

CURRENT TOPICS

THE LONDON correspondent for the Associated Press quotes Mr. Bryan as having said in his speech at Bradford: "In speaking outside one's own country it is necessary to be quite careful about the subject one discusses. I have recognized this for many years and have been very careful outside my own country not to take up what may be called controversial things. I never talk politics away from home for two reasons: First, I never like to emphasize away from home the divisions we have at home, because I want foreigners to look upon us as a united people; second, because I am the guest of the people I am visiting and I think it is very poor payment to engage in controversy."

FORMER UNITED States Senator Henry M. Teller has gone to the defense of Secretary of the Interior Ballinger. Speaking to a Washington correspondent for the Denver News, Mr. Teller says: "There has been no evidence introduced before the Ballinger-Pinchot committee which has in any way tended to show that Secretary Ballinger was guilty of an impropriety, much less any violation of law. I think the evidence indicates that a conspiracy was organized very early in the season to force Richard A. Ballinger out of public life on the theory that he was likely to disturb certain men holding office in the reclamation service and the forest service. I think this was distinctly proved before the committee."

UNDER DATE of St. Louis, June 2 the Associated Press carries the following: "Missouri democrats of all factions at a dinner here tonight heard former Governor Joseph W. Folk announce the principles on which it is said he will seek the presidential nomination in 1912. The dinner was in charge of men who have been promoting the boom of the former governor. 'The doctrine of equal rights should be made a living, vital and controlling force in the government,' said Mr. Folk, after he had listened to democrats from all parts of the state tell the guests that the former governor is the man they should endorse for the presidency. 'The democratic party,' continued Mr. Folk, 'should insist upon the stamping out of the graft and corruption from every department of government; the eradication of all special favors, including bounties, subsidies and a tariff for any purpose other than revenue. We need the honest, sincere enforcement of the laws we already have and the regulation of the rates of public utility corporations upon a reasonable basis that justice may be done the people and a fair return for the amount actually invested be afforded.' Other principles named by the speaker were the preservation of the rights of the state to self-government, the restriction of American territory to the western hemisphere as a necessary corollary of the Monroe doctrine, the extension of American trade by removing the restriction upon commerce, a just income tax the election of United States senators by direct vote and unrelenting opposition to the domination in public affairs of special interests and the elimination of such influences from politics."

A COLUMBUS, O., dispatch to the Denver Times says: "The open letter that William J. Bryan wrote to Governor Harmon of Ohio and printed in this week's issue of Mr. Bryan's paper, The Commoner, has created unusual agitation in Buckeye democratic ranks. Mr. Bryan's letter makes it very clear that he intends to be a free lance in the coming presidential contest—at least until after the democratic national convention has spoken. And it further makes it plain that he will oppose Harmon's nomination for the presidency. This letter shows in every line that Bryan feels that the Ohio democratic executive lacks courage and that he has neither the breadth nor stamina to act as the leader of a great national party. One of Mr. Bryan's earnest desires is that the United States senators shall be elected by the vote of the people. He has fought for years for a constitutional amendment that will bring

that about, but waiting the adoption of the amendment, he urges that democratic state conventions shall nominate their candidates for the senate when and in the same manner as they nominate their governors and state officers, so that the selection of senators shall not be open to bribery influences always set in motion after an election. The case of Senator Lorimer of Illinois has given reinforced strength to his position. He believes that until senators shall be selected either in conventions before elections or directly by the people it will be impossible to secure a majority in the United States senate for reform for a score of years to come and perhaps never. His letter to Governor Harmon cuts deep: 'Have you any influence with the democratic state committee? If you have, why did you not urge the committee to include the selection of a candidate for United States senator in its call for a state convention? If you urged this upon the committee and were turned down, why do you not appeal to the convention as Governor Marshall did? He made a fight for the nomination and won—not only won a victory for Indiana democracy, but won a place among the national leaders of the party.' That was pretty pointed and drew blood, and many Buckeye democrats are now asking Harmon the same question. The Nebraskan's supporters in Ohio are legion. A true follower of Bryan is as insistent and outspoken in his reform demands as is their leader. The absolute control of democratic politics and policies for fourteen years convinces Governor Harmon's friends that Bryan will be a potent factor in the next national convention. Harmon and his friends replied to Bryan's open letter in the usual way: 'To nominate a senator in advance of the election is impolitic; to do so will eliminate the work and influence of every democratic aspirant who is not selected, an important factor in doubtful states,' is their reply. But that reason satisfies neither Bryan nor his friends."

HOLLAND, THE New York correspondent for the Boston Herald who has not always been friendly to Mr. Bryan, writes to his paper as follows: "Since the meeting of the Lake Mohonk peace conference the members of the association who dwell in New York, and who attended the meetings of a week ago, have been speaking with enthusiasm of the address delivered by Colonel William J. Bryan. A majority of those who heard Colonel Bryan upon that occasion have been opposed to him politically, and some have looked upon him as a master rhetorician, who does not think very deeply. But they now say that it is a new Bryan who was revealed to them at the Lake Mohonk conference. They were prepared for somewhat exuberant rhetoric; there was none. Colonel Bryan was revealed to them as a really great speaker, concise, dignified, even profound, and he persuaded his audience as very likely he never before persuaded men of the intellectual capacity which distinguished the members of the Lake Mohonk peace association. Some of those who heard him were of the opinion that his later experiences, and possibly the fire of discipline through which he passed in his latest presidential canvass, have served to bring out his higher and greater qualities, both as a thinker and as an orator who can persuade, giving utterance to thoughts which are remembered after the personality of the speaker has passed from view. And it is the opinion of those who heard Colonel Bryan that his address was the great triumph of the Lake Mohonk meeting."

NOW, MR. ROOSEVELT has stirred up trouble between Robert Collier and the good Dr. Lyman Abbott. The story is told by a writer in the Chicago Record-Herald in this way: "Thoughtless Collier's! Recently, in a moment of ebullient high spirits, it concluded that the people must 'tell Roosevelt,' and instructed them how to do it. They were to cut out the Collier coupons, which gave them a chance to express opinions on a variety of current questions, and were to mail them to Mr. Roosevelt—care of the Outlook. Under this arrangement Collier's was to beat up the game

and the Outlook was obligingly to hold the bag. Collier's was to play the cards and the Outlook was docilely to count the tricks. Collier's was to enjoy the limelight and the Outlook was to be a stage hand in the wings. But the Outlook itself is a mighty hunter and a good hand at cards and an unblinking facer of the limelight. It rebelled. It was not advertising in Collier's, as many people might be led to suppose; nor was it prepared to act as somebody else's letter box. Collier's has now modified its announcement. In its latest issue it states that Collier's will itself receive and tabulate the Roosevelt ballots. Cross lights are confusing. If, therefore, you wish to inform the ex-president that you are not satisfied with the present tariff, that you do not favor the re-election of Cannon as speaker, that you do favor the establishment of a parcels post and that you do not approve of Mr. Taft's administration so far, be sure to send your ballot to Collier's and not to the Outlook. If, on the other hand, you wish to say that you are completely satisfied with Mr. Roosevelt's ideas and practices as a shooter of big game, that you accept with fervor his views on race suicide and international peace, and that you would rather hear the Abbots on Roosevelt than anybody else on any other topic whatever, then send your ballot to the Outlook and not to Collier's. Mr. Roosevelt should not be kept waiting beyond the 19th of June."

WHEN THEODORE Roosevelt was at Cairo he created a commotion by attacking the nationalist movement and a crowd of students made a demonstration before the hotel at which Roosevelt was stopping. But Mr. Roosevelt has repaid them for this indignity. Invited to speak in London in the famous Guild hall, Mr. Roosevelt created the greatest sensation of his whole tour. He practically called upon the British government to use the "big stick" and put down the growing nationalist movement in Egypt. Mr. Roosevelt said: "I speak as a real and not as a mock democrat, who feels his first thought is bound to be for the welfare of mankind, and who wars against injustice and violence, in accordance with the principle I held toward the Philippines while president. You have given Egypt the best government in two thousand years, yet recently you erred. It is necessary to remember that weakness and timidity and sentiment alike are more harmful to an uncivilized people than violence and injustice. If you feel that you ought not to be in Egypt, and have no desire to keep order there, by all means get out. If you feel that it is your duty to stay there, then show yourselves ready to meet the responsibility of your position."

MR. ROOSEVELT'S London speech drew out strong criticism in England as well as in Egypt. English politicians fear that the speech will cause an explosion among the nationalists in Egypt. A London cablegram to the Denver Times says: "There were constant comparisons today between Roosevelt's position and the Lord Sackville-West incident of October, 1888, when the then British ambassador to the United States was dismissed by President Cleveland because he privately wrote a letter advising a citizen to vote for Cleveland. It is not contended that the cases are parallel, but it is insisted by many that Roosevelt has been guilty of a breach of diplomatic propriety. Today's criticism of Roosevelt increased in severity. The Evening Star takes the hardest rap at him. 'Roosevelt has long been unaccustomed to being spoken to plainly,' it says. 'He has long lived in a perfect stew of eulogy, but the temptation is irresistible to tell him that he is guilty of a grave offense against the laws binding host and guest and against the laws that governed the White House when he was its occupant. The fact that his predecessor was assassinated should have made him most careful in his comments regarding the assassination of Boutros Pasha, the Egyptian premier.' The Daily Graphic reminds the colonel that 'even Socrates was poisoned for giving too much advice.' The Manchester Guardian voices a common criticism when it says that