

the defenders of the existing order catch at the Eugenists as at a straw.

Unfortunately the organized forces of discontent are fighting at cross purposes and playing into the hands of their enemies. In the words of Philip Snowden, M. P., "neither trade unionism, nor the Labor movement, nor the Socialist parties have any clear idea of the attitude they ought to take up in regard to the functions of the state in industrial affairs." His remedy is state interference to counteract the effects of the competitive system. The British Socialist Party, assembled at Manchester, hold a turbulent session at which mutually destructive theories are hotly discussed. The Fabian Society at Keswick celebrate the advent of the minimum wage. At the 20th annual conference of the Independent Labor Party at Merthyr, Mr. W. C. Anderson condemns profit-sharing and co-partnerships and demands the abolition of private property in land and in industrial capital.

But there are signs of promise. Socialists are not too pleased with recent socialistic legislation, and members of the Labor Party find themselves more and more in accord with the Singletax group in Parliament so brilliantly led by Josiah Wedgwood.



Most hopeful of all, the discussion of Welsh Disestablishment has brought the land question to the front again and Lloyd George seems prepared to make use of his great opportunity. Speaking at Swansea, on May 28, he declared that Liberals were too timid. "Let them look at the land question," he continued. "Up to the present time they had dealt with it as if they were handling a hedgehog." Religious foundations had been robbed to establish private fortunes, but this was not the only trust in land which had been betrayed. "In South Wales they had hundreds of thousands a year paid in rents and taxes, and the men of South Wales jeopardized their lives to pay these exactions, and when they came up into the sunshine again to seek rest and restoration they were met with disease and degradation. The men for whom they worked grudged them every inch of sunlight or space of breathing ground. That was a trust that would be looked into. They claimed a right to it. Who gave it them? It was not in the Law nor in the Prophets. . . . I will tell you what is the matter with this country. There is one limited monarchy here and there are ten thousand little Tsars. They hold an absolutely autocratic sway. Who gave it to them, this trust or property? We mean to examine the conditions of it. It is a fight full of hope for the democracy.

F. W. GARRISON.

---

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

---

### SENATOR LA FOLLETTE AND THE LIQUOR QUESTION.

Asbury Park, N. J., June 4.

I have read with great pleasure the editorial in your current issue relative to the interrogatory concerning his stand on the liquor question which was put to Senator La Follette at the conclusion of his

speech in Asbury Park.\* Your conclusions are to the point and unanswerable. I desire, however, to correct one detail which may seem of small consequence, but which will gain in significance as the campaign proceeds if Mr. Roosevelt is nominated. I was standing with my hand on Senator La Follette's shoulder when he said to the minister: "If you are an honest man you will come tomorrow and ask the same question of Mr. Roosevelt." Mr. Taft's name was not mentioned. The minister was merely admonished to ask the question of Mr. Roosevelt. The significance of the Senator's remark will doubtless be appreciated by The Public even though recent primary votes go to show that as yet the public isn't "on."

G. A. MILLER.

\*See The Public of May 31, page 506.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, June 11, 1912.

### Presidential Politics.

Although ex-President Roosevelt has been carrying the party vote at the primaries for Republican candidate for President, President Taft appears to be getting the convention delegates. In Ohio, where the popular vote for Roosevelt was overwhelming, the Republican State Convention at Columbus on the 4th awarded the six delegates-at-large to Taft by 390½ to 362½, with the net result of giving Taft 14 and Roosevelt 34 of the national delegation as a whole. "Pure political brigandage," is what Mr. Roosevelt called this action in an interview about it. When the national committee met at Chicago, a vote regarded as a test disclosed only 13 anti-Taft members to 39 in favor of Taft. The vote was over two questions: (1) That 8 votes in the committee should be enough to require a roll call, and (2) that the newspapers be afforded representation on the Congressional press-gallery basis. By *viva voce* vote the first was defeated by the substitution of 20 for 8, and by a roll call vote the second was defeated by providing for accommodations only for 5 accredited press associations. On the 7th contests from Alabama and Arkansas were decided adversely to Roosevelt by the national committee. Most of these were decided unanimously; but in the one from the 9th Alabama district "steam roller" methods were used for Taft in the spirit of rule or ruin, as Roosevelt partisans assert. In a public address on the 8th, Mr. Roosevelt said that "a nomination obtained by the votes of delegates seated in utter defiance of justice as these two Alabama delegates [those from the 9th district] have just been seated, would be worthless to the