

voted to British rule, notwithstanding that it was alien in its origin and is still virtually so to a considerable extent as regards the personnel of the higher branches of the Executive administration. is inconceivable to them and can be made plain, if at all, only by occasional public expressions of loyalty on the part of responsible leaders who cannot be suspected of a desire to flatter Government from interested motives. Perhaps, also, it will enable them to understand why India is an exception to the general rule in Western countries, if we explain that the people of India are divided by sectarian and provincial jealousies of an acute character which makes them, for all practical purposes, as much aliens to one another as the British are to them. . . . The only unifying force in the country at present, besides its geography, its sunshine and its general poverty, is British rule: all else is distractingly divided. And even British rule, unfortunately for us, and also, we think, for its own stability, is betraying a tendency to adapt itself to the separatist and fissiparous tendencies of Indian society rather than to maintain itself as a constraining influence on such tendencies."



This statement has a wider application than that made by the editor. It shows the danger that lies in the attempt of any people to aid by force the people of any other country, whether it be India or Mexico. It also shows the futility of the efforts of a small band of enthusiasts to establish by force political institutions for which the people, as a whole, are not ready. Government, like all things else, is subject to the law of evolution; and since it is wholly a human relation, it must necessarily be in accord with the people over whom it exercises authority. It cannot be in accord with all the people, but it must be in harmony with the major part. And when it is realized that the same substance may have various forms, and be known by different names, it will be seen how far away the Indian Republic is. As the English monarchy is just as liberal as the American Republic, so the British rule in India may, for the present, be more beneficial than that of native princes. The young men of India who have been educated in Europe and America, and who have become enamored of the western idea of individual liberty, return to preach the gospel of freedom to their countrymen. They are doing a great work through their press, and through their personal devotion. But they must not make the mistake of supposing that the change effected in them by a few years' residence abroad can be wrought in the masses at home in a like period. This is a work, not of years, but of

generations; and the best friends of India are not the impatient force-party, but those men and women who are working along educational lines.

S. C.



Cheap Education.

Insufficient as are teachers' salaries in this country, they are princely as compared with those of some other countries. English teachers, according to the findings of a member of Parliament, are paid almost incredibly low salaries. Men principals having certificates receive \$17 a week, women principals \$12; men assistants receive \$12.25, and women assistants \$9. Teachers without certificates receive as low as \$6.25 for men, and \$5 for women. What kind of talent and service can such a wage command? Is it any wonder that English servants "know their place"? When the aristocracy and the nobility have such splendid schools as Eaton and Harrow, Oxford and Cambridge, while the workers have but a few months under the tutelage of five-dollar-a-week teachers in crowded rooms, is there any likelihood of confusing the classes with the masses? These masses have made England the richest nation in the world; they support the largest military establishment and the wealthiest aristocracy; yet their children have a few months' schooling at the hands of scantily paid teachers. Truly, the stupidity of man is past comprehending!

S. C.



How News Is Manufactured.

How some newspapers misrepresent public sentiment is shown by a recent incident implicating John R. McLean's Cincinnati Enquirer. Recently the following telegram was received by the Elkhart, Indiana, Progressive Democrat:

Cincinnati, Ohio, April 10, 1914.

Some Reliable Newspaper Man, Elkhart, Ind.:

Please file early Friday evening 300 words showing unfavorable sentiment in your section toward President Wilson's stand on Panama canal tolls. Interview big business men and get them to say something hot.

ENQUIRER.

The newspaper men who received this particular message happen to be truly reliable, however they may appear from John R. McLean's point of view. They not only refused to become parties to this plot to deceive the public, but exposed it. It would be interesting to learn to what extent public opinion has been misrepresented through fake interviews obtained in this way. These methods have probably not been confined to the canal tolls question, nor to the Cincinnati Enquirer. How much

of the so-called war sentiment has been worked up by similar means?

s. d.



Editorial Management at Its Best.

The merging of the Record-Herald and the Inter Ocean under new management marks the passing of papers long identified with the life of Chicago and the Central West. Of the Inter Ocean little need be said. Born when political passion was at white heat, it pandered to the bigots who would neither forgive nor forget the Civil War. And when that role was played out the paper degenerated into a stupid senility that merited a decent burial years ago. But the Record-Herald was of a better stamp. Professing independence throughout its career, its chief merit—up to the latest management—consisted in moderation in editorial tone and cleanliness of news. At heart it was Republican in the sense that in the last analysis it found an excuse for supporting Privilege by the time election day arrived. It avoided the hide-bound bigotry of the Inter Ocean, and the vacillation of the Tribune. But its independence was negative, rather than positive; and while it had many readers among the progressive Democrats and liberal Republicans it lacked the tang of aggressiveness.



But when the Record-Herald came under the management of Henry Barrett Chamberlin it became infused with a new spirit. Its negative independence became positive independence. It was no longer content to hammer the things that everybody knew were false, and jump on political and social malefactors who stood self-condemned; but it adopted a constructive policy and became a recognized power for the uplift of political and social life. True, the paper did not come out unreservedly for the new economics. That was not possible; for neither its controlling owner nor the mass of its readers were believers in that economy. But it is to the credit of Mr. Chamberlin that he was able to steer a course which on the one hand should satisfy his personal convictions, while on the other it avoided needless antagonism on the part of the owner and the readers. And it is to the credit of Victor Lawson that he was broad-minded enough to permit the introduction of new policies and progressive enough to accept in the end ideas that in the beginning were obnoxious not only to him but to his associates in business and private life. It is one thing to be radical, when one has little or nothing to lose. It is an entirely different thing to be progressive, to see the end, to

recognize the means, and to sanely shape the means to that end. This has been the role so ably filled by Henry Barrett Chamberlin.



What of the Record-Herald and Inter Ocean under the new management? James Keeley takes charge with a phenomenal record for editorial efficiency. The combination of the two newspaper constituencies should give the new paper a paying circulation. But this of itself will not make a successful paper in the truest and largest sense. "The consolidated paper," says Mr. Keeley, "will be independent—in politics and every other phase of activity. It will endeavor to be a constructive force in Chicago and the great Central West. It will work for the upbuilding—physically, commercially and morally—of the city in which it has its home, and in national affairs will strive to uphold the hands of those who are laboring for the welfare of the people as a whole." If Mr. Keeley succeeds in giving a full and honest interpretation to these words, the new paper will have a brilliant and useful future.

s. c.



A Noble Woman's Heroism.

An example of rare moral courage and of an exceptionally noble character was furnished by Mrs. Edna Gerson Montague of Los Angeles in asking Governor Johnson of California to commute the death sentence of her husband's murderer. The act required strength not only to conquer a natural inclination to seek revenge for a great irreparable wrong, but to endure ridicule and misrepresentation on the part of weaker ones who still make a virtue of barbarism. The influence of such heroism can not fail to be great, even though it did not thoroughly inspire another woman, who was also about to write to the Governor in behalf of the eighteen-year-old murderer of her son. Why she did not is thus explained in the March number of the magazine, *Everyman*, of Los Angeles:

Subsequently it developed that the influence of the Rev. Dr. Brougher, minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and of the neighborhood Methodist preacher, had prevailed upon the family to prevent this action. The family have no feeling against the slayer of their boy, and only the kindest sympathy for his broken-hearted mother, but on the advice of their religious counsellors they have decided to let the fate of her son rest in the hands of the Lord.

s. d.



The Gompers Decision.

It is regrettable that in finally dismissing the