issue between those who believe in America, in the American spirit, American institutions, the American form of democracy, American independence, and American ways of co-operating with other nations, and those who believe that American democracy has been essentially a failure, American institutions and, in particular, the American structure of government essentially faulty, and America's established place among the nations and all that it has involved an essentially false position.

This issue has been raised by Senator La Follette and his followers. They are not agreed as to what is right; but they are agreed that the American Constitution with its safeguards against trespass upon individual rights even by a majority in Congress is wrong; they are agreed that the effort of American democracy to rule without divisions into classes and without engaging in class war is wrong; they are agreed that the effort to weld Americans into a united people without consideration of the interests of foreign countries is wrong; and they are agreed that the American faith in individual independence in the effort to accomplish common ends by voluntary co-operation rather than by governmental interference