

sult of the Democratic party primary, there will be a candidate on the Progressive ticket worthy of their support.

S. D.



Inaccurate History.

John Howard Todd, A. B., who is writing the history of Illinois for the Chicago Herald, is not as accurate as a reliable historian should be. On May 11 in speaking of the railroad strike of 1894 he erroneously stated that Eugene V. Debs was tried and convicted on an indictment. Although his attention was called to the error it has not yet been corrected. Now, in the issue of July 3, he has made an even more serious error. Speaking of President Cleveland's action in sending federal troops into Illinois he says: "It was the time of the Pullman strike when train crews refused to handle trains carrying Pullman cars and rioters were tearing up tracks, overturning and burning cars and paralyzing traffic generally." Professor Todd here gives the impression that prior to the ordering of federal troops to Chicago rioting prevailed and railroad property was being destroyed. The fact is that there were no riots nor any serious destruction of railroad property until the order had been issued to send in federal troops. There was certainly nothing serious enough to justify use of troops of any kind. Professor Todd must have failed to study Governor Altgeld's message to the legislature on this matter, since it is inconceivable that, had he done so he would so disregard his duty, as a historian to deliberately make the statement he did. If similar errors exist in his statements regarding other events in the history of Illinois then his history can not well be accepted as fairly accurate.

S. D.



Intemperate Criticism.

The assassination of the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary suggests again the need of a healthy public opinion to secure rational action. Whatever may be the excuse for reform by assassination in countries afflicted with autocratic governments, there is none at all under popular governments. The Russian government has invited the assassin; but the English government anticipates him with freedom. The one government has seen many bloody deeds; the other has been singularly free from personal violence. Yet, we of this country, enjoying the freedom of England, suffer the violence of Russia. Of the thirteen Presidents who have presided at Washington during the last fifty years, three of them have been

assassinated; and attempts have been made on the lives of numerous lesser officials. But there is this difference, however: In Russia the assassin is a man of intellect and character, nerved by a love of liberty. In this country the assassin is a weak-minded man, laboring under some hallucination; but whether the assassin be a patriot striving to free his oppressed countrymen from tyranny, or a crank striking to redress an imaginary wrong, the reality is the same to the individual.



That intemperate criticism of public officials in this country is responsible for overturning the judgment of weak-minded individuals is evident. The relation of our government and people is quite similar to that of the English government and people; but our methods of criticism are very different. Not that the Englishman is at all backward in finding fault with his government, far from it; but he is more temperate of statement. He does not "see red," and his press is not "yellow." The gross exaggeration and intemperate abuse of some of our press cannot but be evil in its influence. The intelligent recognize the exaggeration, but the weak-minded take it in all seriousness; and some are aroused to the point of violent action. It is not a matter, however, for legislation, but rather, the cultivation of a sane public opinion. Laws will not control the weak-minded, but public opinion can restrain the utterance of the intemperate criticism that dethrones the weak mind. Hence, in the last analysis, the responsibility rests with the people themselves; and by patient persistence, by a greater readiness to recognize an opponent's worth, and above all, by placing law above persons, we shall eventually arrive at a public state of mind in which we can discuss rationally our common interests.

S. C.



A Proper Action.

Friends of Joseph Fels have no criticism to offer of the action of the Central Conference of American Rabbis at Detroit in tabling resolutions of sympathy over his death. Nor should the advocates of other resolutions relating to public questions feel that any wrong was done. A resolution should express the sincere feeling of the body that adopts it, or not be adopted at all. Joseph Fels stood for a modern application of the doctrines of social justice proclaimed in the Old Testament. He stood for stopping the taking of wealth from those who have earned it by those who have not. He stood for the abolition of poverty and all the

vice, crime and misery resulting therefrom. The adoption of the resolution would have been construed as implying that the conference felt sympathetically toward such a position. Clearly those who do not feel so were right in objecting. Those who do not stand for social and economic justice should not be forced to appear as though they do. Those who tolerate Oppression should not be asked to give a perfunctory, apparent endorsement to Freedom. If Rabbi Stephen Wise was right in saying, "You are afraid of what the rich may say," then the conference took the only course it should have taken in tabling all resolutions. Insincere praise would be no honor—rather the reverse.

S. D.



Joseph Chamberlain.

The passing of Joseph Chamberlain arrests attention because of his connection with the reactionary movement in restraint of trade. And the fact that such a brilliant leader was unable to revive the protective tariff is good evidence that the British have made a distinct advance on the road toward direct taxation. While Americans, having a protective tariff, have resisted fifty years of campaigning to convince them that the tariff is a tax and that the foreigner does not pay it Mr. Chamberlain with all the power of the Unionist party and Tory landlords behind him was unable to persuade the English workingmen, lacking protection, that a tariff is not a tax, and that the foreigner pays it. In that significant fact lies great hope for economic progress. England was compelled to raise more revenue, and it was a question as to whether it should be raised by direct or by indirect taxation; in other words, whether it should fall upon the bent back of labor, or be drawn from the coffers of idle landlords. Mr. Chamberlain failed; Mr. Lloyd George has succeeded.



Just how much Mr. Chamberlain's course was due to conviction, and how much to overweening ambition may never be known. The fact that he should say in defending his tariff proposals that all direct taxes are either shifted to the consumer or drive the property taxed out of the country showed an utter lack of understanding of the incidence of taxation. The English landlord has not been able to shift to the tenant the land tax of the Lloyd George Budget; and there is very little likelihood of their taking their land out of the country. On the other hand, Mr. Chamberlain's surpassing qualifications for leadership might well

arouse in him aspirations that could not be satisfied while serving under Mr. Gladstone. It was unlikely that he should supplant his chief within the Liberal party; while it was possible, by means of clever political machinations, to ride into power at the head of a new party. Mr. Gladstone began his political career as a Conservative, and changed to the Liberals. Mr. Chamberlain started as a Liberal, and became Conservative. Their paths crossed, but were not long parallel; and the success of the one, and the failure of the other may be taken as an indication of the trend of the times. As Thomas Carlyle and Rudyard Kipling have failed with their Tory preaching to make an impression on the world commensurate with their literary ability, so Joseph Chamberlain, by his espousal of Toryism, has been unable to stay the march toward democracy.

S. C.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

CONNECTICUT'S PROGRESSIVES AT WORK.

Lake Compounce, Conn., June 27, 1914.

Breakers ahead for the Bourbons! More than a hundred militant Democrats assembled here this afternoon, to demand progressive measures and forward looking candidates from their party in this State. Harmony, independence and determination were the dominant notes of the convention. The terms direct primary, initiative and referendum, recall, preferential ballot, home rule in taxation, etc., echoed and re-echoed through it all. The event was without parallel in the political annals of Connecticut, and some of the old-time singletaxers here had to fairly rub their eyes open, to make sure that they were in the Nutmeg State. George M. Wallace of New Haven, chairman of the meeting and a democrat of the most fundamental sort, was finally authorized to appoint a committee of ten to organize the movement and lay plans for the coming campaign. The appointments will be announced later in the week. Another conference will be held within the next six weeks, in accordance with a unanimous vote of those present.

CHRISTOPHER M. GALLUP.



NEWS FROM ONTARIO.

Toronto, July 1.

We have just concluded a big fight. We have been defeated, but not vanquished. The enemy has won and the downtrodden are rejoicing that their oppressors are still in the saddle.

Eighteen months ago the people of this city by a direct vote of four to one declared in favor of local option in taxation. The city council prepared a bill to give effect to that vote; but when it reached the parliament, it never passed the committee stage, the eight representatives of the city utterly ignored the bill, and yesterday, at the elec-