

allegiance to the beneficiaries, who had declared theirs to the king; and in this manner feudalism as a system is believed to have originated. The king was overlord, but the beneficiaries were lords—barons with subjects of their own, whose allegiance was not to the king but to them. This had the effect of prostrating the authority of the king. For the beneficiaries, supported by their tenantry, were able to command an overwhelming military force, either to support or to defy him. And they added to their power by forcing all allodial proprietors into their service. Through their rapacity they had created a reign of terror among allodial proprietors—something like that which prevails among independent business men today who find themselves threatened by great trusts and who join the trust rather than be crushed by it. So the terrorized allodialists gladly surrendered their allodial holdings on condition of getting them back as feudal tenures. As the military compact of feudalism between landlord and tenant, or lord and vassal, was their only hope of protection, they delivered over their lands as gracefully as Slim Jim Pulsifer gave over his pocket book to the "hold-up" man—delivered them to the powerful lords, and received them back again charged with the feudal contract. This obligated the tenant to support the lord, and the lord to protect the tenant. It was a contract of trust, don't you see? in contradistinction to contracts of ownership.

The historical circumstances were such, however, that those feudal obligations developed a paternal relationship which had its attractive as well as its repulsive aspects as compared with the contractual tie—whether of trust or of absolute ownership—which had preceded feudalism and has come again. Custom, personal attachment, gratitude, honor, dread of penalization and infamy, cemented by the sanctions of religion, all contributed to that homogeneity which raised feudalism to the level of a social system.

As a political institution, Mr. Bryce describes feudalism—let me get his "Holy Roman Empire," and quote. Ah, here it is at page 113. He defines feudalism politically as—

the system which made the owner of a piece of land, whether large or small, the sovereign of those who dwelt thereon; an annexation of personal to territorial authority more familiar to Eastern despotism than to the free races of primitive Europe. On this principle were founded, and by it are explained, feudal law and justice, feudal finance, feudal legislation, each tenant holding toward his lord the position which his own tenants held toward himself. And it is just because the relation was so uniform, the principle so comprehensive, the ruling class so firmly bound

to its support, that feudalism has been able to lay upon society that grasp which the struggles of more than twenty generations have scarcely shaken off.

But all powerful, Doctor, as was that grasp in the eleventh century, and slowly as society has been able to shake it off, the evidences of its decline soon after the eleventh century are quite obvious. By the fifteenth century new social forces had greatly reduced its power; and in our day there are few feudal remnants except in our law of land tenures, and not so very many there. Feudalism has been almost completely superseded by capitalism.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, October 6, 1908.

The Bryan-Roosevelt Controversy.

Mr. Bryan's reply to Mr. Roosevelt's letter of the 27th appeared in the newspapers of the 30th. After referring to Mr. Roosevelt's "attempt to shift the issue," both as to his charges against Gov. Haskell and as to his insinuations against Mr. Bryan himself, Mr. Bryan writes:

You have since given wings to accusations that no disinterested party would make against another without investigation.

His letter then refers to Mr. Roosevelt's accusation that a St. Louis lawyer employed in a case by the Standard Oil Company is supporting Bryan, and says:

While the trust attorney to whom you refer is not an official of a trust, I will warn him and, through him, his clients that if I am elected I will not only vigorously enforce against all offenders the laws which we hope to have enacted in compliance with the Democratic platform, but that I also will vigorously enforce existing laws against any and all who violate them, and that I will enforce them, not spasmodically and intermittently, but persistently and consistently: they will not be suspended, even for the protection of cabinet officers.

Turning then to Mr. Roosevelt's assertion that the attitude of many men of large financial interests warrants him in expressing the belief that those trust magnates whose fear of being prosecuted under the law by Mr. Taft is greater than their fear of general business adversity under Bryan, are supporting Bryan rather than Taft, Mr. Bryan responds:

You have attempted to word that statement in such

a way as to claim the support of all the trust magnates, and yet put it on the ground that they are supporting your party for patriotic reasons rather than for the promotion of a selfish interest. That is ingenious, but it is not sound. The trust magnates are supporting the Republican party, and the Bible offers an explanation—"The ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib." You admit you gave permission to the steel trust to absorb a rival and thus increase its control of the output of steel and iron products. I will leave the American people to pass judgment upon that act and compare your position on the trust question with mine.

After contrasting the campaign funds of the two parties in 1896 in answer to Mr. Roosevelt on that point, Mr. Bryan's letter directs attention to the question of publishing campaign contributions before instead of after election:

You are the first conspicuous member of your party to attempt an explanation of the party's opposition to publicity before the election, and the admission which you make will embarrass your party associates. Your position is that the publication before election of the contributions made to your campaign fund would furnish your political opponents an opportunity "to give a false impression" as to the fitness of the candidates. You cite as illustrations the contributions made to Gov. Hughes' campaign fund, the contribution collected by Mr. Harriman and the contributions which are now being collected for Mr. Taft's campaign fund. You charge, in effect, that the people are so lacking in intelligence that they might condemn as improper contributions which you declare to be proper. If the voters differ from you on this question are they necessarily ignorant and wrong? Must the members of the party organization act as self-appointed guardians of the people and conceal from them what is going on, lest the people be misled as to the purpose and effect of large contributions? Is this your explanation of the action of the Republican leaders in the national convention in voting down a publicity plank? If you will pardon the suggestion, I believe a better explanation can be found in Holy Writ, for do we not read of men "loving darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil"? You attempt to make a personal question of it and ask whether any one will accuse such men as you, Gov. Hughes, and Mr. Taft of being influenced by contributions. That is not the question. If it is found that a party to a suit has given a sum of money to one of the jurors, the court does not stop to inquire whether or not the juror is an incorruptible man or whether in accepting the money he explicitly stated that it was accepted with the understanding that he was under no obligation to consider it in making up his verdict. The court would hold that the giving of money by an interested party or the receiving of money was a contempt of court and an interference with the administration of justice. Public officials occupy much the same position as jurors. They are constantly called upon to decide questions between the favor seeking corporations on the one hand and the people on the other, and there is a general impression that officials of these favor seeking corporations do not put up large sums of money from purely patriotic motives. . . .

The reflection upon the people, involved in your charge, that they would misuse the knowledge which publicity would give, is unworthy of one who has been elevated to so high an office by the votes of the people, and I venture the assertion that you cannot procure from Mr. Taft an indorsement of your defense. He is now before the people; he is offering himself as a candidate for the Presidency; he dare not tell the people to whom he appeals that they have not sense enough to form a just and correct opinion as to the purpose which leads parties interested in special legislation to make big contributions. You fear that we would misrepresent the motives of those who are contributing to the Republican campaign fund, and cast an unjust suspicion upon Republican candidates if the names and amounts were made known before the election. Your argument, if sound, would prevent publication after the election, for why should an unjust suspicion be cast upon officials after the election any more than before? Does not the secrecy before the election increase this suspicion? We are going to give you an opportunity to misrepresent the motives of those who give to our campaign fund, and to arouse all the suspicion you can; we are going to prove to the people that we are making a fight for the whole people and not for those who have been enjoying privileges and favors at the hands of the government, and we expect that the honest sentiment of the country will rebuke the party whose convention refused to indorse any kind of publicity and whose candidates are not willing that the people should know until after the polls are closed what predatory interests have been active in support of the Republican party.

+

No reply has been made to this letter; but in an effort to explain Mr. Roosevelt's silence, his secretary, Mr. Loeb, stated for publication on the 30th that the "President felt that Mr. Bryan's letter was simply an attack upon him personally, and considered there was no reason why he should answer it." It was reported, however, that other reasons had decided the matter and that the President was restive under enforced silence. His part thus far in the campaign, as disclosed by good authority, appears to have been offensive to Mr. Taft's friends as putting Mr. Taft in second place, and objectionable to the managers of the campaign as being prejudicial to the candidate.

+ +

Mr. Taft's Speaking Tour.

After his meeting of the 29th at Sioux City (p. 634) Mr. Taft went on the 30th to Lincoln, Nebraska. Here he was received in a non-partisan way, Mr. Bryan having requested his friends to withdraw his portraits and banners for the day and treat Mr. Taft courteously as the guest of the city. On the 1st Mr. Taft spoke at Omaha and on the 2d at Denver. He was at Topeka on the 3d. He spoke to church audiences on the 4th in Kansas City, and on the 5th spoke at several places in