

but the shores of the estuaries and harbors. The News urged that the case should be appealed, declaring that it would be indeed unbearable if all the holiday pursuits of the public at the seaside should have to be dependent upon the kind permission of some land magnate, and it cited the mountain precedent:

The Access to Mountains bill establishes the principle that for all ordinary purposes of rambling or climbing the tourist is not to be hindered from making the mountains his playground. The same principle should be applied to the seashore, and with even better reason. Some money is spent in the mountains in reference to game preserving. The beach is barren and useless save for purposes of pleasure. The owner who should try to keep the public from it would be the supreme instance of the dog in the manger. But so selfish are some land-owners in England, and to such an extent has the idea of private property in the surface of the earth taken possession of the minds of many of our governing class, that doubtless attempts will be made to keep the public from what should be inalienably their own. Would it be possible to enlarge the Access to Mountains bill, and make it apply also to the seashore? If such a course were possible, without endangering the original measure, it might be well to adopt it.

\* \*

#### **Emma Goldman Leaves the Question of Violence Entirely Alone.**

Miss Goldman has written Mr. C. E. S. Wood in regard to his report of her visit to Oregon, published as Editorial Correspondence in The Public of June 26th, that she can afford to pass without notice the misrepresentations of the hostile press, but she cannot afford to leave uncorrected the misrepresentations of her friends. She states that in fact she has never said that violence as tactics would be folly, for it only more firmly intrenches the one assailed; or that individual force against individual officials is worse than useless, because she has never argued these questions at all, nor does she look upon them in that light. She writes that she does not propagate violence and never has done so; but not because she is particularly sentimental about life, so much as that she does not believe in inducing any one to act under the influence of any power save his own reason and the dictum of his own soul. And she adds, "Besides, so long as I am not to pay the penalty of the act, I do not feel justified in inducing another person to do it." She also says that neither does she wish to be understood as classing the men who commit violence as unbalanced or insane; that the psychological cause which induces some to act against all consideration of self, while others will only hiss a

mild indignation against the social order, is to her of the greatest interest.

\* \*

#### **Tolstoy Indicts the Russian Government.**

What one isolated citizen can do to halt the bloody progress of a nation, the aged Tolstoy has done with his terrible denunciation of the hideous reign of terror being maintained by the Russian autocracy. Appearing in the London Daily Chronicle of the 15th, his letter immediately created a profound impression, and was regarded by the labor and socialist groups in England as justifying their protests against the King's recent visit to the Czar (p. 326). The meagre excerpts from the letter which were cabled to America on the day of publication, gave no space to the urgings to land reforms which appear here and there in the letter, and redeem it from hopelessness. In another department of this Public will be found fuller extracts, which are reproduced from what purports to be the full text. That this letter of Tolstoy's will produce immediate results in Russia, few will expect; but as surely as day follows night, the hours of this bestial imperialism, revealed now in all its bloody squalor, are being counted out to their ending.

\* \* \*

#### **DEMOCRACY IN ACTION.**

Once more has democracy shown itself capable of self-government. Once more has direct legislation through the initiative and referendum amply fulfilled the predictions of its advocates and refuted the arguments of its opponents.

The election held in Oregon on the first of last June aroused great interest, not only in the State itself, but quite generally throughout the nation. For the sake of having in compact form a summary of the chief events that have occurred in Oregon in connection with direct legislation, the following resumé has been prepared. All the figures are official.

After ten years of effort in favor of the measure, and after a favorable vote for it by two legislatures had been secured, a direct legislation amendment to the Oregon constitution was adopted by the electors of the State on June 3, 1902, by a vote of 62,024 for, and 5,668 against it; being a majority of eleven to one in its favor.

#### **First Enactments Under Direct Legislation in Oregon.**

On the 6th of June, 1904, the electors enacted at the polls two laws, one for local option in temperance matters, and one for direct primaries.