

cities, where the Indians are wage-slaves, not peons, there are some walks set aside for the whites (Spanish and Americans) and the other walks for the Indians. The Indians get the best of it, but feel just as resentful as if the whites took the best of it. The Indians are given the cool, shady inside walks, and the whites get only a glaring cement walk around the edge; but because it is a privilege, every one who treads the cement feels proud.

There are even two distinct codes of morals—one for the Indians and one for the whites.

The Americans in Mexico form a large class. The monopolists who own so much there do not live there; but in this country. However, there are thousands on thousands of Americans living in Mexico. Certain trades are tacitly given over to them. For instance, it is quietly understood that they are to be used as railway trainmen, mine drillers, etc. They have lived there for generations, some of them. There are their homes and places, and they cannot go away. Their children are born there. Many intermarry with the Spanish. But whether they do or do not intermarry with the Spanish, they become that peculiar product, the "Mexican American." They speak English among themselves, but intersperse the Spanish words they all know, and they have many ways peculiar to them all, yet not shared by other residents of Mexico. Their strangest trait is the maintenance of the fiction that they are Americans, fully entitled to protection. Even in the act of taking part in the politics of the country where they have spent their lives, they hypnotize themselves into the belief that they are patriotic only toward the United States. Individually, the Americans are popular in Mexico. As the losers, the Mexicans do not readily forget the war of 1846. But each American is generally liked, because he is not stingy. He is vastly more popular with the Indians than with the Spanish.

Contrary to belief, my impression is that Mexicans—and especially the Indians—are not treacherous, not cruel, not murderous, and not lazy. To get away from the landlords these Indians will go into places where the winter frost only ends about June 30 and begins again by September 30, with only short tropical days in the meantime, where, owing to the elevation, the summer temperature never rises above 60 degrees in the sunshine—in other words, plateaus where it is terrific work to bring a crop to maturity. In Sinaloa, where the native Indians own most of the land (which is held in common) you will always find them hard at work. I have lived with them as well as the hacendados, and they are the most peaceful people imaginable. But the half-breed Spaniard is very apt to be a bad character. He takes to all kinds of work requiring horsemanship, makes a good foreman, is a born leader of Indians, is generally not scrupulous, and, in fact, Villa, Huerta, and Orozco are of this class, and I presume Zapata is also. Carranza and the Maderos are Spanish. The Rurales are always half-breeds. Most of the people are, for that matter, but in most of them the Indian predominates.

B. F. BUTTERFIELD.



"You can arrest me but you can't arrest my contempt."—The Masses.

## PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

London, July 17.

We had a considerable victory on Monday last as the House of Lords by a unanimous vote inserted a clause in a Bill promoted by the Government for amending the Home Rule Bill, the effect of which is to apply proportional representation to the whole of the Irish House of Commons instead of as at present to 31 out of 164 seats. It is not certain, however, that this will pass as the Amending Bill—its proper title is the Government of Ireland (Amendment) Bill—contains other measures on which the Conservative majority in the Lords and the Ministerial majority in the Commons are in conflict, and the whole Bill may be sacrificed. The debate in the Lords, however, showed the movement of opinion in favor of proportional representation, and the amendment received the support of some very distinguished peers, including the ex-Lord Chancellor, Earl Loreburn, an ex-chancellor of the Exchequer, Viscount St. Aldwyn, and an ex-Ambassador, Viscount Bryce, in addition to Lord Courtney and a number of peers representing the Irish interests which the amendment was designed to safeguard.

JOHN H. HUMPHREYS,

Secretary, Proportional Representation Society (England).

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

### ANOTHER ARGUMENT FOR JUDICIAL RECALL.

Boston, Mass., July 20.

A recent decision made by Judge Crain of the New York Court of General Sessions convicting Upton Sinclair for his vagaries before No. 26 Broadway, because "no citizen may rebuke another citizen by subjecting him to ridicule or insult," seems to invite wider comment than its subject is enabled to make in the organ of his party. Mr. Sinclair seems to be justified in saying: "This decision is inconceivable. If it were upheld, it would mean the end of free speech, and, indeed, of public life. . . . Take public parades and mass meetings, called to protest against the conduct of any citizen, for instance, against the conduct of Murphy, an entirely unofficial person—in deposing the governor of the State. To do any public thing to 'rebuke' Mr. Murphy 'by subjecting him to ridicule or insult' would be disorderly conduct; and it would not be necessary that Mr. Murphy should be there, or should make a complaint; the police would at once arrest anyone who uttered a word—since uttering a word is 'doing'—and take him to the nearest police station.

"Or, take cartooning: obviously, after that decision, no newspaper dare publish a cartoon tomorrow morning. If any of them do, I shall at once call the attention of the nearest police captain to the offense, and the editors and publishers will at once be taken to jail. Drawing, printing and selling a cartoon are a form of 'doing'; and they are necessarily public; and their main purpose is generally to 'rebuke a citizen by subjecting him to ridicule