common in camp and in the field. But, sir, it also speaks to me of bloodshed—possibly some of it unavoidably innocent—in defense of loved ones, of homes; homes in many cases but huts of grass, yet cherished none the less.

It speaks of raids and burnings, of many prisoners taken and, like vile beasts, thrown in the foulest prisons. And for what? For fighting for their homes and loved ones.

It speaks to me of General Order 100, with all its attendant horrors and cruelties and sufferings; of a country laid waste with fire and sword; of animals useful to man wantonly killed; of men, women, and children hunted like wild beasts, and all this in the name of Liberty, Humanity, and Civilization.

In short, it speaks to me of War-legalized murder, if you will—upon a weak and defenseless people. We have not even the excuse of self-defense. Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM BUWALDA.

There is authority for the principle—"pernicious," "obnoxious" and "dangerous" authority it was in Palestine somewhat less than two thousand years ago—that "by their fruits ye shall know them." If Mr. Buwalda's sentiments are legitimate fruit of Emma Goldman's doctrines, what shall we say of her doctrines? By that test they are indeed "peculiar," but if they are "obnoxious" and "dangerous," to whom are they so? To all the barbarian gods of war, no doubt, but not to the Prince of Peace.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

GOVERNMENT BY GROUPS: A TENDENCY.

20 Ridgewood Ave., Newark, N. J.

The question of direct nominations merges itself in a much greater and more significant problem. The American people are in fact already deciding this question of political institutions: Shall power be, as heretofore, delegated to representatives; or shall as much of it as possible remain in the hands of those among whom it originates? The issue is, in other words, between so-called representative and so-called democratic government—an old issue.

♣

With the establishment of the Republic the problem was decided in favor of representative government; now, with the renewal of the question, there is more doubt as to the issue of discussion. In considering the matter today, it is perhaps wise to review the well known reasons for the selection of representation by the builders of the Constitution.

They had before them as models the ultra-democratic regimes of ancient Athens and Rome, where every citizen had a hand in making the laws; nevertheless, a historical factor, a rational factor, and a physical factor determined them in the choice they finally made.

The historical factor was the example of England and the previous scheme of government in several of the colonies.

The rational factor was a general distrust of a majority rule, with a resultant desire to place in the hands of the "best citizens," good men and true with the respect of their communities, the power which it was deemed inexpedient to leave in the control of the people at large.

The physical factor was even more potent, depending as it did on apparently uncontrollable forces of nature and circumstance. For it was in fact impossible in 1787 that the people should rule directly. How could problems involving imminent dangers of war and peace be proposed to communities so widely separated, with so little intimacy of communication, as the original States? It was a necessity that all powers be temporarily delegated for fixed periods to a central body, able to decide questions at short notice.

In the course of a little over a century the value of all three factors has altered radically. The historical factor, involving the example of another country, is no longer of particular validity, since from the success of the past it may be argued without paradox that American communities have become sufficiently experienced in political affairs to undertake experiments of their own. Democratic feeling has, meanwhile, been triumphing over oligarchic,—the "American Bill of Rights" has been added to the Constitution in the shape of the earlier Amendments, the franchise has been widely extended, the slave has been freed, the ballot has been made secret and purified. Jefferson's ideals are regnant today, curiously admixed to be sure with the forms and opinions of government advocated by Hamilton;—that is to say, it has been found that a democratic movement is best founded on a strong central government! Finally, in respect to the last factor, the United States has ceased to be a somewhat artificial conglomeration of diverse elements; it has become a unified community in absolute fact. For the farthest points of the country are in easy and intimate bonds; railroads, telegraphs, telephones, newspapers and periodicals, the postal system, and many other miracles of human invention have pulled more tautly together New York and Nome at the beginning of the present century than Boston and New York were on the day of the adoption of the Constitution. As a result, the inhabitants of Los Angeles, of Helena, of Santa Fe, of Tallahassee, know as soon as Congress does what needs of legislation the President has urged and conditions demand. The citizen of the pettiest town can be as well informed, if he so wish, concerning the situation of the country as any Representative or Senator. What applies to the central government applies naturally in even greater degree to each single State, to each single community of city, borough, township and village.

Considered from these points of view, representative government is today as supererogatory and obsolete as would be the use of a written communication instead of every "call" on the telephone in a modern business office. Any defense of the plan must be on a new basis. For example, it might well be argued that we need economic and political experts to govern us, in which case we might proceed

to turn out our present governing bodies and prepare to procure such experts.

✤

The system of party conventions is the absurdest term in a series of absurdities. There is no need to speak here of the practical consequences of this system so far as concerns the political autocrats who vend the privileges they have captured. From a purely logical standpoint the system is so ridiculous as to seem to require nothing more than accurate statement to secure its overthrow.

For here we have a scheme whereby we—if we go to the primaries—elect representatives, who shall—an they so condescend—choose for us party nominees, who will—provided they be elected to office—represent us in one fashion or another. It is even possible that some of these last persons may again, as members of a State legislature, elect for us still further representatives in the form of Senators at Washington.

What remote likelihood is there that we shall then be truly represented by these final representatives elected by the representatives who were picked out by the representatives supposedly chosen by us? Most of us would be loth to recognize as adequate the persons into whose hands our proxy and power of attorney have fallen. That we should choose directly our party nominees is surely the least that can be granted us—by ourselves.

It is objected, however, that the system of direct nominations inevitably involves not merely the overthrow of the "bosses," in itself perhaps desirable, but also the overthrow of the very party system. But have not parties already fallen into innocuous desuetude, except for venal purposes? The common complaint of the campaign just past was the entire identity of the platforms of the two greater parties, the lack of real points at issue between the two more prominent candidates. The rancour of partizanship centered on the name of an organization is hard to find in the United States today: lines are broken, ballots are "split," candidates "scratched," nobody excited over the epithets of party, and "mugwump" become an honorable term. To correct the one prominent evil of all primaries, whether direct or not, the fact that party lines are secretly broken by machine men to help the "organization" on the other side in a desperate emergency, there is already unfolding an iridescent dream.

✤

The time is coming when the primary will issue one ballot, with no distinction of party, and everyone will vote just as he pleases for nominees to be placed at election on one ballot, with no distinction of party.

A blank hopelessness will appear on the faces of how many citizens on that day. What! no kindly party to tell us whom to vote for? we must know something about every man on the ballot, or forego voting? Truly a desperate condition; and yet it will not be without palliatives.

For the one irremediable defect of parties in the past has been that they continued to exist after the need that called them into being had passed. The merit of the no-party ballot will be that every candidate will be obliged to justify his presence at the election by a vital and contemporaneous issue, not by the artificial existence of a stultified party. No "straight ticket" will carry a man into office; no popularity of another candidate will enable corruption to sneak back to power.

The chief merit of the new system has still to be noted. Under it, it will become necessary for every honest man, if he be really desirous of continuing these States in honor and in loftiness of purpose, himself to take part in perpetuating and developing the ideals of Americanism. For no novel principle will be able to make headway—and many such principles must be established if the republic is to flourish,—unless it find in every community, large and small, a group or a number of groups willing to devote themselves to placing the principle in practical application. There will be no party organization to fall back upon; and the work will need to be carried on from year to year, incessantly and actively, by such "good government" groups. The ballot-system in vogue will allow no automatic continuance of an issue; election by election a given number of men will need to be sufficiently interested in the idea to fight for it and to spend money for it, or the idea will perish instantly. The utmost the ballot will permit, will be the placing together as a unit, by due petition, a number of nominees pledged to a single ideal; and every election will require a new petition.

But no dead issue of half a century past will keep men in continuous power. Our Irish neighbors will cease to vote for one party because it happened to secure in their favor the extension of the franchise in bygone decades; the blacks will cease to vote for another party because it happened to secure in their favor the extension of the franchise for motives which no longer animate it. Both parties as such will have gone out of existence. Yet if anything vital be in them, it will survive; and if any new problem split the country in twain, it will appear on the ballots. But its symbols will also vanish the moment the problem is settled; no one will gain credit for that which he has not done, and perchance would not do if he had the opportunity.

✤

What a splendid training in responsibility for our citizens! Either the majority of citizens will actively be deciding with vehemence and intelligence the business and elections of the country; or the country will go to rack and ruin.

There is no doubt that the first of these alternatives will come to pass; and in accordance with the well known truth that responsibility engenders strength, all citizens will become better and better qualified to investigate and conclude the details of government. Communities will be spontaneously alive with many groups, each seeking a particular object, but each obtaining it only as long as it can convince all citizens that the object is desirable. Corruptionists will discover plaintively that it is a trifle more difficult to bribe a whole community, responsible absolutely to itself, than to bribe a few representatives of the representatives of some representatives, responsible directly to no one except the "man who made them."

Then the time may arrive, at no very distant future, when intercommunication will be so swift, so instantaneous, and when the mechanics for registering public opinion will be so perfected, that we shall be enabled not merely to choose our representatives more directly and check them more efficiently, but even to dispense entirely with the legislative branch of our governments. We shall initiate and promulgate our own laws; we shall regulate their application in the executive branch, and determine the validity of the decisions rendered by the judicial branch. Happy shall then the sovereign people be with few laws, few rulers, few judges! And already the path is being blazed, and the pioneers are trudging forth. The direct nominations, the Massachusetts ballot, the referendum, the initiative, the recall, mark their triumphant progress towards the light.

M. J. HERZBERG.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, June 1, 1909.

The Tariff in Congress.

In its work on the tariff (p. 512) the Senate on the 28th adopted sugar duties in accordance with the plans of the sugar trust as reported to the Senate by the majority of the finance committee under the chairmanship of Senator Aldrich. The tobacco duties also, as reported by the committee, were adopted on that day. Higher duties on barley, hops and potatoes were adopted on the 29th, when also a duty was placed on oysters and eels. But the duty on olives was reduced; and a dispute arose between Senator Root of New York, for lemon consumers, and Senator Flint, of California, for lemon producers, over the proposed increase of duty from 1¼ to 1½ cents a pound on imported lemons. The increase was adopted.

✣ ✣

Illinois Senatorial Election

The Senatorial deadlock in the Illinois legislature (p. 514) came to an end at the 95th ballot on the 26th, with the election of William Lorimer, now a Republican member of Congress from Chicago.

✣

At the primaries last summer, the sitting Senator, Albert J. Hopkins, received a majority of the popular vote of his party, Republican. The Democratic nominee at the primaries was Lawrence B. Stringer. Mr. Hopkins had led the voting throughout the deadlock, but fell far short of receiving full Republican support, his highest vote at any time being 90, and the number necessary for election being 103. Neither did the entire Democratic vote go to Mr. Stringer. At the final ballot, some kind of bargain having apparently been made, the vote was as follows:

Lorimer	108
Hopkins	70
Stringer	23

✣

The Senator-elect was born in Manchester, England, April 27, 1861. He is the second son of a Scotch Presbyterian clergyman who came to Chicago in 1870. As a boy Mr. Lorimer contributed to the support of his father's family by selling newspapers and blacking boots. Afterwards he worked as a laundry delivery boy. For a while he worked in the packing houses, and afterwards became a horse car conductor. He went into Republican politics in the early 80's, and was first elected to Congress in 1892. He is a man of large means, acquired as a contractor and in real estate investments, and a thorough-going machine-politician. In his acceptance speech Mr. Lorimer said:

In my service in the national House of Representatives, I have come to look upon the proposed deep waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf as my mission in Congress. On account of the stupendous nature of the undertaking, it would naturally move slowly to the point of established legislation, and it has consequently been a source of constant concern to me that through the uncertainties of politics, I might be deprived of a seat in Congress at a time when my work would be of most value to this project. For this reason, my election to the Senate, carrying as it does a tenure of office for six years, will allow me to devote my time and energy continuously to the accomplishment of the task that I have laid out for myself. Within the term for which I have been elected, I hope and expect to see a deep water way from the Lakes to the Gulf well under way.

✣ ✣

Work of the Illinois Legislature.

After the Senatorial deadlock had been broken by the election of Mr. Lorimer, the Illinois legislature soon came to the hour when its adjournment was expected. But at dawn on Sunday morning, the 30th, the two Houses had been unable to agree to adjournment. They made a gentlemen's agreement, however, to do no business until the 3d. Following are among the more important bills thus far enacted:

A bill making it unlawful for landlords to impose as a condition to the leasing of flats a prohibition against children under 14 years of age or to write in leases a provision terminating the lease if the lessee has children under that age.

A bill fixing maximum prices for school books. This