

# CURRENT TOPICS

MANY PROGRESSIVE republicans were disappointed because Mr. Roosevelt did not say a good word for LaFollette prior to primary election day. The Minneapolis Journal prints this editorial: "Arriving in Milwaukee on the day following Senator LaFollette's victory at the polls, Colonel Roosevelt was bound to say something about it. What he said can not be construed as an enthusiastic indorsement of Senator LaFollette. It amounted merely to this, that it would be a shameful thing not to ratify the choice of the people. But, as Colonel Roosevelt when president said the same thing about the election of Senator Chamberlain in Oregon, this indorsement can be construed no further than was the Oregon indorsement. In each case Colonel Roosevelt stood for the right of the people to make their own selections and the duty of the legislature to ratify the same. Why Colonel Roosevelt did not go further and say something in praise of Senator LaFollette is his own secret. But it is no secret that the ultra-progressives expected it and are disappointed that it did not come. Colonel Roosevelt has indorsed warmly such senators as Dolliver and Bristow, who work hand in hand with LaFollette, but he has not warmed up to LaFollette himself."

MRS. BELLAMY STORER is taking a hand against Mr. Roosevelt. The Springfield (Mass.) Republican prints a letter from Mrs. Storer written in France, September 6, reviewing the controversy between the Storers and Mr. Roosevelt concerning the former president's alleged authorization of the former ambassador to Austria-Hungary to visit Pope Pius X. and ask him as a personal favor to the president of the United States to make Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul a cardinal. Letters written by the archbishop in 1903 and 1904, hitherto unpublished, are quoted by Mrs. Storer to show that at repeated intervals in the fight between the archbishop and the president, Mr. Roosevelt acknowledged that he had commissioned Mr. Storer to act as his personal envoy at the vatican in behalf of the archbishop. Mr. Roosevelt has hitherto publicly denied that Mr. Storer was ever authorized to represent him in this manner, and the Ireland letters now published by Mrs. Storer have the effect of making much sharper the issue of veracity between the Storers and the ex-president. Mrs. Storer's letter to the Republican also seeks to prove, on the testimony of Archbishop Ireland, that President Roosevelt promised to make Mr. Storer United States ambassador either at Paris or London and there is included still another letter, alleged to have been written by Mr. Roosevelt to Mr. Storer, just after the presidential election of 1896, in which Mr. Roosevelt asked Mr. Storer to see President-elect McKinley and urge him to appoint Mr. Roosevelt assistant secretary of the navy. This last letter seeks to refute a recent assertion that Mr. Roosevelt never sought a public office except when he sought a presidential nomination in 1904.

AN "IOWA DEMOCRAT" writes from Sioux City to the New York World to remind that newspaper that Thomas Jefferson, as well as Theodore Roosevelt, had some distrust of courts. This Iowa democrat says: "Inasmuch as the World is a democratic newspaper, I suggest that it read and digest Thomas Jefferson's opinions concerning the sanctity of courts and the infallibility of judges before it ventures too far in condemnation of Colonel Roosevelt's 'assault' upon our august supreme tribunal. What Roosevelt said is mild and gentle compared with the openly expressed abhorrence with which the patron saint of the democratic party viewed our whole federal judicial system. Condemnation of Colonel Roosevelt's remarks concerning the supreme court has been confined almost exclusively to journals published east of the Alleghany mountains. Western newspapers know that Roosevelt echoed western feeling. The real sentiment of the ordinary voter of the middle west, which now holds the balance of power in presidential and congressional elections, was voiced in the platform recently adopted by the republicans of Kansas, which declared specifi-

cally for the election by direct vote of the people of all federal judges for specified terms. The strength of Roosevelt lies in the belief on the part of a majority of the people that he represents and embodies opposition to special privilege, which has seized control of every branch of the federal government, including its judicial branch. That the popular estimate of Roosevelt's sincerity is a mistaken estimate the writer, in common with the World, is firmly convinced. But the fact remains that his popularity is bottomed on a popular belief that he is a champion of the rights of man as opposed to the greed of vested wrong. No utterance he has made on his western trip is more popular in the region where he made it than his outspoken criticism of the hair-splitting, wire-drawn reasoning processes of the supreme court of the United States. What atmosphere of holiness surrounds a group of judges to render them immune from making the same mistakes or yielding to the same improper influences as other men? Why are they not subject to the same temptations and as likely to commit the same errors as other men? Are they not, in common with the policeman on his beat, mere public servants, liable to the same free criticism as the policeman for any departure from the strict line of duty? Is not 'bench worship' out of place in a republic?"

THE SAN FRANCISCO Star says: "Several months ago Mr. Bryan offered the suggestion that if the government is to hire ship owners to sail ships so that it may have ships to use in event of war, it might find it more profitable to build and operate the ships itself. The idea is not new. We have used it as an argument against ship subsidy. The idea of the government using its transports and colliers in time of peace to carry merchandise is not wholly without merit, says the Milwaukee Journal. It might not be a bad idea if the entire navy could be put to some useful service and carry the flag and exports of coal oil and other commodities to remote places. When Mr. Bryan made the suggestion, of course, it became 'socialistic' and extremely visionary. It was absurd that he should pretend to be a Jeffersonian democrat and hold to such undemocratic ideas. How little those who extol Jefferson most know of what he really said and urged and advocated in his long and active life! The idea, it happens, was original with Jefferson and is something over a century old. In a letter to Richard Henry Lee on the building of an American navy Jefferson wrote: 'I would be happy to hear congress thought of establishing packets of their own between New York and Havre. \* \* \* Could not the surplus of the postoffice revenue be applied to this?' So we see that Jefferson entertained the socialistic idea that the government should own and operate merchant ships which belong to the navy. Jefferson, of course, was not a practical man or there would not have been a surplus in the postal revenues."

THE SITUATION looks blue for the republican party. The Kansas City Star, a republican newspaper, says: "Representative Muddock's prediction that the next congress will be progressive is borne out by the political events of the summer. It may even be democratic, if the revolt proves as far reaching as the outcome in Maine indicates. In the house the republicans started with a majority of forty-seven. With a loss of two votes—in the Cape Cod district in Massachusetts and the Rochester district in New York—this was reduced to a majority of forty-three. The loss of two more in Maine reduces it now to thirty-nine. But with the further losses in the general elections that are thus foreshadowed—including five seats in Missouri—there is hardly a republican leader who falls to admit privately that the house is 'gone.' Of the thirty retiring senators, nine are removed from the possibility of succeeding themselves. These are Aldrich, Burrows, Flint, Hale, Piles and Warner, regular republicans; and Daniel, Money and Tallafiero, democrats. Burrows probably will be succeeded by Townsend, progressive; Warner by a democrat; Flint and Piles by either progressives or democrats, and Hale presumably by a democrat. Aldrich's suc-

cessor presumably will be a regular. A democrat, temporarily appointed from North Dakota, is likely to be succeeded by A. J. Gronna, progressive republican. It is believed that nine of the thirty members who ask for re-election are leading forlorn hopes. These are Beveridge of Indiana, progressive; Burkett, of Nebraska, near-progressive; Bulkeley of Connecticut, Carter of Montana, Depew of New York, Dick of Ohio, Kean of New Jersey, Nixon of Nevada, and Scott of West Virginia, all regulars. In the event of a landslide year, Clark of Wyoming, DuPont of Delaware and perhaps Sutherland of Utah might go. If Maine forecasts a general landslide, there is a possible loss of sixteen republican votes in the senate and a gain of one—a net loss of fifteen. The republican majority of twenty-six would then be transformed into a minority of four. A republican loss even of six—which is regarded as practically inevitable—would give the balance of power to the progressive republicans. Evidently it is distinctly within the range of possibilities that President Taft may have to work with a democratic house and senate for the last two years of his administration."

RUSHING TO the defense of the much abused "preachers' sons," the Omaha (Neb.) Daily News says: "Other men commit crimes and there is no special reference made to their fathers' occupation, but let a preacher's son make a mistake, and the gossipers are set going at once. 'What can you expect from a preacher's son?' is so easily asked by those who seem to expect preachers and their children to be immaculate specimens of human beings. It must not be forgotten that while your minister is doing a thousand and one things for the spiritual comfort of the members of his congregation on a salary that most bricklayers would despise, his children must necessarily be neglected to that extent, and that they have each the same temptations to struggle against that your boy and girl face. The next time it occurs to you that preachers' children 'are no better than they should be,' read over this list of preachers' sons: Oliver Wendell Holmes, author; Edward Everett Hale, statesman and author; John Hancock, first signer of the declaration of independence; Jonathan Edwards, theologian; Increase Mather, former president of Harvard; Cotton Mather, author and scholar; George Bancroft, statesman and historian; Louis Agassiz, naturalist; Henry Clay, statesman and orator; Ralph Waldo Emerson, essayist and poet; David Dudley Field, jurist; Stephen J. Field, justice United States supreme court; Cyrus W. Field, founder of the Atlantic Cable company; John B. Gordon, soldier and statesman; Henry Ward Beecher, preacher and reformer; Samuel F. B. Morse, artist and inventor; James Russell Lowell, author and diplomat; Francis Parkman, historian; Grover Cleveland, twice president of the United States; David J. Brewer, former justice of the United States supreme court; Jonathan J. Dolliver, senator; Henry James, novelist; Richard Watson Gilder, editor and poet; Lyman Abbott, preacher and editor. There are others, too many to enumerate, enough to prove that were all men's sons up to the average made by preachers' sons there would be a much higher average."

REV CHARLES STELZLE, the "union labor preacher," has prepared what he calls "an every day creed." Here it is: "I believe in my job. It may not be a very important job, but it is mine. Furthermore, it is God's job for me. He has a purpose in my life with reference to his plan for the world's progress. No other fellow can take my place. It isn't a big place; to be sure, but for years I have been molded in a peculiar way to fill a peculiar niche in the world's work. I could take no other man's place. He has the same claim as a specialist that I make for myself. In the end, the man whose name was never heard beyond the house in which he lived, or the shop in which he worked, may have a larger place than the chap whose name has been a household word in two continents. Yes, I believe in my job. May I be kept true to the task which lies before me—true to myself and to God who intrusted me