

effectively fight reactionaries there must be a leader who is not compelled to get his ideas of democracy from a party platform. While a perfunctory democrat is to be preferred to a reactionary, that is not the kind of democracy which usually gains victories. Sullivan's nomination was assured the moment it became known that there was no better hope for the opposition than concentration on Stringer's candidacy. However, since there was no vigorous democrat to take the nomination it is well that the final contest will be between an avowed reactionary and so advanced a democrat as Raymond Robins. Had Stringer been nominated, some democrats would have felt bound to support him, and the democratic vote would have been divided. There is no need to feel such an obligation now. Robins is clearly entitled to the vote and energetic support of every democrat in Illinois.

S. D.



### WHEN THE PRIMARIES FAIL.

Getting the right men elected depends on two things. There must be enough people to want these men and they must want it hard enough to busy themselves about it.

When nobody cares very much, the professional politicians will nominate the men they prefer and the public can either vote for them or stay home and let them be elected by default. That situation developed so many objectionable results that the people went to work in many States and had primary election laws passed.

In nearly as many cases they have been disappointed. The same men who were busy under the old system busied themselves at the primaries. The discontented public found itself confronted by the choice of accepting the candidates offered by the politicians, voting for self-seekers whom nobody wanted, or staying home and letting it go by default.

As an attempt to eliminate the politician, the primary is a failure. The politician is the man who attends to political duties. He cannot be retired by men who do not attend to political duties. The machine is an agency for collecting the available strength of any political group. It can be overcome only by opposing it with an organization equally effective or by a force of numbers vastly superior. Upheavals sometimes come which carry everything before them, but ordinarily the only way to get action in politics is by political action. The non-political brand of politics never has been a success and never will be for any length of time.

Under any system the people can get anything they want any time they want it bad enough.

Under the primary system, it is easier to get what the people want, or rather it is harder to thwart the well-defined will of the public. But the primary is no automatic device for registering the unconscious desires of the public.

The best engine in the world won't run till the steam is turned on. Primaries or any other popular machinery won't work unless the people supply the necessary energy.

Unceasing effort is the price of political progress.

JOHN S. PARDEE.



### MAKING HISTORY.

Of all stock phrases used as conversational currency by the majority of mankind, the above is the most pernicious, and the most mendacious. We are hearing it constantly just now. Whenever there are wars and rumors of war, and the daily papers bristle with scareheads that fairly drip gore, the good citizen takes another hearty drink of his morning coffee, leans back in his chair and remarks unctuously—as if he really enjoyed it—“Ah, we are making history now—in great chunks.”

Were this point of view not so pernicious, one could laugh at it because it is so ridiculous. It's true, the average good citizen, belonging to the great mass of those who think in phrases they have heard, has an excuse for it. In his youth, he was probably, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, taught history only by dates of battles and names of kings. The different periods of civilization's development were marked for him by wholesale slaughter on some battlefield, or by the life story of some swash-buckling King Tiger, or some mildly innocuous King Log. Small wonder then, that this average citizen does not understand that he and the hundreds of thousands like him do a great deal more to “make history” than do the sanguinary encounters or the pompous coronations or funerals he so much admires in the movies. We do not make history by killing men but by making it possible for them to live more human lives. History, any dictionary tells us, is a record of the development of the human race. Development implies constructive effort, and so does the verb to make. It means to construct, to build up. Wars and battles, and very frequently the monarchical principle and its representatives, are the destructive forces of society. Civilization has developed in spite of them, not because of them. Destruction can never mean development, it is always the force which interferes with development. Therefore a record of the destructive moments in civilization's course cannot be making

history. It is unmaking it, holding it up, if indeed history be a record of the development of human civilization.

It was not the Pharaohs who made the history of their age, they held it up with their wars. Moses, who led a people forth from bondage to build up a new civilization and to make laws that are of value today, made a very large chunk of the history of that epoch. It was not the Spanish Emperors with their Armadas and armies who made the history of medieval Europe. They tried their best to unmake it, but Columbus and Gutenberg, and a few others of that kind, managed to keep up a forward movement in the development of the human race. It was not Crecy nor Agincourt that made history for England, but it was the signing of Magna Charta and the Repeal of the Corn Laws which marked well-defined strides forward in the history of England's development. The discovery of steam did more to make history than a dozen of the most famous battles, however they turned out. Every great thinker, every great artist whose dreams inspire mankind to make them a reality—these are the history makers of all times.



No, gentle reader, we are not "making history now"—we are unmaking it—more's the pity.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### UTOPIA IN MARYLAND.

Oxford, Maryland, September 1.

Oxford is a curiosity. It is a democracy where there are no rich or poor, or at least where there are no sharp drawn lines or contrasts. There is no poverty. No workless class, and as for work, well, they don't do much after providing for their simple wants. It's hard to get help because of the abundance of opportunities for self-employment—oystering, fishing and crabbing. In oystering season a man and boy in a boat can earn from \$30 to \$50 per week if he works all the week and the weather permits. I have known men to earn \$10 and even \$25 per day. Do you suppose you can hire those fellows to work? The bottoms of the water abound in oysters and crabs. They are free, and what a man gets are his wages. He doesn't work all the time. He is satisfied with three days a week. They have a baseball team here, and I thought the fellows were the ordinary loafers you see around a ball ground. Fellows that lie on the grass and look up to the floating clouds, as I did when a five-year-old. So I "jacked" them on being in the easy class when some one said: "Why, Mr. Bingham, these boys have been to work. Got up early, caught a boatload of crabs and sold them to the canning factories, and have the money in

their pockets." Three days' work in a week is enough. There is no drunkenness. Living is cheap and house rent low, so are land values. The town is older than Baltimore and doesn't grow. They don't want the improvements (so-called). They are satisfied. If you want help, be good-natured and jolly them and perhaps you can get it. If you put on "airs" and are not considerate, you can't get any help. I had a whole crowd of colored people "just quit me," because I pushed them on some work. They don't starve. They get another job. Or, this being fine climate, they could sleep out of doors, and a confiscated chicken would give a sumptuous repast.

MILLARD F. BINGHAM.



### HOME RULE CAMPAIGN IN CALIFORNIA.

San Francisco, Sept. 10.

The outlook at this moment is very encouraging. If all "good weather signs" do not fail us, and our ammunition and supply trains make connection, we shall surely win a great victory, not alone for California but for the cause all over the country.



In 1911 the California League of Municipalities at their annual conference held at Santa Barbara, after a thorough discussion of the local tax problems that confront every town and city administration, unanimously passed a resolution endorsing "Home rule in the matter of local taxation." At this conference there were 231 delegates, mayors, councilmen, city attorneys and others, from 87 cities of the state. The state controller and other prominent citizens participated in this discussion. At Berkeley in 1912, at their annual conference, "home rule in taxation" was endorsed by a five to one vote, of those voting. At this conference there were 308 delegates from 104 cities.

Again at Venice, California, 107 cities and 417 delegates endorsed the home rule amendment by a unanimous vote.

The 1913 Legislature passed the measure by a two-thirds majority vote.



The Farmers' Educational Co-operative Union, the Fruit Growers' convention and the State Federation of Labor have endorsed the amendment, while thirty-seven individual city councils have also endorsed it.

It would seem foolish, in the face of such facts, to have any fears of the measure carrying; but a similar measure was defeated in 1912, largely, as we believe, because the people did not understand it, and this will be the reason, or the principal reason, if it should be defeated this fall. This lack of information, coupled with a conservative fear based upon prejudice (preconceived and illogical opinions) that obtains with the masses, must be overcome in some way. The printed page is the most potent agency by which to do this. But this means money for stamps, for printing and clerical help. To send leaflets explaining the matter to each voter would mean thousands of dollars for a one-cent stamp to each one, aside from other expenses.